

**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

**Part A: General Information****Subject area and awards being examined**

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Faculty / School of:          | School of Medicine (LIME)  |
| Subject(s):                   | Clinical Education   |
| Programme(s) / Module(s):     | <p><u>Programmes:</u> PGCert &amp; Masters (Clinical Education);</p> <p><u>Modules:</u><br/>           MEDS 5106M (Learning &amp; Teaching in the Clinical Context),<br/>           MEDS 5107M (Assessment &amp; Evaluation in the Clinical Context) ,<br/>           MEDS 5108M (Innovation &amp; Change in Clinical Education),<br/>           MEDS 5109M (Researching Clinical Education)<br/>           MEDS 5110M (Clinical Education Dissertation)</p> <p>Also EDUC 5340M (Critical Study - programme transferred from School of Education).</p> |
| Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc): | PGCert/MEd Clinical Education  |

**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.*

Good practice includes:

- Double-marking of assessments;
- Explicit feedback on each of the 5 criteria by which assessments are judged;
- 'Feed-forward' feedback that clarifies what students could do to improve grades the next time;
- Feedback on academic skills, where appropriate – e.g., on building an argument; on grammar and punctuation;
- Feedback on the feasibility and size of proposed research projects, and on ethics;
- The opportunity for me to meet with students on the programme – greatly appreciated.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

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

- As a new external examiner, I don't have direct experience of this. However, the programme transferred to its new home, the Leeds Institute of Medical Education, this academic session; comparing my experience with that of the outgoing external examiner, it's clear to see that the same high standards of delivery have been achieved in spite of what must have been a relatively disruptive time for staff.

**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*

- Not applicable.

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

|    |   |       |
|----|---|-------|
| 1. | Were you provided with an External Examiners Handbook?  | Y / N |
| 2. | Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School 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 / N |
| 5. | Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?                         | Y / N |
| 6. | Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this? | Y / N |
| 7. | Have you acted as a External Examiner Mentor?   | Y / N |

*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*

- Not applicable.

**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 / N |
| 10. | Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?     | Y / N |
| 11. | Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)? | Y / N |
| 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.*

- The programme is structured such that students completing the first two courses (MEDS 5106M and MEDS 5107M) will have a good grounding in the basics of learning, teaching, assessment and evaluation in clinical education, as well as experience in applying the theory to their practice, and reflecting critically on that practice. An exit point of PGCert is provided here.
- Students who wish to undertake the masters go on to complete MEDS 5108M and MEDS 5109M, the former allowing them to gain a deeper understanding of new developments in clinical education; and the latter giving them experience in undertaking literature searches, in critical review of the literature, and in considering methodologies to address specific research questions. They then move on to undertake course MEDS 5110M, the Dissertation, in which they learn about the conduct of research in clinical education by carrying out and reporting on an empirical project.
- In my view, this overall structure is well-suited to meeting the needs of those who wish to improve their clinical teaching practice, as well as those who wish to learn about and experience research in clinical education.
- MEDS5108M is a particularly clever addition to the programme, because it offers the programme team flexibility to change the focus of the course year on year, to reflect current developments and thereby ensure that students receive a thoroughly up-to-date education.
- Initially, I had some concern about the possibility of auto-plagiarism, if there was too much overlap between the assessment for MEDS 5109M and the Dissertation. However, the programme team responded to my concerns and I am completely reassured that MEDS 5109M is developmental in nature, and note that the literature review comprises a relatively small component of the Dissertation.

