
External Examiners' report template (Programme Assessment Board)

Purpose of the External Examiner's report

Please read this section before writing your report

External Examiner reports are an integral part of the University's quality monitoring and enhancement process and play an important role in the programme review cycle. External Examiners are required to submit annual written reports.

Reports should be submitted within **four weeks** following the final Programme Assessment Board. Report submission should not be delayed until re-sit boards have taken place.

The report should be linked with programme aims and outcomes, and the assessment criteria for each module, as described in the programme/module handbook(s). Reports should be objective and make positive criticism and/or recommendations where appropriate.

External Examiners' reports are the property of the University. The University will circulate reports as it sees fit, in accordance with legislative requirements. External Examiner reports are public documents, and are seen by students at Programme Voice Group meetings. **Please do not reference individual students and members of staff by name.**

Under the Freedom of Information Act, the University will provide copies of External Examiners' reports to third parties who have made a lawful request. Reports will normally retain External Examiners' names. The University will consider any reasonable request from External Examiners to anonymise their reports. Such a request should be made in writing and submitted with the report.

Full details of the procedures, and the use of the reports is outlined in [LQEH section 4](#).

Submission of the report

Please submit your report via email to the following email address:

h
externalexaminer@mdx.ac.uk

Your annual fee will be processed once we receive a copy of your annual report.

External Examiner Report – Programme Assessment Board

External Examiner name	Helen Stanley	
Academic Year (period covered by report)	2022-2023	
Date report submitted to Externalexaminer@mdx.ac.uk	15.10.23	
Programme(s) reviewed	Masters in Professional Practice Post Graduate Diploma in Professional Practice Post Graduate Certificate in Professional Practice Post Graduate Certificate in Professional Education Post Graduate Diploma in Leadership in Professional Practice Post Graduate Certificate in Leadership in Professional Practice	
Apprenticeship standard (if applicable)	N/A	
Module(s) moderated	Active Learning and Assessment Advanced Assessment and Decision Making Advancing Professional Practice Coaching and Mentoring Leading, Developing and Working within Teams Leading a Quality Service Leading Service Development Pedagogy and Practice in Education Policy, Strategy and Planning Research and Development Methods Extended Project	
Name of Programme Leader/ Module Leader	Dr Rachael Major	
Date(s) Programme assessment board(s) attended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19-20.7.2023 in person • 11.5.2023 via MS Teams • 16.3.2023 via MS Teams • 9.2.2023 Via MS teams • 3.11.2022 via MS Teams. 	
Programmes/module delivery arrangements – tick all that are applicable	Apprenticeship	
	Hendon Campus	
	Dubai Campus	
	Malta Campus	
	Mauritius campus	
	Collaborative partner:	Yes Partner(s) name
	Franchise	
	Joint	
	Validated	The Institute, Guernsey

To be completed by all external examiners by ticking the appropriate box:

OVERALL STANDARDS	Yes	No
1. In your view, are the standards set for the award(s) appropriate for the qualification(s)? <i>For apprenticeship programmes, consider whether they reflect the apprenticeship standard.</i>	x	
2. In your view, are the standards of student performance equivalent to other UK institutions with which you are familiar?	x	
<i>If 'no' please add comments here</i>		

Support for the role of External Examiner	Yes	No
<i>(For new external Examiners)</i> Did you find the induction arrangements effective in helping you understand your role and the University's expectations of you?	x	
I confirm that the ACEE measures/evidence which form the body of evidence were sufficient for me to provide an overall judgement on student performance and the quality and standard of the programme	x	
The Faculty and Programme Team communicated effectively with me throughout the year	x	
I was given sufficient information concerning my role as an External Examiner	x	
I was given sufficient information concerning the modules for which I am appointed to enable full consideration of delivery, including collaborative partner provision, franchises and overseas campuses, if applicable	x	
Did you receive formal written feedback on your report for the previous academic year? (N/A for EEs completing their first report)	N/A	
Were you satisfied with the response to the issues raised in your report for the previous academic year?	N/A	
Comments (if 'no' to any of the above)		

Report

Please use the following headings and guidance notes:

Programme/ Subject design, content and standards

Please comment on;

- *[the extent to which standards (apprenticeship standards; PSRB requirements; Professional benchmark statements) are appropriate to the qualification, or qualification element under consideration on comparable UK Higher Education programmes]*
- *the curriculum, its aims, content, and development the*

