

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 11/10/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Leeds Institute of Cardiovascular and Metabolic Medicine

Subject(s):

Clinical Embryology

Programme(s) / Module(s):

CE-DL 2016 Cohort

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

MSc

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

Points of innovation and/or good practice

The quality of the course is consistently high. The setting and marking of exams are both very rigorous. The electronic marking system for marking essays works very well, with detailed comments and clear guidance on how to improve performance. The lab design project is an excellent part of the course, allowing students to work together collaboratively on a project with clear practical relevance to working in clinical embryology. The fact that students can report on each other's input into the project is a useful way of monitoring how this works as a joint enterprise. The fact that in the essay on legal and ethical guidelines the students are asked to compare the UK framework and that of their country of origin, is a very good way to get them to think about differences in regulations internationally.

Enhancements made from the previous year

The main enhancements to the course are more uniform marking schemes to provide a consistently high quality of assessment across the different aspects of the course.

Matters for Urgent Attention

None.

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

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?	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

It has been a pleasure to be an external examiner on this course. It is extremely well put together, with a variety of interesting components, providing a comprehensive learning experience. The assessment of both course work and the exams are very rigorous and there is a huge amount of effort put into helping the students develop and improve throughout the year. The quality of the work of the students is very high, as shown by the high level of Distinctions, but this also reflects the great attention to detail shown by the course organisers and the faculty members in general. The course organisers and examiners have been extremely responsive to my comments and suggestions for improvements over the years I have been external examiner.

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><i>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</i></p> <p>The programme of work is very well thought out, with a well-integrated design structure that teaches the students about clinical embryology in a variety of ways. The aims and intended learning outcomes are very clear.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<p><i>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)</i></p> <p>The influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching is very clear. There is a clear input from the research expertise and interests of the faculty members who give seminars and mark essays.</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i></p> <p>N/A</p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i></p> <p>The programme has a central clinical component which is enhanced by the highly experienced clinicians and clinical embryologists who teach on the course.</p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i></p> <p>The programme is specifically geared towards producing skilled clinical embryologists who meet the requirements required for working in the industry, as assessed by a professional body such as the UK Association of Clinical Embryologists (ACE).</p>		

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 students are assessed by a variety of methods, which include marking of essays set during the year, the assessment of the lab design project that included presentations, and the marked dissertation. The design of the course clearly aligns intended learning outcomes with assessment.

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:

The students have shown a very high level of academic achievement, as shown by the high number of Distinctions, and evidenced by what I have seen of the high quality of essays, presentations, and written dissertations.

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

All the points I wanted to make are covered above.

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
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:

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 Examiner:

Subject(s):

Clinical Embryology

Programme(s) / Module(s):

CE-DL 2016 Cohort

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

PGdip/MSc (all 2016 students graduated with MSc)

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Programme Leader

Faculty / School of:

SoM, LICAMM

Address for communication:

Room 7.15a, Leeds Institute of Cardiovascular and Metabolic Medicine, The LIGHT Laboratories, Clarendon Way, University of Leeds,

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

We thank _____ for the very positive comments on the programme, and note that the points of innovation /good practice that were described were:

- i) That when marking essays we give our students feedback clear guidance on how to improve performance.
- ii) That the lab design group project is an excellent tool for collaborative working.
- iii) That the essay on legal and ethical guidelines allows student to comment on the practices in their own country.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

The external examiner refers to the use of uniform marking schemes to across the course. When new staff members have joined the programme we have held meetings to discuss how we give feedback to students, showing examples of the type of feedback and the typical marking ranges. This has included holding meetings of the academic team as a whole and also through one-to-one meetings with the Programme Lead and the new staff member.

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:

There are no matters for urgent attention.

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 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:

The only comment is that the programme is not accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB).

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 external examiner indicates that the assessment methods are varied, that they are appropriate and that they align with learning outcomes.

The external examiner indicates satisfaction with the academic standards demonstrated by this cohort.

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 external examiner is satisfied with all the points relating to progression and award.

Other comments

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

No specific comments were made by the external examiner.