

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

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 27/02/2019

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

<i>Title and Name of Examiner:</i>	Prof Fiona Woollard
<i>Faculty / School of:</i>	IDEA Centre
<i>Subject(s):</i>	<i>Interdisciplinary / Philosophy</i>
<i>Programme(s) / Module(s):</i>	MA Applied and Professional Ethics MA (Online) Biomedical and Healthcare Ethics MA Biomedical and Healthcare Ethics BA Biomedical and Healthcare Ethics Professional Ethics Short Course
<i>Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):</i>	

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

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

*I was extremely impressed with the scope and quality of the teaching. These programmes provide unique opportunities to explore ethical issues in a way that is deeply connected to professional practice. The feedback provided was helpful and clearly explained to the student why they received the mark they did and how they might improve.*

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

*Not applicable. (This is my first year as external examiner on these programmes.)*

**Matters for Urgent Attention**

*None.*

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

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	Y / <del>N</del>
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	<del>Y</del> / N
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	<del>Y</del> / 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 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 / 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 I do not know of any comparable programmes.
-----	---	--

*Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes  
The overall programme structure seems to be very well designed. The learning outcomes are appropriate. See comments above..*

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)*

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

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

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

*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.*

The assessments were very well designed to scaffold student learning and to guide them towards achieving the learning outcomes. I was particularly pleased to see a nice variety of assessment methods.

18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y / <del>N</del>
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y / <del>N</del>

*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:*

As noted above, I am not familiar with any truly comparable courses. The programmes at IDEA are unusual in their focus on an interdisciplinary approach to professional and healthcare ethics. The academic standards demonstrated by students are appropriate to the level and focus of the degree. As a cohort, students often initially had considerable practical experience, but much less familiarly with ethical theory.

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

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

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

**Other comments**

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