- *Does the course content remain relevant and up to date?*
- *please comment only on those modules that have strengths, weaknesses or areas of good practice that you would wish to highlight*
- *Where the programme has a vocational element or link, please comment on the content of the course in terms of preparing students for employment in that sector*

This my first year as external examiner and the second year of the master's course, with some modules running for the first time this academic year. I have provided specific detailed feedback comments for all of the individual modules that I have externally examined this year to the assessment boards. There is a comprehensive and contemporary range of programme options and appropriate modules available for a wide range of health and social care professions and workplace settings. The programme was driven by and influenced appropriate clinical/professional practice, developing students personally and professionally and demonstrating service improvements to benefit patients/clients and staff. Flexible and varied learning approaches were encompassed across module activities and assessment tasks relevant to personal and professional development and senior roles in health and social care.

Strengths:

- Extended project – encouraging to see masters 'students tackling data collection and empirical work and have experience of going through ethical approval, with access to previous examples on Learning Pod helpful.
- L6/7 Coaching and mentoring- changes to mentor requirements in nursing and midwifery highlighted well to students.

Weaknesses:

- Leading a Quality Service and Leading Service Development module overlapped and some confusion with assessment tasks, as detailed in module report and discussed at July board.
- It would have been helpful if the Module Evaluation final section of the Module Report Form was completed at the time of the board to reflect the student's perspectives on their study and assessment experience.

Good practice

- The Marking Grid has a specific section for presentations and this is an example of good practice e.g., the Research and development methods module.
- AADM module – the role of ANP clinician confirmed for clinical accuracy of content of task 1 standards.
- L7 Programme Team meeting after Progression Board

Student achievement (please avoid reference by name to individual students)

Yes

No

Are you satisfied that the level of student achievement is comparable across all locations of programme delivery (e.g. overseas campuses, franchise programmes)

x

Please comment on:

- *standards achieved by students*
- *student performance in relation to their peers on comparable courses*
- *student performance in modules taught at overseas campuses (Dubai, Mauritius) and modules on franchised and joint validated programmes at UK and overseas sites*
- *student performance in relation to clinical/professional practice (if applicable)*
- *student performance in relation to PSRB requirements (if applicable)*
- *the effectiveness of employer engagement (if applicable)*
- *foundation degrees: Are there sufficient and effective opportunities for work-based learning and work-related learning?*

- *strengths and weaknesses of the cohort*
- *factors that the External Examiner is aware of that have positively or negatively affected student performance (e.g. resources, field trips etc.)*

The standards achieved by the students were appropriate for level 7 and the performance was comparable to master's students on comparable modules and courses across the UK. As usual in professional development courses and modules, the students varied in their academic ability and most were able to successfully complete their studies, with those that chose not to generally citing health or personal reasons.

The strengths of the cohort were their attendance, engagement with the extensive online resources and materials available to inform their formative and summative assignments, and response to the detailed and constructive feedback from the module leaders and markers. There was comprehensive student support and encouragement given by the module team and course leader to reach potential with academic writing and referencing, skills of critical analysis and reflection.

The weaknesses of the cohort were a minority who did not utilise the support systems in place for resubmitting work, in spite of clear communication and direction, and some issues with students misunderstanding of the confidentiality policy when using appendices and documentation of service improvements they had been involved in, which has been addressed.

Assessments: structure, design and marking	Yes	No
I was given the opportunity to see samples of marked work (including written assignments and examination scripts) covering the full range of marks	X	
I saw evidence of internal moderation in the assessment process and confirm it was used effectively and consistently	X	
See evidence of adequate student feedback being provided to students?	X	
I saw samples of work from across all programme sites of delivery including overseas campuses and franchises where applicable	X	

Please comment on:

- *appropriateness of assessment for measuring achievement of standards*
- *The appropriateness and rigour of the course assessment strategy and methods of assessment;*
- *standards of marking and moderation (please comment on all overseas campuses and sites)*
- *procedures for assessment and examination.*
- *effectiveness and quality of feedback to students*
- *Are the processes for assessment, examination sound and fairly conducted in line with the University's/ Collaborative partner's (where applicable) regulations?*

I examined a large sample as this was my first year as External Examiner to the course and some modules were running for first time in this recently validated programme. Formative activities, such as from presentations, informed summative assignments effectively as feedforward. There was detailed and constructive feedback given on student's assignments as Quickmarks and summarised well in the marking section. The rationale and decision making for changes of marks/grades at moderation was articulated and documented clearly in the Module Report Form. It would be helpful if the module code as well as title was used. Some initial issues with accessing different elements of assignments and presentations and multiple submission points were resolved. Setting a time limit for Q&A in presentations and reminders of timings would aid consistency.

