

# The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18 QAT Received 08/10/2018

### Part A: General Information

#### Subject area and awards being examined

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

Medicine and Health/ Medicine

*Subject(s):*

*Cardiac Device and Rhythm Management*

*Programme(s) / Module(s):*

ARCS5204M Bradycardia Device and Rhythm Management  
ARCS5205M Tachycardia Device and Rhythm Management

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

PGCert

### 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 Cardiology course team possess a wealth of clinical experience that greatly enhances this programme. The course is delivered to a high standard and the student support provided including comprehensive feedback is highly commended.

#### Enhancements made from the previous year

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

N/A

#### 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*

None

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

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

The structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes are equivalent to the Advanced Scientific Practice requirements of the National School of Healthcare Science.

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 programme team are Lecturer Practitioners that undertake clinical practice to inform their subject knowledge and use current research to influence their teaching and learning.

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>All assessment methods are appropriate to the intended learning outcomes of each module. All marks awarded are consistent and appropriate to the work submitted and assessment brief. All feedback is constructive highlighting areas for improvement where applicable.</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>Unfortunately the postgraduate student performance was rather poor with evidence of lack of critical analysis and independent thought. This was discussed with the module team and student support mechanisms are already in place.</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> <p>I would like to highly commend the course team for demonstrating excellent student support by their provision of very comprehensive electronic student feedback following submission of work.</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?	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?	Y
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	N
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
<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**

Following a restructure within the administration team I found that this year was more organised and all work that was required to be seen was sent in a timely manner. Access to the VLE allows easy access to course material, electronic moderation of student work and verification of student feedback.

**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)**

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

*PG Cert Cardiac Device and rhythm Management*

Programme(s) / Module(s):

ARCS5204M Bradycardia Device and rhythm Management  
ARCS5205M Tachycardia Device and Rhythm Management

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

PF Cert

Title and Name of Responder:

Position\*:

Director of Student Education – SoM - TPG

Faculty / School of:

*Medicine*

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 [qat@leeds.ac.uk](mailto: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**

The programme utilises experts in the field of device management to deliver the core components, with consultants, physiologists, nurses and academics delivering the content to ensure a diverse range of delivery and content in line with the curriculum.

**Response to Enhancements made from the previous year**

The modules have been combined into a PG Cert programme rather than stand alone modules.

**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:

N/A

**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:

All learning outcomes have been mapped to the curriculum as identified by the external examiner.

## 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 academic standard this year was poor for post graduate level. Many progressing onto the programme had been out of academic study for a number of years and had done their undergraduate studies at other universities. Some struggles to adjust to the academic requirements of the programme. The programme team have reviewed the timetable and additional time has been allocated to discuss assessment, academic writing and presentation skills.

## 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:*

All requirements were met. With a dedicated programme support worker the processes have been easier to implement for this academic year and the programme organisation has improved from when the modules were stand alone.

## Other comments

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

Thank you for your comments and I look forward to working with you again this academic cycle.