

# The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

### Part A: General Information

#### Subject area and awards being examined

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

Medicine/ Medicine and Health

*Subject(s):*

*Molecular Medicine*

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

*Intercalated BSc Clinical Sciences (Molecular Medicine)*  
 PATH3160 Gastrointestinal Disease  
 PATH3090 Molecular Oncology  
 PATH3140 Paper Criticism  
 PATH3050 Research Project

*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

The course is extremely well run and the blend of modules and assessments provides a good overall view of student performance. Providing students with the opportunity to carry out a significant research project is a key component of the programme.

#### Enhancements made from the previous year

None

#### Matters for Urgent Attention

None

#### *For Examiners in the first year of appointment – Not applicable*

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?	N
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

This is an excellent programme, which provides students with a mix of taught and research components, covering a range of elements of molecular medicine. The individual modules have been of a high standard, overseen by committed and highly competent staff. The inclusion of a significant research project is a key component and the standard of supervision of these research projects has been uniformly very high. Many supervisors attend the student presentations and provide their comments on student performance; these supervisors clearly enjoy and appreciate working with intercalated students. The organisation of the programme has been exemplary. Particular thanks go to \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_, who have provided me with all of the information and organisational support to enable me to act effectively.

### 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
See my comments above.		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
The students undertake a significant research project.		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
Not applicable.		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
Not applicable.		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
Not applicable.		

### Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
A good range of assessment methods is employed across the programme.		
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
The students performed to a high standard. Their project presentations were excellent and demonstrated clear commitment to, and understanding of, their topics.		

### 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

### Other comments

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

This an excellent programme. As last year, the students are academically very able and the programme provides them with the opportunity to develop their skills and excel. The level of teaching and supervision is very high.

**Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report****Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)**

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):	Clinical Sciences (Molecular Medicine)
Programme(s) / Module(s):	
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BSc

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:	Director of Intercalated Studies <i>on behalf of the</i> Head of School
Faculty / School of:	Faculty of Medicine and Health School of Medicine
Address for communication:	Clinical Sciences Building, St James's University Hospital, Leeds LS9 7TF
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 School notes the highlights of the programme which \_\_\_\_\_ has captured in \_\_\_\_\_ report. Of the intercalated undergraduate programmes offered at Leeds, it provides a research intensive experience.

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

None

**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:

None

**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:

\_\_\_\_\_ praised the commitment and organisation of the Programme Leader and Student Education Service Officer. \_\_\_\_\_ noted the important role of the project supervisors in equipping students with research skills.

## 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:*

None

## 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:*

commented on the high standards achieved by students on this programme.

## 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:*

None

## Other comments

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

The School of Medicine congratulates \_\_\_\_\_ on the submission of \_\_\_\_\_ final report for the Clinical Sciences (Molecular Medicine) programme. We are grateful for \_\_\_\_\_ service during appointment. \_\_\_\_\_ arranged to meet the students informally during the year and understood their challenges. We note that \_\_\_\_\_ report is entirely positive and we appreciate \_\_\_\_\_ comments.