

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT received 27/09/19

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

School of Healthcare

Subject(s):

Clinical Research Methods
Innovative Healthcare
Research Modules

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MSc Clinical Research Methods
MSc Innovative Healthcare
Postgraduate Research Modules

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

MSc

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.
None identified.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.
None.

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 identified.

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
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?	Y

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

The programmes are well designed and develop the knowledge and skills of the students. The administration of submissions and resubmissions could be better managed. For example, providing external examiners with submission and resubmission dates at the beginning of the academic year can help to plan the timely reviewing and return of students' work.

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
<i>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</i>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<i>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>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<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>		
The assessments are relevant, appropriate, robust, challenging and appropriately assess the students' broad understanding of module contents and academic skills.		

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 most instances students demonstrated a good grasp of the requirements of the modules and associated assessments. Overall, the performance of the students was very good and in some cases exceptional.</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>None.</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?	N
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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p>		

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

QAT Received 07/01/2020

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Clinical Research Methods
Innovative Healthcare
Research Modules

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MSc Clinical Research Methods
MSc Innovative Healthcare
Postgraduate Research Modules

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

MSc

Title and Name of Responder:	
Position*:	Director of Student Education
Faculty / School of:	School of Healthcare
Address for communication:	Baines Wing 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. 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

Although no new innovations have been made over the last academic year, we consider the following aspects of the MSc Clinical Research Methods to be examples of innovation/good practice:

- Student centred approach to learning: students select a topic of their choice to explore/investigate in two compulsory modules, enabling them to choose a topic relevant to their professional practice and to the needs of their organisations; in other modules, students are able to adapt the assessment to fit with their area of interest; a wide selection of optional modules to choose from.
- Practical sessions on designing, undertaking, and presenting research.
- Use of learning contracts to structure learning.
- Opportunity to develop professional networks as part of modules.
- Learning and teaching is facilitated by research active staff with a wide variety of experience.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Minor changes were made to the MSc Clinical Research Methods relating to supporting students in selecting a topic and methods of learning for HECS5008M Accrediting Learning from Study Days that are intellectually stimulating; encouraging students to access academic support for HEC5305M Research Management; and providing an addition session on quality in HECS5238M Mixed Methods Research.

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 were identified.

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:

We are pleased to note that you consider the programmes to be well designed and that you have observed improvements to the programmes over the period of your appointment. We apologise for the oversight in not providing you with the dates of submissions and resubmission and will ensure that this information is sent to your successor in a timely fashion. .

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:

We are pleased to note that you consider the overall programme structure to be coherent and appropriate for the level of study and that the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching is clear.

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:

It is pleasing to note that you consider the assessment processes to be robust and the assessments to be appropriately challenging to test both the learning outcomes and students' academic skills. Indeed, overall, the performance of the students continues to be very good (sometimes exceptional) which you clearly noted.

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:

It is pleasing to note that you consider the nature and level of the assessment questions and dissertation topics appropriate. We encourage students to write a research article for publication based on their dissertation and the programme is structured to enable this.

Other comments

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

We should like to thank you for your work in supporting this programme throughout the tenure of your appointment and for your diligence in providing oversight of our assessment processes.