

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

Faculty / School of:	Leeds Institute of Health Sciences
Subject(s):	<i>Masters in Public Health</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Masters in Public Health
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	Masters

**Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards**

**Points of innovation and/or good practice**

*Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.*  
The high level of support for dissertation supervision is to be commended. Whilst the course has come to an end the team are still actively supporting students to the completion of their programme of study. Over the period of my involvement with the programme I have seen a wide range of research methods being successfully supervised with a very practical application of dissertations into practice.

As an examiner I have been a mentor to other examiners and feel this is an innovation that the School should be commended on.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

*Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.*

NA as the course is now closed

**Matters for Urgent Attention**

*If there are any areas which you think require urgent attention before the programme is offered again please note them in this box*

NA

**For Examiners in the first year of appointment**

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	Y / N
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	Y / N
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	Y / N

**For Examiners completing their term of appointment**

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y

6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y / N
7.	Have you acted as an External Examiner Mentor?	Y

*Please comment on your experience of the programme(s) over the period of your appointment, remarking in particular on changes from year to year and the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching provision, on standards achieved, on marking and assessment and the procedures of the School*

Over my period of tenure I have found that the course team have comprehensively responded to all comments made. Prior to the closure of the programme I was involved in the management team meetings which I found very beneficial and was able to use this to both meet and hear comments from student representatives. The use made of paperless examination boards is also to be welcomed. After the decision to close the course at each examination board it was clear that student completion of the programme was a priority for the team and that student experience was not adversely affected. The team is to be commended by the professional manner in which they have managed this transition.

## Standards

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Y
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y

*Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.*

NA as the course has now closed

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
-----	---	---

*Please explain how this is/could be achieved (examples might include: curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research)*

During this last year I was able to review 6 new submissions of dissertations and 1 resubmission. The students covered a wide range of research methods from primary data collection to secondary data analysis. These methods were supported by the staff within the Masters programme. The research subjects were both practical and applied to the field of public health and there is evidence that findings will be used in practice. This application of theory to practice is an important skill for the public health professionals that have undertaken this programme.

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
-----	--	---

*Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:*

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
-----	--	---

*Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:*

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
-----	--	---

*Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:*

## Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs, in particular: the design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards; the quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.</i></p> <p>NA taught elements of the programme are now complete</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses; the strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort: The range of marks for the dissertations reviewed were appropriate and comparable to similar programmes of study in other Universities.</i></p>		
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p> <p><b>I was provided with all relevant marks and I have always been impressed by the quality of feedback that the course team provide for their students. An area that the University may wish to consider in future is that for any resits on dissertations it would be helpful to provide external examiners with marks sheets and comments from both attempts so a comparison can be made.</b></p>		

### The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiner's role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?	Y
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y / N na
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y

35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>The Board was efficiently chaired and all processes were transparent.</p>		

**Other comments**

**Please use this box if you wish to make any further comments not covered elsewhere on the form**

Thank you to \_\_\_\_\_ and the course team for their support of my role as their external examiner over the past 5 years. I have found the course team to be enthusiastic and supportive of the student cohort, and I expect this has had a positive impact on student experience. I understand that a number of their students have achieved high level positions in public health and this is to be commended.

**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)**

Title and Name of Responder:

Position\*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

Director of Postgraduate Studies *on behalf of* the Director of Student Education

Faculty of Medicine and Health School of Medicine

\*If the individual responding to the report is not the Head of School please state their position within the School.

**Completing the School response**

The completed School response (including the full original report) should be attached to an e-mail and sent to the Pro-Dean for Student Education in the relevant Faculty. Following approval by the Pro-Dean for Student Education, the School must send the response (including the full original report) directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at [qat@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:qat@leeds.ac.uk). External Examiners should receive a formal response no later than six weeks after receipt of the original report.

**Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice**

N/A

**Response to Enhancements made from the previous year**

N/A

**Response to Matters for Urgent Attention**

If any areas have been identified for urgent attention before the programme is offered again please provide a specific response to them here:

N/A

**Response to questions 1-7 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

The School is grateful for \_\_\_\_\_'s sustained approach to the Public Health programme. The course is no longer recruiting. \_\_\_\_\_ kindly agreed to continue in \_\_\_\_\_ appointment as External Examiner whilst the students completed their dissertations.

**Standards****Response to questions 8 to 16 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

N/A

**Assessment and Feedback****Response to questions 17 to 19 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

N/A

**The Progression and Awards Process****Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

The School notes the positive comments made about the Programme Leader,

**Other comments****Response to items included in the 'Other Comments' section of the report**

N/A

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

Faculty / School of:	Medicine and Health
Subject(s):	<i>Nuffield Centre for International Health and Development</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Master of Public Health (International)
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MPH

**Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards**

**Points of innovation and/or good practice**

*Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.*  
This has been a one year (interim) external examinership, but I have been supplied with the last report of my predecessor and am familiar with the course from my role of external examiner for the parallel MA in Health Management Planning and Policy. Staff have rightly been regularly complimented on the quality of the feedback on assignments given to students.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

*Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.*  
My predecessor had commented on a similarity in structure of assignments. The teaching staff- regularly develop assignments and there is a regular increase in their diversity. This year has been no exception.