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

*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)*

- Several of the staff who teach and examine on this programme are active in (medical) education research.

|   |   |       |
|---|---|-------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was noticeable that students were inclined to reference literature pertaining to education within their particular health profession or, at most, other health professions. In their feedback to students, the programme team encouraged them to engage with the literature on higher/general education per se, and I wholeheartedly agree with this stance.</li> </ul> |       |
| 14.   | Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?  | Y / N |
| <p><i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not applicable.</li> </ul>   |   |       |
| 15.   | Does the programme include clinical practice components?  | Y / N |
| <p><i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not applicable.</li> </ul>  |   |       |
| 16.   | Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?  | Y / N |
| <p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The programme is accredited by the Nursing &amp; Midwifery Council; however, the appropriateness of the programme to address NMC requirements is the remit of my fellow external examiner.</li> </ul> |   |       |

### Assessment and Feedback

|   |   |       |
|---|---|-------|
| 17.   | Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?   | Y / N |
| <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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The main forms of assessment are essays, case studies and the Dissertation. The case studies are particularly appropriate for a programme that aims to foster critically reflective practice, and they make for especially interesting reading, given the variety of health professions represented in the student body.</li> <li>Regarding the TEL case study (MEDS 5108M), at the October CoA we did discuss whether it might not have been appropriate to assess the wiki directly, but the programme team had justifiable concerns about the situation if any students did not contribute.</li> </ul> |   |       |
| 18.   | Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?  | Y / N |
| 19.   | Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes? | Y / N |
| <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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In general, the work produced by the students is of high quality which is reflected in the merits and distinctions achieved.</li> </ul>  |   |       |
| <p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I'm impressed that the programme team has been able to maintain the practice of double marking all assessments.</li> <li>The student reps appreciated the feedback on summative work, but also (and especially?) the feedback on draft assignments.</li> </ul>   |   |       |

### The Progression and Awards Process

|   |  |         |
|---|--|---------|
| 20.   | Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiners role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?               | Y / N   |
| 21.   | Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?                                 | Y / N   |
| 22.   | Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?  | Y / N   |
| 23.   | Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?   | Y / N   |
| 24.   | Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?   | Y / N   |
| 25.   | Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?   | Y / N   |
| 26.   | Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?  | Y / N   |
| 27.   | Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?   | Y / N   |
| 28.   | Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?               | Y / N   |
| 29.   | Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?   | Y / N * |
| 30.   | Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?   | Y / N   |
| 31.   | Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?  | Y / N   |
| 32.   | Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?          | Y / N   |
| 33.   | Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?  | Y / N   |
| 34.   | Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?   | Y / N   |
| 35.   | Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board? | Y / N   |
| <p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(*) Regarding 29, internal examiners made use of the opportunity to make in-text comments, to varying degrees. Where such comments were included, there was generally consistency between these and the feedback given.</li> </ul> |  |         |

#### Other comments

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

I found the programme team to be very enthusiastic about their courses and students, and to be very professional in all of my interactions with them. As a new external examiner, they made me feel very welcome.

**Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report****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 <i>on behalf of</i> 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 [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**

Thank you for indicating 4 areas of good practice relating to the assessment process. The students do this programme on a part time basis and are usually working fulltime in the NHS or HEIs. The Programme Team put a lot of effort into ensuring that students are supported in making the transition from scientific fields of study into the social science and education fields. This is done by the provision of developmental feedback on their work and the School notes that you have indicated that this is an area of good practice. You have also mentioned the work the team does ensuring that Masters students have a feasible and manageable research project as well as supporting them through the ethical review process. The team will continue wherever possible to arrange for you to meet a range of students when you visit.

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

The programme is now established within the Leeds Institute of Medical Education in the School of Medicine. The Programme Team will show you how we intend to enhance the programme by making available our action plan from our programme review for 16-17.

**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:

No matters of urgent attention required

**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 points raised here.

**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:*

Thank you for your considered points in relation to the standards. You state that module MEDS5109M is developmental in its nature and that although there are links between modules MEDS5109M and MEDS5110M, there is no duplication of work. Thank you for this careful analysis.

## 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:*

You comment on the assessment methods and we welcomed the discussion the Programme Team had about the TEL activity. As the new MSc Medical Education is developed we welcome your advice and expertise.

## 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 points need addressing in this section

## Other comments

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

Thank you for your final comments, these are much appreciated by the Programme Team and the School of Medicine.