UNIVERSITY OF LONDON INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMMES

Annual Programme Report Reporting period: 2014/15
Programme names: Clinical Trials, Epidemiology, Global Health Policy, Infectious Diseases and Public Health

1. About this report

This Annual Programme Report (APR) has been prepared at the conclusion of the Annual Programme Planning and Review (APPR) process for Clinical Trials, Epidemiology, Global Health Policy, Infectious Diseases and Public Health. APPR is the process agreed by the International Academy and the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM) to review and monitor the performance of the programme and to consider enhancement and forward planning.

The report is produced by the Programme Manager, agreed by the Programme Directors and considered by:

- Senate Quality and Standards Committee at LSHTM; and by
- The International Academy's Quality Assurance and Student Lifecycle sub-committee (QASL).

Sections 3, 5, 7, and 9 below are summarised or adapted from the Programme Director's annual appraisal and commentary.

2. Programme information

Lead College: London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine

Date of programme launch:
Clinical Trials (2006)
Epidemiology (1999)
Global Health Policy (2011)
Infectious Diseases (1998)
Public Health (2005)

Programme Director:
Programme Directors (referred to as 'Course Director' at LSHTM):
Clinical Trials (CT): Professor Diana Elbourne and Dr Claire Snowdon
Epidemiology (Epi): Ms Anne Tholen, Dr Patrick Nguipdop-Djomo and Dr Sara Thomas
Global Health Policy (GHP): Dr Preslava Stoeva and Dr Catherine Dodds
Infectious Diseases (ID): Dr Patricia Gorak-Stolinska, Dr Anita Skinner and Dr Jackie Cliff
Public Health (PH): Dr Ros Plowman and Dr Marcus Keogh-Brown

Course managers:
Clinical Trials: Cristina Thomas
Epidemiology: Carrie Magnusson
Global Health Policy: Karen Ormsby
Infectious Diseases: Melissa Bridge
Public Health: Louise Whittle

Programme Manager: Kerry Corrigan

Date of APPR meeting: 14 January 2016

Present at the APPR meeting: Kerry Corrigan, Annemarie Dulson (QM), Tim Wade (Chair), Huw Morgan-Jones, Tim Palmer, Sue Horrill, Anita Skinner, Marcus Keogh-Brown, Anne Tholen, Louise Whittle, Melissa Bridge, Claire Snowdon, Christina Thomas, Catherine Dodds and Pamela Roberts.

Date of APR sign-off: 17 March 2016

3. Programme standards

The programme standards were considered during the APPR process; the benchmarks below were used to assess the standards. The programme standards were also considered by the External Examiners and these are reported in section 4, External Examiners.

Currency and effectiveness of the
- **educational aims and learning outcomes;**
- **the learning, teaching and assessment strategies;**
- **QAA subject benchmark statements and FHEQ descriptors**

are considered through the annual review of the Programme Specification and updated accordingly.

Comparison with similar on-campus programme:
There are equivalent on-campus programmes for two of the programmes only – MSc Epidemiology and MSc Public Health. The quality and standards of the Distance Learning (DL) Epidemiology and Public Health programmes are assured in the same way as these London-based courses and the programme teams liaise with the London-based course teams in terms of curriculum to ensure consistency where possible. For modules where there is a sister module, work is also done towards harmonisation of content between the DL and London-based modules. In Global Health Policy (GHP), where one of the modules has an in-house version, the Module Lead straddles both to ensure consistency in content and assessment. The final MSc Epidemiology completing unseen written examination paper is identical between the DL and on-campus programme.

Requirements of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) for Clinical Trials, Epidemiology, Global Health Policy, Infectious Diseases and Public Health programmes
Not applicable.

4. External Examiners

There were 12 External Examiners for the Clinical Trials, Epidemiology, Global Health Policy, Infectious Diseases and Public Health in 2014/15, each of whom provided a report which was considered at the APPR meeting. An overview of standards and significant issues is provided below and the full reports, together with LSHTM responses are provided in Appendix A.

