

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 21/08/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Institute of Cardiovascular and Metabolic Medicine (LICAMM)/Medicine

Subject(s):

Diagnostic Radiography

Programme(s) / Module(s):

ARCS1028
HECS1028
ARCS1073
HECS1073
HECS2144
ARCS2144
ARCS2145
HECS2145
ARCS2147
HECS3277
HECS3076
HECS3201
HECS3077

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

BSc (Hons)

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 exams reviewed are areas of good practice using a combination of pattern style recognition allied to more in depth knowledge acquisition this is particularly apparent on the A&P modules.

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 as no information was passed from the previous year as this was my first year as external examiner

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

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

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

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
 First year as external examiner so I feel that it is difficult to comment completely but all marking was fair as was the feedback and the subsequent remarking. I am happy that the students are receiving a high standard of support.

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.

Structure seems well established and the overall course design is logical and the aims are clear and concise and fit with the intended outcomes

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	N/A
-----	---	-----

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)

I feel that in my first year as external this is difficult to comment on at this point.

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

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

N/A

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y
-----	--	---

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

N/A

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:

The programme achieves the standards required

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 design and structure is appropriate for assessment and in some cases shows a similarity to my own academic establishment.</p> <p>On occasion a little more notice for me as an external would be useful but in general all marking and verification was good and therefore the module marks are consistent which meant that final progression was fair.</p> <p>The fact that a high portion of the students achieved grades in the higher banding is an indication of the level of teaching and support that has been shown to the students.</p> <p>The assessment methods are well structured to allow students to present their knowledge and progress.</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>In general the students showed good academic standards but there were those who struggled with certain aspects but this is to be expected at this level and is consistent with my own and other institutions. Those students who struggled at assignment level tended to lack the ability to critically analyse, which is comparable with most 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> <p>Where possible more notice for papers to be reviewed, I am aware that this is not always possible but a timetable of assessment dates as an overview may help.</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
<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

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Diagnostic Radiography

Programme(s) / Module(s):

ARCS1028
HECS1028
ARCS1073
HECS1073
HECS2144
ARCS2144
ARCS2145
HECS2145
ARCS2147
HECS3277
HECS3076
HECS3201
HECS3077

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

BSc (Hons)

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 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

--

Response to Enhancements made from the previous 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:

Many thanks for raising the matter regarding tight turnaround times for you to look at work in a timely manner. We have updated our 'Assessment Schedule' to identify key dates for student submission deadlines/completion of marking/make available to external examiner/Committee of Examiners. This will be shared with our External Examiners and BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography Programme team for guidance.

However, it is important to note that the University of Leeds delayed the start date of the 2018/2019 academic year by one week but did not change the dates of central assessment deadlines. Therefore this may create a tighter schedule and turnaround times for our assessment periods.

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

Many thanks for sharing your observations during your first year as External examiner for our programme. It is reassuring to know that we have good standards of learning, teaching & assessment that are commensurate with other programmes. It is also reassuring to note that other programmes have similar challenges and students who struggle to engage with the assessment.

Your observations regarding student support are welcome as we have been working hard to further enhance and develop our student support and feedback in both formative and summative activities and in response to NSS/UG survey feedback.

We hope that you have settled well into the role as External examiner and we look forward to working with you for the forthcoming academic year.