

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT received 16/10/19

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Subject(s):

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Independent and Supplementary prescribing for Nurses and Midwives
Principles and Challenges in Diabetes Care
Fundamentals of Diabetes Care

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

Nursing

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.

The prescribing programme is only offered now at master's level and the programme was successfully approved against the new NMC standards earlier in 2019. The IP programme is part of an advanced practice qualification. Students can undertake the programme as a standalone module, although it is anticipated that the majority of students will take the programme as part of an ACP qualification. The IP module within the programme has been re-aligned in terms of credit size and face to face delivery. A module for diabetes that has not run for the past two years is planned for delivery in the academic period 2019-2020
Revised grading structures for UG programmes were implemented by the school and communicated with me as an 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

For Examiners in the first year of appointment only

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 only

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
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.

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:

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 aims and outcomes reflect the NMC 2018 prescribing standards. The programme was approved by the NMC in 2019

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
-----	---	---

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.

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>Students undertaking the diabetes module sometimes struggle with some of the content in the examination. I do not believe that this is due to the level of the examination being too difficult, it is primarily framed around the individual practitioner's area of practice e.g. mental health nursing. I wonder if there is a bigger piece of working in raising awareness of these practitioners with supplementary materials that may assist them with the content of the module or module development for those practitioners prior to them undertaking this specific module.</i></p> <p><i>The module handbooks clearly articulate the need for all students undertaking this module to outline safe care and the penalty that will apply in an examination situation if markers or the programme team identify an answer that could have significant impact on patients and service users (if this transcended into the practitioners clinical practice).</i></p> <p><i>The prescribing portfolio and examinations reflect outcomes of the NMC standards and proficiencies.</i></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
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?	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
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

No further comments

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)*Title and Name of Examiner:**Subject(s):**Nursing; Independent and Supplementary prescribing**Programme(s) / Module(s):*Independent and Supplementary prescribing for Nurses and Midwives
Principles and Challenges in Diabetes Care
Fundamentals of Diabetes Care*Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):**Title and Name of Responder:**Position*:*

Director of Student Education

*Faculty / School of:**Healthcare**Address for communication:*University of 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) must be sent 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

No points were identified.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year**Diabetes Modules:**

The new grading structure was implemented in the 2018-19 academic session. The students have embraced this and continue to achieve.

HECS 5315M is an option module within the MSc Advanced Clinical Practice programme and whilst it has been fallow for the past 2 years it is encouraging that students have opted to study it in the current academic year.

Prescribing Modules:

This is the last year of delivery of the prescribing modules based on the 2005 NMC Standards and the assessment burden associated with this. We successfuly reaccrredited to the new NMC 2018 Standards this year and now have a Masters only module with an appropriate assessment load. The module now has 14 days less face-to-face contact time therefore the major overhaul of the academic delivery methods has commenced and is ongoing and we are creating a suite of blending learning resources to replace face to face teaching.

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:

No issues were raised.

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:

No matters were identified.

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:

Thank you for your positive responses to the questions regarding standards.

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:

Diabetes Modules:

Thank you for your comments. It is disappointing that all four students on the BSc (Hons) Nursing (Mental Health) programme failed the examination for HECS 3126 at first attempt. This is very unusual as in previous cohorts there has been a 100% pass rate or very near with mental health students achieving marks in the high sixties, however there is a strong correlation between attendance and academic ability in these particular students. All students across the fields comment on how relevant the module is to their own practice including mental health nursing given the strong links between diabetes and mental health.

Prescribing Modules:

Thank you for your comments. The prescribing modules can be a challenging one for many students. This is largely due to the requirement to gather vast amounts of evidence in practice and present this in their portfolio. Students who have not written in an academic style, sometimes for many years, can struggle with the assessment, despite the support they receive. In recent years we have had more students undertaking the MSc in Advanced Practice who have undertaken other modules before the prescribing module and this has enhanced their academic writing. With this in mind, students on the module this year performed slightly better than previous years. Those who had to resubmit were successful upon resubmission with the support from their academic supervisor.

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.

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

I believe that unfortunately you are stepping down as External Examiner in the next academic year. May I take this opportunity on behalf of the teams to thank you for your scrutiny of our processes and for your comments which have been valuable in ensuring clarity for the student regarding the assessment process.