

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:

Faculty / School of:

School of Medicine (LIME)

Subject(s):

Clinical Education

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Programme:
PGCert Clinical Education

Modules:
MEDS 5107M (Assessment & Evaluation in the Clinical Context)

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

PGCert Clinical Education

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 whole process for external examiner involvement has been very positive. Staff have ensured that full support is provided for access to all materials required. The assessment board meetings include the opportunity to speak to students in a confidential environment which is really useful to get the students perspective on things.
I have been fully supported and have been welcomed into the university by the team. Nothing is too much trouble.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.
As I was away sick last year I can't comment on this point.

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
No matters for urgent attention were noted.

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 / 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

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

This is a very good programme which embodied inter-professional learning and allows the students to develop within their own area of work as well as taking learning from other areas.

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)

The programme is part of the masters pathway so current research is embedded within this. Students are encouraged to incorporate current practice and research as part of their assessed work.

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:

Students are encouraged to use their own environments and roles to enhance the learning within the programme. It incorporated teaching and assessing within their practice as part of the summative work they do. They are assigned a mentor to provide feedback and support within their workplace

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:

All areas of the programme are mapped to the NMC outcomes for students from a nursing field to complete and achieve. This is demonstrated for students within the handbook and assessment documentation. These requirements are also filtered into the teaching and assessing for these students and very evident within the students portfolios on completion of the programme.

Assessment and Feedback

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

<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>Assessments for nursing students on this programme is threefold which offers the opportunity to build on the learning process and support student development processes throughout the programme. The programme invites several different lectures to deliver the teaching which enhances the learning process for the students. Students are offered a range of support when undertaking the programme, both via the university and practice areas. The marking and classification process is very robust with inclusion of student input, where relevant, and all members of the programme. Students are provided with clear feedback from the assessment process which identifies the rationale for the grades awarded.</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y / N
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y / N
<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>Students undertaking this programme are supported to achieve the given learning outcome and the sessions are structured in a way that enhances this process. This is also inclusive of a practice element which takes into account the students own area of work and diversity. This is a very similar process to other universities who provide a similar programme, including my home university. This delivery and process helps to achieve the required professional body objectives as well as the programmes requirements. I believe that the strength of this programme lies in the inter-professional nature of the learning as your cohorts are made up of different professional disciplines which is not always possible in other universities.</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>Clear robust assessments were undertaken with two markers identified for each student's submissions. There is comparability between the grades and markers comments with the grades awarded being almost identical for the students scripts presented for examination. Feedback is clear for the student to understand and allows them to identify where their strengths and weaknesses are with regard to the submission being graded. The process for this was very transparent and open.</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 / N
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y / N
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y / N
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y / N
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y / N
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y / N
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y / N

30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y / N
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y / N
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y / N
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

I wanted to say thank you to all of the team for making me feel so very welcome and supported within this role. Thank you.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Clinical Education

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Postgraduate Certificate in Clinical Education
MEDS5107

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

PGCert Clinical Education

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Director of Student Education – SoM TPG

Faculty / School of:

Medicine and Health, Medicine

Address for communication:

Worsley Building
University of Leeds
Clarendon Way, Leeds
LS2 9PN

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 very positive comments on the programme and note that that points of innovation and good practice described are:

i) The opportunity to speak with students on the programme in a confidential environment to gain the student perspective.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

There was no response as the external examiner was on long term sick last year.

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:

There are no specific comments, the examiner compliments the quality of the programme which embodies inter-professional learning and allows the students to develop within their own area of work as well as taking learning from other areas.

All areas of the programme are mapped to the NMC Teacher Standard Outcomes for students from a nursing / midwifery field to complete and achieve the professional qualification of Teacher. These requirements are filtered into the teaching and assessing for these students and is very evident within the students portfolios on completion of the programme, the students are required to cross reference the evidence within their e-portfolio with the NMC Teacher Standards.

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 robust and align with learning outcomes. It is also noted that students are provided with clear feedback from the assessment process which identifies the rationale for the grades awarded.

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 points relating to progression and award

Other comments

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

We are pleased that feels welcomed and well supported within the role.