

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18 QAT Received 22/08/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

SCHOOL OF HEALTHCARE

Subject(s):

Mentorship

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Support for Learning in Practice

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

NCB

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 is a practice based units where candidates use evidence and reflection to evidence there practical knowledge and understanding of mentorship.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

More students are being given feedback as to their achievement of the portfolio rather than a tick.

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

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 offered at induction

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
The team have been very helpful in helping me to understand the unit and the processes of the faculty. An excellent induction was provided and the unit lead, , is always available for queries and discussion. Over the course of the year the rigour of review has been consistent. Students who have not achieved have been given clear guidance regarding resubmission.

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 (NMC 2008 SLaiP
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.

This is a non-credit bearing unit and the assessment process is appropriate. The assessment process enables the student to demonstrate their ability to support and assess students in practice.

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)

The unit materials draw upon recent research on mentorship as well as core texts that are in date and evidence based.

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

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

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

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

Please see comments above

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

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

This programme has been validated as part of the NMC approval process

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
-----	---	---

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 ILO's are commensurate with a non-credit bearing assessment and in alignment with the NMC (2008) standards

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?	

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:

Many students demonstrated rigour to their approach. These students mapped the evidence clearly to the outcomes. Their reflection supported their practical application of the mentorship standards. Where students were not successful it was because they had not considered the nature of the evidence or had used the unit reading list to inform their understanding. Some students had unwittingly breached confidentiality, this was addressed by the unit lead. This is a challenge when providing evidence that is practice based.

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
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?	N/A
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	N/A
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	N/A
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	N/A
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	N/A
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	N/A
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	N/A

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

I am due to attend a board in October 2018 and so feel unable to respond to q32-35

Other comments

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

I have been made to feel very welcome by the whole team. IT were super in helping me get logged on, My thanks to
for kindness and responsiveness and to for friendly welcome.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)*Title and Name of Examiner:*

Subject(s):

Support for Learning in Practice

Programme(s) / Module(s):

As above, HECS 8007

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

NCB

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Director of Student Education

Faculty / School of:

School of Healthcare

Address for communication:

The University of Leeds
LEEDS
LS2 9JT

Email:

Telephone:

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. 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 your very positive and supportive report. The programme team greatly appreciates your input into the module and your comments have been discussed by the team.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

The team has add more depth to feedback for candidates in response to your earlier advice on this issue and it is pleasing to note that you are now content with the level of feedback provided.

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 issues were identified

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:

Thank you for confirming that you were provided with all required information for your induction.

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 confirming that our programme continues to comply with the required standards of both the University and the NMC.

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 team works with students to ensure that they have a clear understanding of the evidence that they are required to submit to demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes, and it is pleasing when students' approach to this and their reflections enable them to clearly demonstrate achievement of the mentorship standard.

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:

It is reassuring to receive confirmation that you are satisfied with our assessment and award processes and the team looks forward to welcoming you to the exam board in the autumn.

Other comments

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

Thank you for your complimentary comments on the support you have received from both the student support team and programme leader.

The programme team has welcomed your support and advice over the last year and is delighted that you have agreed to continue as external examiner for this programme to oversee the remaining 3 cohorts.