

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:	Institute of Health Sciences
Subject(s):	<i>Postgraduate Certificate of Education in Primary Care</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	GPPH5101M Educational Theory GPPH5102M Education in Practice GPPH5103M The Consultation GPPH5104M Teaching the Consultation
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	Postgraduate Certificate

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 PG Cert is one of the preferred programmes of local deaneries for prospective trainers and the modules and assessments have clearly been developed with a practical focus. GPPH 5102M is an example of this. The assessment has relevance to the students' future roles and the induction pack could be used in practice.

The team are clearly responsive to student feedback and I have been provided with examples of how the course has evolved in response to the feedback.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

Some of the course materials have been updated in response to student feedback.

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

There are no matters for urgent action.

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?	Y

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 an 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

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
<p>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</p> <p>The course has evolved and developed over the last few years. This was highlighted in the previous External Examiners Report. It is well structured and the aims and ILOs are appropriate and at a level commensurate with other institutions. They were of an appropriate standard for a certificate level award in relation to the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<p>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)</p> <p>The modules and assessments are aligned with current research on medical education theory and support the principles of the RCGP curriculum. Research underpins the course objectives and students are provided with research based feedback in the marking of assignments.</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<p>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</p> <p>Not applicable</p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<p>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<p>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</p>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p>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.</p>		

I believe that the assessments are clearly aligned with the ILOs. The assessments have clear practical application and allow students to demonstrate their understanding of the relevant module theory. As the external examiner, I am provided with the assessments for moderation well in advance of the examiner meetings and I am encouraged to provide feedback prior to the meetings.

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

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:

In general performance was good. The assessments allowed the students to demonstrate their ability and achieve a high standard. From the assignments submitted for moderation, there were no obvious consistent weaknesses, which would indicate a problem with the course delivery. Students seemed to be able to apply the theory learned with the practical application of education delivery and demonstrate this in their assessments.

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:

The level of feedback provided to students was very good. There is evidence of a rigorous approach to marking and all grades are justified accordingly, with second marking performed. Comments are clear and in general there is consistency between markers and across modules in this regard, which needs commending. There may be scope to increase the length and number of second marker comments to justify/validate the first marker grade and comments in some instances. Whilst there is clear consistency between the grading of markers and the level awarded, there is some variation between markers on the number and length of the comments provided. This is a minor point given the quality of the comments.

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/A
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	N/A
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

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:

I was provided an appropriate range of assessments to allow me to make a judgement on the quality and standard of the student work. The final exam board was conducted appropriately in a professional manner and the meetings are structured well. Examiners have the opportunity during the meeting to reflect on student feedback and discuss potential changes.

Other comments

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

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 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

The School thanks _____ for report. _____ notes that the assessments have been developed with a practical focus that have relevance to their future roles, aligning with school strategy. It is also of note that _____ highlights that the programme team has responded to student feedback in the past resulting in changes in our course delivery.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

With respect to assignment feedback I am pleased to read that _____ notes we give research based feedback in the marking of the assignments and that the assessments are clearly aligned with the intended learning outcomes for the course. _____ also notes that the level of feedback provided to students is very good and this is something on which the programme team focuses on.

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:

The School notes that there are no matters arising that require urgent attention. I am confident that the important points that _____ notes are being addressed.

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 comment

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:

No comment

[]

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:

With respect to assignment feedback, the School notes that the team gives research based feedback in the marking of the assignments and that the assessments are clearly aligned with the intended learning outcomes of the course. [] also notes that the level of feedback provided to students is very good.

The School has noted the comment on the variation between the number of comments given by markers and also the length of the second marker comments. This is partly process driven and the team are reviewing the marking. Primary marking is electronic. Second marking is on paper and this maintains student anonymity. Otherwise the team perceives there is a risk that the comments included in the text from the first marker may influence the second. As a result the comments are not usually transcribed by the second marker on to the original submission as this is felt to be a quality and benchmarking process rather than a specific additional layer or feedback. The Programme Leader will consider this with the wider team and reflect on whether this is the appropriate process or whether the additional feedback would be valuable. This needs to be considered in the context of equity across students with all receiving feedback from only one course marker under the current system.

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:

I am glad to read that [] thought the exam board meeting [] attended was run in a professional manner and was consistent with the expectations of the School.

Other comments

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

[]