

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 06/12/2019

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Institute of Health Sciences

Subject(s):

Postgraduate Certificate of Education in Primary Care

Programme(s) / Module(s):

GPPH5101M Educational Theory
GPPH5102M Education in Practice
GPPH5103M The Consultation
GPPH5104M Teaching the Consultation

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

Postgraduate Certificate

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 course continues to provide a practically focussed programme aimed at GP trainers. The modules all have a focus on the educational theory applicable to the role of GP education. The team are excellent at communicating issues relating to the course and any changes. This year has seen the withdrawal of the external funding for the course and the team have kept me up to date of these changes and explored ways to ensure students continue to receive a high quality educational experience. Finally, feedback received through the assessment process has been excellent.

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 team have responded to the feedback provided by students and seek to improve the experiences as a result.

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
There are no matters for urgent attention.

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.

The intended learning outcomes continue to be appropriate to the award and are in line with other institutions, including my own. The resources, teaching and assessment processes are at an appropriate standard for a certificate level award in relation to the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

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)

The modules demonstrate a sound foundation on appropriate research and educational scholarship. This is apparent to the students in terms of on line materials and the assessment requirements.

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

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

Not applicable

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

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)?	N
-----	--	---

Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:

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.

I have commented in previous reports on the strength of the assessment processes, which are appropriately aligned with the teaching days and online resources. I had the opportunity to discuss the experiences of the students in October 2018 and there were no reported concerns. Marking is of a high standard and the feedback clear, extensive and offers appropriate challenge and support for ongoing learning and development.

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

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:

As above, the assessments allowed the students to adequately demonstrate their understanding of educational theory and apply this in a practical way. Students would be able to transfer the work undertaken for the assessments to their own roles in education in the workplace.

The assessments were generally of a good standard, with an appropriate range of performance demonstrated and appropriately graded. There were no obvious errors in the submissions provided for review.

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:

I think it is worth mentioning here that this has been a challenging year for the team following the decision not to continue offering this particular certificate in the future. As I stated above, the team have informed me of all the issues and changes that may affect the students and I am happy to report that the changes/challenges have not impacted in any way on the fairness and delivery of the course. There continues to be clear evidence of consistency between markers within modules and overall between modules for the Certificate in general. It has been a pleasure to act as external examiner and feel that the team have been open to my input and role.

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?	N/A
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	N/A
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 via teleconferencing
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):

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Education in Primary Care

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

PGCert

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Director of Student Education TPG-SoM / Programme Lead

Faculty / School of:

Medicine & Health

Address for communication:

Worsley Building
School of Medicine
Clarendon Way
Leeds, LS2 9PL

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 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

As noted from above this is the final year that this programme is running. There are some very positive comments from the external examiner about the programme deliver, assessment and feedback, but also about the approach to closing the programme.

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:

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:

No concerns

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:

No concerns

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:

No concerns

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:

No concerns

Other comments

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