External Examiners' confirmation of standards

The External Examiners reported on:
- the standards of the award, and the standards achieved by students;
  'Many students demonstrate a high level of performance at least equivalent to that achieved on face-to-face courses.'
- the curriculum and learning materials;
  'The study materials appeared well focussed and directly relevant to clearly stated learning outcomes.'
- the design and structure of the assessment; and
  'For the modules that I have reviewed, there was a good balance between focussed questions requiring specific information in unseen written exams and broader questions requiring students to read around topics for assessed assignments.'
- the assessment procedures:
  'The integration report as opposed to the more standard dissertation I am used to worked extremely well and I felt was an innovative approach to assessing the broader learning and combination of learning provided across the course.'

Did the External Examiners' raise any significant issues?

The External Examiners raised no issues with regard to academic standards. However, they made comments on some areas along the themes of; marking and sampling, standard of assessment, programme and assessment design, the assessment process, standards (candidate performance) and resolution of significant grade point discrepancy.

All of the issues raised by the External Examiners are included in detail in Appendix B to this report, along with the Programme Teams' responses.

5. Study materials and programme resources

The following materials, resources and methods are used to support the learning, teaching and assessment strategy:

Study materials

Name of material	Medium	Location
LSHTM Student Handbook	Online only	LSHTM VLE
Module study materials: Workbooks, Readers, module Study Guides, Computer Assisted Learning sessions (CAL), Collaborate sessions, Moodle lessons and discussion forums, depending on the module. Additional materials for some modules may also include quizzes, and online video/audio lectures	Hard copy and online (Online only for CT modules)	LSHTM VLE
Textbooks	Hard copy and/or online (mostly online for CT modules	LSHTM online library via LSHTM VLE
Module reading lists	Hard copy and online (Online only for CT modules)	LSHTM online library via LSHTM VLE
Stata software (CT, Epi, PH only)	DVD and online	
Programme Regulations	Online only	Website and LSHTM VLE
Programme Specification	Online only	Website and LSHTM VLE
Past exam papers	Online only	LSHTM VLE
Examiners Commentaries	Online only	LSHTM VLE
Online library	Online only	Access to LSHTM online library resources via LSHTM VLE
Study skills resources (Information skills, academic English writing, maths refreshers)	Online only	LSHTM VLE

Virtual Learning Environment (VLE)

The following are resources on the VLE that have not been highlighted above:

- Discussion forums available for all modules on the LSHTM VLE.
- Collaborate (real-time tutorial) sessions run periodically during the study year, and are particularly useful in supporting project students and those preparing for exams.
- Clinical Trials provide Assessed Assignment and Specimen answers for the previous two years to their students on the LSHTM VLE.
- Screencasts on various topics (academic content and general guidance) (Epidemiology).
- Links to London-based MSc Epidemiology and Public Health module lecture recordings where appropriate.
- Most of the Global Health Policy modules provide learning materials via a combination of audio and lecture slide content. The GHP team have also initiated the use of short video clips of tutors speaking on particular cross-cutting themes, or to provide direction on assessments in advance of Collaborate sessions.
- E-tivities such as journal clubs and essay writing forums are run annually within Infectious Diseases.

- There are additional resources on the LSHTM VLE such as information skills training at "foundation" level (open to all students) and at "Intermediate" level for Project students which are supported by library staff.

The engagement within the VLE comes through the discussion forums and the Collaborate sessions. Student induction sessions between students and Programme Directors were very well attended this year.

In terms of discussion forums, student engagement varies depending on the module and time of year. There is greater engagement during the holiday period between Christmas and New Year, during the exam revision period (April-May) and close to assignment submission deadlines. In the student satisfaction survey, students frequently identify the discussion forums as being the most useful/ enjoyable aspects of the course.

GHP tutors increase engagement by setting and responding to voluntary activities that are posted in each learning session's individual forum. Some have also set up cross-session discussion forums for limited time periods to provoke more intensive exchange at key points in the year. This tactic has met with varying success. In the past three years GHP have seen steadily growing engagement with more students engaging with learning through these fora, and also an increase in engagement from student to student.