The need for improvements was handled sensitively as feedforward commentary, with sensitive handling of repeated errors by commenting on a few incidents, then highlighting that this occurred throughout. comments for students on how to retrieve their work on resubmission clear and helpful.

Good understanding and implementation of the MDX Faculty of Health, Social Care and Education policy documents was evident, e.g., Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Policy for Managing Accounts of Unsafe Practice described in academic work; Managing Breaches of Confidentiality in Academic Work; and Guidelines on Recognition of Prior Certificated and Experiential Learning. The role of an ANP clinician confirming the clinical accuracy of content of task 1 standards was noted as good practice in the AADM module.

RPL work submitted was assessed and a robust process undertaken, with healthy discussion concerning documentation of grades as well as the 20-point scale on student's transcript at the Progression Board.

Programme Assessment Boards

Yes

No

Did you attend the Programme Assessment Board (this could include attendance via Microsoft Teams)?

X

Did you receive relevant meeting, board, deadline dates and board paperwork in a timely manner?

X

Please comment on:

- *The organisation and conduct of Programme Assessment Boards and, in the event of non-attendance, whether you were fully involved in the assessment process.*

I attended all of the Programme Assessment boards this academic year, via MS Teams and including the July one in-person. The communication for preparation for the boards has generally administered well, and any issues with accessing the different components and submission dates for the various assignment tasks have been helpfully addressed. The boards have been chaired in a professional and collegiate manner and discussion and clarification of any issues has been encouraged. Constructive feedback has been welcomed and responded to in the final module reports.

Collaborative Programmes

Please add any comments relating to the links between the University and the collaborative institution.

The unique nature of the health and social care environment in Guernsey and the challenges were clearly understood and there was clearly a supportive relationship between the Institute and the MDX University. There was good use of MDX Faculty of Health, Social Care and Education policy documents as incidents arose in marking and assessment boards, e.g., Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Policy for Managing Accounts of Unsafe Practice described in academic work; Managing Breaches of Confidentiality in Academic Work; and Guidelines on Recognition of Prior Certificated and Experiential Learning. This led to checking the draft status of the reports and actions taken to change them to confirmed policy documents.

Recommendations

Please use this section to provide the programme team with suggestions that you would like them to consider, arising from the comments within your report matters where, in your opinion, there is potential for enhancement.

Recommendations

- Module evaluations completed on Module Report Form for Programme Assessment Boards, then updated after resubmission/extensions all completed.

- Programme Team meetings and student input through evaluations informing course delivery and development more explicitly.
- Stakeholder engagement more formally logged and how this contributes to course development.
- Review the Leading a Quality Service and Leading Service Development modules, clarify the different foci and assessment tasks before running again, as detailed in module report and discussed at July assessment board.
- Breaches of confidentiality to emphasise to students that this applies to all work submitted, including appendices and local documents.
- Students to be encouraged to present their Extended Project work at relevant conferences and potentially publish their work.

Actions

Please use this section if you require the programme team to take further action relating to issues which have a serious impact on academic standards or academic quality.

None

Commendations / Good practice

Please comment here on any particular strengths, distinctive or innovative features of the programme(s)/ modules

- The programme was driven by and influenced appropriate local clinical/professional practice, developing students personally and professionally and demonstrating service improvements to benefit patients/clients and staff.
- Comprehensive student support given by module team and course leader with academic wiring and referencing, skills of critical analysis and reflection.
- Flexible learning approaches across module activities and assessment tasks relevant to personal and professional development and senior roles in health and social care.
- Good understanding and implementation of MDX Faculty of Health, Social Care and Education policy documents e.g., Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Policy for Managing Accounts of Unsafe Practice described in academic work; Managing Breaches of Confidentiality in Academic Work; and Guidelines on Recognition of Prior Certificated and Experiential Learning
- The Marking Grid has a specific section for assessing presentations.
- Use of clinical staff contributing to the assessment of Advanced Clinical Practice portfolios.
- Masters 'students in their Extended Project module tackling data collection and empirical work and gain experience of going through ethical approval, with service developments and improvements identified as outputs.

Final Report – only applicable if you are completing your term as an External Examiner

Please consider and comment on:

- *Your overall experience of being an external examiner*
- *The overall development of the Programme/Modules during this time.*

N/A