**Matters for Urgent Attention**

*If there are any areas which you think require urgent attention before the programme is offered again please note them in this box*  
I have expressed my concern about the depth of the coverage of epidemiology within the course. It is not uncommon for MPH courses to be centred totally around epidemiology and it is not inappropriate that the Leeds University Course should adopt a contrasting approach. However, the current course would appear to enable students to graduate with a fairly rudimentary knowledge of the subject. Greater coverage of epidemiology should be core for all students.  
Staff should review the comparative weightings given to elements within assignments. Group presentations generally count for 20% or 30%, but in some cases this is as high as 50%. Individual poster presentations generally count for at least 50%. This variation in weighting may not be inappropriate but it should be reviewed across modules to ensure that there is underlying consistency.  
A number of optional modules failed to run this year. The implications of this should be reviewed to ensure that students who may have wished to follow these options are not 'short-changed' in their educational experience. Staff should consider the possibility of making M&E a core module (as is the case with Health Systems Research). I believe there is evidence that students are currently handicapped in their pursuit of other options if they have not followed this option – or, put more positively, that there is good evidence of synergy between options. {This could potentially be within the context of a fuller project/programme planning module}.

**For Examiners in the first year of appointment**

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	Y
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	Y
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	N

**For Examiners completing their term of appointment**

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y
7.	Have you acted as an External Examiner Mentor?	Y previously

*Please comment on your experience of the programme(s) over the period of your appointment, remarking in particular on changes from year to year and the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching provision, on standards achieved, on marking and assessment and the procedures of the School*  
As indicated above, this has been a one year (interim) appointment. However, from my prior knowledge of the course and from my review of my predecessors comments, it is clear that the staff are highly committed and receptive to suggested improvements in the learning and teaching provision.

**Standards**

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Y / N
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	N/A
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y / N

*Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.*

Please see my earlier observations on the coverage of epidemiology within the course.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
-----	---	---

*Please explain how this is/could be achieved (examples might include: curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research)*

Staff at the Nuffield have traditionally been heavily involved in international consultancy work – effectively undertaking applied research. This is vital for them to retain an up-to-date knowledge of the current status of health systems and current debates around their development. Recently this has frequently take the form of longer-term institutional development (working with academic colleagues in-country to develop their own teaching programmes). This is very worthwhile and should be encouraged.

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
-----	--	---

*Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:*

Students are required to undertake the Health Systems Research Module which provides excellent grounding

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
-----	--	---

*Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:*

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		

### Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs, in particular: the design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards; the quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.</i></p> <p>The variety in assessment methods employed enables these to be tailored to the ILOs of particular modules; but (as above) I would request that a check be made of comparability of weighting of elements across modules. Student performance in assessments generally reflects well on the quality of teaching and learning (not only in the module being assessed but in other modules previously pursued.)</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses; the strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort:</i></p> <p>This has been a widely performing cohort of students, with some achieving an excellent standard of work and others more noticeably struggling. In the case of the latter I am happy with the level of support provided and, across the full group, very satisfied with the comparability against other courses.</p>		
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p> <p>I have observed (and commented on) a contrast between those markers who adopt a 'glass half empty' approach to providing feedback – concentrating on the weaknesses in assignments – and those that adopt a 'glass half full' approach – concentrating on the achievements in assignments. I think that this (to a small degree) is reflected in marks awarded for assignments, or in particular dissertations, and should be kept under review.</p>		

### The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiner's role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?	Y
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	N
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y



29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i>  Students at the Nuffield have always enjoyed a high level of support from non-academic and academic staff alike. It has been gratifying to see that this has not altered despite the increasing pressures and demands upon staff.</p>		

#### Other comments

**Please use this box if you wish to make any further comments not covered elsewhere on the form**

I have made some quite detailed comments on individual module assignments and on dissertations. These have always been well received.

## Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report

### Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

<i>Title and Name of Responder:</i>	
<i>Position*:</i>	Director of Postgraduate Studies <i>on behalf of the</i> Director of Student Education
<i>Faculty / School of:</i>	Faculty of Medicine and Health School of Medicine
<i>Address for communication:</i>	
<i>Email:</i>	
<i>Telephone:</i>	

## Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report

### Completing the School response

The completed School response (including the full original report) should be attached to an e-mail and sent to the Pro-Dean for Student Education in the relevant Faculty. Following approval by the Pro-Dean for Student Education, the School must send the response (including the full original report) directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at [gat@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:gat@leeds.ac.uk). External Examiners should receive a formal response no later than six weeks after receipt of the original report.

#### **Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice**

No specific comments

#### **Response to Enhancements made from the previous year**

The programme team ensures that there is considerable diversity in the type and structure of the assessments which include written assignments, an examination, individual and group oral presentations and individual poster presentations. The written assignments include topics determined by the module leader and topics which are self-selected by the students and based on their previous work experience.

#### **Response to Matters for Urgent Attention**

*If any areas have been identified for urgent attention before the programme is offered again please provide a specific response to them here:*

has raised concerns that students may graduate with a fairly rudimentary knowledge of the subject of epidemiology.

The programme team will consider opportunities to enhance epidemiology teaching. They will raise these concerns with the new External Examiner who started his role during the academic year 2017/8.

The School is grateful to for highlighting the variability in the contributions made by assessments to module marks. The programme team will review the weightings

The programme team will review the range of modules which are available as optional parts of the programme.

.

#### **Response to questions 1-7 (and related comments)**

*Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:*

No specific comments

## Standards

### **Response to questions 8 to 16 (and related comments)**

*Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:*

The issue of Epidemiology has been addressed under issues for urgent attention.

## Assessment and Feedback

### **Response to questions 17 to 19 (and related comments)**

*Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:*

The analysis of the comparability of weighting of different assessment elements in different modules will be conducted during this academic year. The results will be discussed with the other programme leaders, teachers and the new external examiner.

## The Progression and Awards Process

### **Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)**

*Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:*

No specific comments

## Other comments

### **Response to items included in the 'Other Comments' section of the report**

No specific comments

The School is grateful to \_\_\_\_\_ for submitting \_\_\_\_\_ report and we are grateful that \_\_\_\_\_ acted as an interim External Examiner.