

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 19/10/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

<i>Faculty / School of:</i>	School of Medicine / Leeds Institute of Health Sciences
<i>Subject(s):</i>	<i>Health Economics</i>
<i>Programme(s) / Module(s):</i>	MSc Health Economics HECN5010M Principles of Health Economics HECN5020M Economic Evaluation for Health Technology Assessment HECN5030M Applied Health Econometrics HECN5040M Health Economics Dissertation
<i>Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):</i>	MSc

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 very well-designed programme, which provides students with a thorough training in health economics at the masters level. Particularly commendable is the fact that along with a thorough training in the theory of health economics and relevant statistical/econometric methods the students are given opportunities to put the methods into practice within several of the modules in the programme. Students therefore develop many hands-on skills that will be useful whether they continue doing research in health economics at the PhD level, or decide to start working as health economists in the public or private sector after completing their masters.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

No enhancements were necessary.

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?	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?	N/A
7.	Have you acted as an External Examiner Mentor?	N/A

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

My experience of the programme over the period of my appointment has been consistently very positive. No major changes have been necessary, but some modifications have been made from year to year (e.g. to the HECN5030M Applied Health Econometrics module), which have been very successful. The standards achieved are high and in line with comparable institutions. The marking and assessment is very thoroughly conducted, and the marks are well-justified by the detailed feedback provided. The School is very professionally managed, which has greatly assisted me in my role as 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

Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.

My overall impression of the programme is very positive. The Aims and ILOs for the modules are appropriate and comparable to similar programmes at other universities.

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 material taught to students is informed by current research in health economics. Students have the opportunity to undertake an independent supervised piece of research in the Health Economics Dissertation module.

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

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

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	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)?	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
<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> <p>The assessment methods are appropriate and suitable for judging whether the ILOs have been achieved. Based on student performance the quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods is consistently high.</p>		
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
<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> <p>The students were given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement and performed similarly to students on comparable courses at other institutions.</p>		
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p>		

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 (via teleconference)
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Health Economics

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MSc Health Economics
HECN5010M Principles of Health Economics
HECN5020M Economic Evaluation for Health Technology Assessment
HECN5030M Applied Health Econometrics
HECN5040M Health Economics Dissertation

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

MSc

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Director of Student Education – SoM TPG

Faculty / School of:

School of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Health

Address for communication:

University of Leeds,
Worsley Building
Clarendon Way
LEEDS LS2 9NL.

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 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 MSc in Health Economics was designed to underpin theoretical knowledge in health economics with practical hands-on skills in order to provide the students with a solid platform for their future endeavours. We are pleased that _____ noted this as good practice.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

N/A

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:

N/A

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:

We are pleased that _____ highlighted the success of modifications which improved the programme over his time as external examiner. No specific points were raised that require addressing.

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 specific points were raised. We would like to thank _____ for positive comments on the standard of our programme.

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:

No specific points were raised. We would like to thank _____ for noting the high standards achieved by our students following thorough teaching, assessment, and feedback from staff and the processes our programme put in place.

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 were raised.

Other comments

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

We would like to thank _____ in _____ role as external examiner for the MSc in Health Economics. Despite the programme being discontinued we are pleased that the programme was well structured, taught and assessed, that student satisfaction was high and the external examiner had a positive opinion of our programme.