

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 04/09/2018

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 (LICAMM)
School of Medicine

Subject(s):

Audiology

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Healthcare Science (Audiology)

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

BSc

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.
Once again, it was great to see such a ubiquitous commitment to providing feedback to help students learn and that this translates into feedback that is probably effective for helping learning in many or perhaps most cases.

There's a fab range of assessment methods used across the programme and I really like the way that cases or clinical scenarios are used in exams to make the questions more engaging and to assess integration of knowledge with clinical practice and in cases problem solving.

The programme team have a very positive and constructive attitude and approach to interaction with their external examiner and through that to continuous improvement.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

The response to my report last year indicated that my recommendations regarding clarifying marking schemes would be taken onboard. I saw clear evidence of this in most assessments. Thank you.

The administrative difficulties that were apparent in 2016-17 were absent during 2017-18. Many thanks to and the team. If anything, I fear I let the side down at times for apologies for that.

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

Possibly **HECS3263** depending on timescales when assessment on that. See comments in box at bottom.

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

I've put all comments in box at end of this document for my convenience, apologies!

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.

No concerns. Seems to work well.

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)

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?	Y
-----	--	---

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

I've put all comments in box at end of this document for my convenience, apologies!

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:

No concerns. The team will have to provide annual reports to their PSRBs.

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>See good practice at top. I've put all other comments in box at end of this document for my convenience, apologies!</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>I've put all comments in box at end of this document for my convenience, apologies!</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've put all comments in box at end of this document for my convenience, apologies!</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
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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p>		

I've put all comments in box at end of this document for my convenience, apologies!

Other comments

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

Apologies for length of these comments, taken from notes during the year and during my visit. Sorry, I ran out of time to shorten and remove repetition.

General suggestions for improvement next year:

- When looking at draft exam scripts, some marking schemes for some didn't make clear how the marks would be awarded. There was less of this than last year. Note that I'm not arguing for prescriptive marking schemes, just that for all questions there is at least give a sense of what sort of answer is worth one mark etc rather than just listing the possible content of the answer and leaving it wide open to interpretation as to how marks are awarded. I would encourage those moderating exam papers before they're set to help point out issues before they go to the ExEx.
- Advise keep record of which scripts were moderated rather than just saying "moderation was done". Also, who double checks adding up of marks? Who double checks they are entered correctly into final grid? It's often not obvious that moderation was done or not clear which scripts were moderated (e.g. to check that the 'correct' ones were done inc. all fails). Recommend across the board that there is a better audit trail for all modules.
- Great that staff are so keen on giving feedback. Very important. For some modules, worth considering how to give feedback that is more likely effective given what we know about science of learning. E.g. say why something was good not just that it was good (especially avoiding vague terms like "that was good") and should be repeated; focus more on what student could have done and could do next time to improve ("Next time...") and less on what they didn't do and justifying the mark; do this for students regardless of their mark – e.g. for high scorers as well as lower. When doing this, focus more on quality rather than quantity – so I'm not suggesting 'write more feedback'. Rather I'm suggesting spend the same time on feedback more likely to be effective. In some cases lots of fine grained feedback is given to students on pieces of written, that is often quite specific to that piece of work and may be hard for them to generalise.
- Some of the marking schemes provided to students in advance are overly generic, used for a variety of different types of assignment and are unlikely to help them understand the expectations of the particular assignment at hand. I suspect it's only a matter of time until a failing student appeals/complains on grounds of insufficient clarity in what's required. Marking schemes. Often use one or two generic marking schemes (+/- more specific one) – hard to know what is being used and this generated many queries from me. Generic schemes often don't seem well suited for the different styles of assessment. Plus it is hard to connect the feedback to the marking scheme because the language used in one isn't necessarily the same as the other. Recommend that every component of assessment has a single specific marking scheme, perhaps with additional notes to help students understand what is expected and how they might achieve that. Providing examples of bad, good and excellent also could be helpful.

HECS3263

- Has three assignments. Would be better to clarify that they're equally weighted in instructions.
- Each assignment has two elements: (a) report writing; (b) critical reflection. I found the additional notes doc. I can't see any info on expectations, relative weighting of the two and I can't see a marking scheme. The guidance could be clearer e.g point towards structured reflection (e.g. Gibbs-based reflection) to encourage deeper reflective rather than just "reflect on". E.g. who is report for and what is the context? E.g. as if for GP? What intro and practice do students have on reflection before doing these? I'm not convinced that combining reflection on personal effectiveness and effectiveness of clinical tools is helpful. This is also apparent when looking at the standard of work required for the word count per element – might be difficult to demonstrate high level ability.
- Does ML and students know what they are looking for with reflections?
- Not clear what marking scheme is being used. There's one on Turnitin, one in module handbook and both are generic and don't indicate what is expected for the particular tasks at hand. The inadequacy of the generic marking schemes is particularly apparent here because the two parts of the assignment are looking for very different skills.
- For first assignment, words for report vs reflection are given. Not for second. For third, words for reflection only. Would be better to be more consistent.
- Lovely to see some specific feedback on what's good. Not convinced all of the comments are warranted (see below). Feedback was often on writing or presentation and some content (low hanging fruit). Would have been good to have seen feedback on evidence of practice, e.g. reinforcing evidence of patient-centred practice, and process e.g. higher level cognitive skills (critical analysis). Would have been good to see feedback to promote these if they are absent.
- How are marks arrived? One mark per assignment but not clear what mark was achieved for each component of assignments. At least some of the feedback only pertains to one component.

