

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 28/09/2018

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

School of Healthcare

*Subject(s):*

Various

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

HECS 1098  
HECS 1099  
HECS 2008  
HECS 2183  
HECS 2184  
HECS 2201  
HECS 3088  
HECS 3248  
HECS 3249  
HECS 3254  
HECS 5168

I am now a mentor for a new external examiner.

*These three are, I believe, dead?*

HECS 1100  
HECS 3267  
HECS 8007

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

Various

**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.*

As per last year, in my view the quality of marking and feedback to students makes Leeds 'stands out'. Across modules, marking is consistent and fair (albeit 'robust'). Feedback is copious and of a high quality. Feedback is tailored to the capability or level at which students operate. It is 'forward facing' and constructive.

Documentation in relation to modules (teaching materials etc.) is, again, of high quality. Blackboard resources and other supportive materials are well presented, helpful, and informative. Once more, these comments mirror those made last year. However, that's a good.

I have witnessed summative student presentations. These were appropriately and well organised. The standard of presentations that I saw (across a number of rooms) was high. Marking was fair, robust, and consistent.

I have not visited students in practice.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

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

I am unaware of specific enhancements – I would just say that simply maintaining the standards you have set is, in my view, achievement enough.

**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?	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/A
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	N/A
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?	Yes

*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?	Yes
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Yes
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Yes
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Yes
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	No – I'd say it is 'better'

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

Programme structure, design and aims (leaning outcomes etc.) are well designed and well thought through.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Yes
-----	---	-----

*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)*

Students include research findings in their work to support and advance argument across modules.

Modules with a research/evidence focus clearly do this thing well.

Research/evidence use and critique are generally of a high standard.

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	No
<i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i>		
N/A		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Yes
<i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i>		
I do not examine this element of the curriculum.		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Yes
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		
Excellent.		

### Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Yes
<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>		
Assessment methods are suitable and well-constructed. If the quality of the majority of student submissions reflects the quality of teaching provided, then that quality is high.		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Yes
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Yes
<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>		
Student submissions vary in quality. However, overall, most submissions are of good/high quality. Students demonstrate pleasing levels of performance across modules. Students at Leeds easily meet and even outperform students at other institutions I am familiar with.		
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i>		
As noted above, assessment feedback is of a very high standard.		

### 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?	Yes
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Yes
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Yes
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Yes
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Yes
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	When appropriate

26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Yes
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Yes
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Yes
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Yes – almost always
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Yes
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Yes
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Yes
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Some
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Yes
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Yes
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>Processes and procedures are well established and well delivered.</p>		

#### Other comments

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

1. First, I would like to apologise for recent 'tardiness'. I have experienced significant illness (August-September) and this has prevented me keeping up to date with my responsibilities.
2. I would like to thank everyone who I deal with for answering queries promptly and comprehensively. The support team is helpful and good at what they do.
3. Lastly – in general – while occasional 'blips' occur – Leeds is to be applauded for the high quality of its engagement with students.

**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)***Title and Name of Examiner:**Subject(s):**Healthcare Ethics & Law, Adult Nursing, Research Dissertation**Programme(s) / Module(s):*

BSc (Hons) Nursing (Adult)

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

BSc

*Title and Name of Responder:**Position\*:*

Director of Student Education

*Faculty / School of:*

School of Healthcare

*Address for communication:*School of Healthcare  
The University of Leeds  
LEEDS LS2 9JT*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](mailto: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**

Thank you for your positive comments regarding the quality of the marking and feedback across modules within the programme. In the past year the lecturers within the School of Healthcare have focussed on the constructive feedback given to students – it is good to see this has been recognised and considered to be supportive of students.

Your support during the summative student presentations is very welcomed and it is pleasing to note that you consider our assessment practices are consistent and robust.

I hope in the next year, you will be able to accept an invitation to visit students in practice, which we will try and coincide with an Examination Board meeting or at the time of the student presentations.

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

Each year, the Programme Leader and the Module Leaders do ensure a standard is maintained and whilst small changes are made regarding current evidence-based practice, large scale changes are actioned if necessary. Thank you for your positive remarks relating to maintenance of standards and acknowledgement of the work that this involves, these are much appreciated.

**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:*

The BSc (Hons) Nursing (Adult) is an established Programme and it is pleasing you have identified 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:*

It is much appreciated you have acted as External Examiner Mentor within the past year.

**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:*

Your comment regarding the comparability of the programme to similar programmes elsewhere is reassuring. The importance of evidenced-based literature and research is a theme that is an important thread throughout the modules, although this is more explicit in some than in others. There is an expectation for students to reflect evidence-based and the value of research within their assessments.

The Healthcare Ethics and Law team has introduced blended learning as a way of maximising the time for ethical debate and we would like to acknowledge the positive comments in relation to innovation and good practice in relation to this.

**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:*

Students are able to receive academic support to enhance their learning and are encouraged to produce a high standard within assessments. Students are encouraged to reflect on feedback given in assessments and to build on the comments received – markers/moderators are aware of the importance of providing meaningful constructive feedback and we would like to acknowledge the positive comments in relation to this.

**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 positive comments here are appreciated.

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

The Programme Team would like to thank you for your valued support over the past year, and wish you a speedy recovery from your recent illness. Your considered, positive comments are pleasing and I will ensure the Support Officers are informed of your comments regarding communication and support.