

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 13/09/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Nursing

Subject(s):

Diabetes, Prescribing

Programme(s) / Module(s):

DAPP 3001, HECS 3103, HECS 5120M, HECS 3126

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

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.

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 would like to thank administrators for providing me with a calendar of when I am to expect work for external comment; it is very difficult to manage the commitment without knowing when to receive work. I commenced this role part way through the academic cycle (2017-2018) so at this stage I have nothing to report.

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

Within the prescribing module students have been failed for 'unsafe practice'. The guidance information within the examination paper, module guides etc needs to reflect that students can be failed for unsafe practice and still meet the required pass mark. I did ask the team to respond to my questions surrounding how this is managed and communicated to students. As yet I have not had a response.

I think for completeness it would be beneficial to invite external examiners to attend one round of clinical OSCE's. It is very difficult to see how students are achieving all NMC competencies in relation to supplementary or independent prescribing.

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.

The programme structure and design of both the diabetes programme and the nurse prescribing programme address key national drivers and where appropriate regulatory outcome measures

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)

Programme outcomes and assessment are evidence based and contemporary

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 required to complete a portfolio that is mapped to NMC proficiencies for nurses who are undertaking a programme of independent prescribing. Students are assigned a Designated Medical Practitioner who assesses prescribing competencies. There is clear evidence within the portfolio of this requirement being met and therefore risks are managed. At present these are in paper format and I wonder if there is any plan on these becoming electronic in the future?

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:

The programme addresses current prescribing standards as set by the NMC. The programme will require modification in order to meet the new guidelines for prescribing in the 2018 standards

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>The programme assessments do align to module and where relevant regulatory outcomes. The programmes are assessed by examination, OSCE and portfolio. I have raised some questions in relation to unsafe practice and how this is clearly articulated to students. Particularly where students have exceeded the pass threshold.</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>The performance of students is equitable with programmes across the UK sector.</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>		

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?	NA
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	NA
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

--

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

Diabetes and Prescribing

Programme(s) / Module(s):

DAPP 3001, HECS 3103, HECS 5120M, HECS 3126

*Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):**Title and Name of Responder:**Position*:*

Director of Student Education

Faculty / School of:

School of Healthcare

*Address for communication:*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 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

Thank you for your report regarding the prescribing modules HECS 3103 and HECS 5120M, your support and advice throughout the year is appreciated. Since submitting this report the team has corresponded with you regarding a project that the prescribing module team is working on with colleagues from the Leeds Institute of Medical Education to standard set the OSCEs for the module. This project has recently commenced following receipt of funding through the Education Innovation Fund from Health Education England.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We note your positive comments regarding the administrative processes which we will endeavour to keep streamlined and efficient to ensure your role is fully supported.

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:

Thank you for bringing this to our attention. On investigation it was HECS 3126 Fundamentals of Diabetes Care and not the prescribing modules that failed three students for dangerous practice. Unfortunately at the time of the assessment the module leader was on long term sick leave but on return emailed you on the 14th of September 2018 to apologise for the delay in responding to your comments. explained that dangerous practice is identified within the Programme Handbook which all students have access to on the VLE and which is updated annually for new and returning students. In the email also gave assurances that the issues of dangerous practice will also be clearly identified in the module handbook from the 2018/19 academic session onwards.

Your suggestion that you would like to observe the OSCE has been noted.

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:

I note that you have not received a copy of the previous external examiner's final report. If you would like to receive a copy (not all external examiners do) then please do not hesitate to contact me so that I can arrange for this to be sent to you.

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:

It is reassuring that you judge our modules to be of a comparable standard to that of other institutions as well as to that of your own and that they meet key national drivers with the prescribing modules addressing regulatory NMC outcomes. As you point out the programme will require modification and reaccreditation in order to meet the new 2018 guidelines for prescribing standards and we are just beginning this process.

In response to the changing learning environment and student feedback we have a longer term aim (12months) to introduce an e-portfolio which will make aspects of your role as well as ours and that of our students much more streamlined.

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:

We appreciated your conclusion that the programme assessments align to module and relevant regulatory outcomes and that the performance of the students is equitable with other programmes across the UK sector.

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:

Thank you for your positive responses regarding our internal procedures and administrative process.

Other comments

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