- I really not convinced about standard of work for the marks here.
 - E.g. 200850604 74%. Assignment 1 report seems very basic and descriptive, not patient centred and lacking integration of information, critical analysis of information, justification for decisions, albeit succinct, clearly written and nice diagrams. And yet gets 74%. Student tends to give references but not indicate what they are substantiating. The reflective account is good in that it follows a structure but lacks analysis/insight into the issues arising in the session as well as concrete or SMART action plan. Assignment 2 reflection is very superficial. Overall mark seems very high.
 - 200948418. Assignment 1 report. Contains much more integration of test results than above and reasoning for 'diagnosis'. Also contains elements of patient-centredness, although could be a lot stronger and feedback could promote that. Reflection doesn't obviously follow a structure but does a far better job than above of trying to make sense of experience and building a concrete action plan, and all in context of patient centredness. But gets 71%, less than above. I suspect the 71% is about right or low.
 - 200953102. Similar comments to first one above. Lacking patient-centredness e.g. component 3 fitting plan – surprised on feedback on this. Reflection lacks insight and analysis into what went well and not, and why. But got 70%. Overall mark seems unduly high.
 - 200839825. Similar to above. Lacks patient-centredness and reflective practice. Marks seem too high.
- Generally lacking feedback to challenge students to improve. E.g. 200839825's comment about patient who refused hearing aid but student "managed to convince to trial HAs with some persuasion" had feedback indicating that this "good practice" – but that is rather debatable.

ARCS2146

- Relationship between assignment for this and final dissertation?
- How do students know what's expected of them? All I can see is a generic marking scheme.
- General feedback comments on +ve. How can student improve?
- Average mark seems a bit low – thoughts on why? How compares to previous? (Do students know what is expected of them?)
- Not convinced by the marking with respect to the marking scheme – seems high. The 70% seems largely descriptive and devoid of some of the key features mentioned in the marking scheme (analysis, argument [and by implication justification]) – it has some good content but weak process. Similarly, 65% xxx1714, 52% xxx3810 and lacks features of process/argument referred to marking scheme and for latter even the content. I could imagine a marking scheme where these marks would be broadly appropriate (although the 70% would still seem a bit high) but not the marking scheme in the module booklet.

ARCS2197

Module booklet refers to workbook based on practicals. But Turnitin contains assignment on an aspect of REMs. I can't find a brief for it so am not sure what students were expected to do. Also, I can't see a specific marking scheme, just a generic one in the module booklet.

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

Subject(s):

Healthcare Science (Audiology)

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Healthcare Science (Audiology)

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

BSc

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Director of Student Education (Classified UG Programmes)

Faculty / School of:

School of Medicine

Address for communication:

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

It is pleasing to note that feedback provided on student assessments is considered an example of good practice. The programme team understands the importance of feedback and reflects collectively on what constitutes good feedback.

also commented on the fabulous range of assessment methods used across the programme and particularly the use of clinical cases/scenarios in exams. The assessment strategy is an area of the programme that is regularly evaluated based on student feedback and utilising a varied strategy takes in to account the different preferences of our students.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Module specific marking schemes were developed where appropriate and used alongside generic schemes to make the marking process clearer. These schemes were appreciated by students who used them when preparing work and it was pleasing to note that acknowledged this development.

also commented that administrative difficulties encountered in the previous year were absent this year. This is reassuring.

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:

highlighted a number of issues with regards to HECS3263 but indicated that the changes may not be feasible before the next academic year. However, changes have been made to this module which will address the comments raised. Please see below in 'other comments' for detail.

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:

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:

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 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:

Other comments

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

provided all general comments in the 'other comments' section at the end of report. These have been responded to on a point-by-point basis below:

General suggestions for improvement next year:

- Whilst improvements were acknowledged in the clarity of marking schemes, more consideration will be given to the detail provided for marking schemes for exams. Moderators will be involved in this process.
- We thank for this comment. All scripts which are to be reviewed by the external examiner are included in the ones which have been moderated. We apologise if this isn't always clear. This includes all fails. A list of which scripts have been moderated will be included on the module report form which is sent to the external examiner. Moderators check the adding of marks and mark inputting in to spreadsheets. A note that this has occurred will also be made on the module report forms.
- Staff will be encouraged to think about the type of feedback being provided, ensuring it is still detailed but giving more consideration to the actual usefulness of it with regards to future work.
- Module leaders will further review marking criteria with a view to being more specific for each assessment. Assessment specific marking schemes will be provided to students where appropriate to facilitate them in understanding more what is required.

HECS3263

- We thank for comments regarding this module, and specifically the assessment strategy and marking processes.
- Many of the points raised were discussed and/or addressed following the Committee of Examiners meeting (e.g. marks awarded and feedback). However, further to the comments raised, the assessment strategy and marking schemes will be discussed with students and this detail also provided in written format to ensure students are aware of what is required. Amendments have been made to the module handbook to further address these points.
- The points raised regarding feedback will be address as indicated above, via communication with all staff pertaining to type and extent of feedback being provided.

ARCS2146

- We thank _____ for _____ comments regarding this module. This module has not evaluated well with the students and the expectation that the proposal would be used to inform the Level 3 dissertation project has not borne out. Thus, in response to feedback, this module will no longer run and has been replaced by a new 10 credit Research Methods and Evaluation module (ARCS2210) which will be assessed via a single 2000 word structured assignment assessing knowledge and understanding regarding both research design and statistics. Given the structured nature of the assignment, a specific marking scheme will be developed.

ARCS2197

Students are provided with practical worksheets during practical sessions for completion during the sessions and to enable them to understand, and start working towards, the REMs assignment. Information provided here details the practical, guidance on completing the practical, questions about specific aspects of the practical and outcomes, and assessment information and marking criteria. This information is also discussed with the students during the practical sessions. Students are given a specific marking scheme during the practical sessions. A duplication of this marking scheme will now also be added to the module handbook and the practical and assignment details placed on MINERVA.