Three Epidemiology modules run group activities in which the discussion forums (and sometimes media of their own choice e.g. Whats App) are used primarily for discussion of a specific exercise. The CT module which involves group work as an assessed component sees regular activity providing a link between students and tutors.

In terms of Collaborate sessions, participation is fairly low although students who do participate rate them very highly and are often cited higher than discussion forums in terms of useful/ enjoyable aspects of the course. Additionally, students engage with the sessions through viewing recordings. The VLE appears to be well received. The format of the course pages is reviewed at the start of each academic year and presentation enhanced where possible.

Students who take part in the Student Survey do raise the issue of increasing the number of online Collaborate sessions. The Collaborate sessions serve the needs of some students well, but the majority of students do not in fact attend. Students have complained of not being able to participate due to time differences, although most Collaborate sessions do offer options across differing time zones. The mixed needs of the student body are addressed by running the sessions even if there is a small number of attendees, recording the sessions, and making these available to download for all.

The GHP team have noticed that students in the past failed to engage with the VLE until quite late in the academic year. In response, the team has taken steps to encourage students to utilise the VLE in their learning from the outset and to clarify its role. Some students have been unsure about where to ask for technical help on the VLE. Relevant technical issue forums have now been sign-posted more clearly and the GHP student support team has been re-directing queries to these from other forums. Tutor teams are now also briefed regarding where to direct such queries. The ID team are drawing up similar guidance for their students.

In 2015/16 two Public Health modules chose to record lectures specifically for DL students. Some students have experienced difficulty accessing this resource and so a DVD was developed for each module and is being sent to all students registered for the modules (regardless of whether they had experienced difficulty in accessing the resource).

Infectious Diseases students have requested recorded/video lectures. Within ID, two modules are looking into the feasibility of producing short videos covering specific key topics. However, students have complained of difficulty downloading the resources they do currently have, such as the Global Health Lecture Series [a regular series of public health lectures held at LSHTM, recorded and available to all students on the LSHTM VLE], due to hardware issues such as power outages and internet connectivity problems. Students are also experiencing a number of technical issues some of

which are beyond the School's control so it may not be suitable to rely on delivery of an increased amount of recorded material to students via the VLE alone.

Features of the VLE that were running in 2013/14 continued throughout 2014/15.

A simple 'tick' box is being introduced for two Epidemiology modules this year which will allow students to track their completion of individual sessions.

The Global Health Policy team are planning to considerably revise the way that their module learning materials are presented on the VLE, with a plan to shift away from Captivate software (that focuses on hour-long lectures and slide sets) toward a more modular form of delivery of multi-media resources on Moodle itself. This re-design will take time to accomplish, but it is hoped to pilot this new approach for launch in 2016-17. Increased use of quizzes, video, collaborative working, and written content are all a part of this planned revitalisation of the GHP learning materials.

In 2014/15 some Public Health modules utilised the feedback facility within Moodle. This facility allows Module Organisers to request feedback on specific resources (e.g. feedback on a Collaborate session). The feedback facility will be used more widely in 2015/16.

Students are encouraged to engage with their peers and tutors via the VLE through discussion boards and Collaborate sessions (in real time or as a download). Clinical Trials tutors monitoring the boards respond within three working days and are also asked to make their own posts to encourage students to engage when they are aware that the boards are quiet.

Students are often asked to register in advance for Collaborate sessions. Those that don't register may still participate but requesting initial registration gives the course teams forewarning if numbers are likely to be low and efforts can then be made to encourage students to engage.

Several of the course teams monitor the number of messages posted by students each year (e.g. mean number of messages per Epidemiology student in 2014/15 varied between one and eight, depending on the module), as well as participation and viewings of Collaborate sessions.

GHP Module Organisers are encouraged to monitor the numbers of students accessing various components of the module. This has already resulted in a better understanding of Collaborate sessions, given that few participate actively, but vastly more access the recordings that are later made available. The GHP teaching teams also monitor discussion boards, facilitate discussion of learning activities and provide informal feedback on student learning.

Due to concerns expressed about the level of engagement in the Public Health modules in 2014/15, the course team developed a summary table of activity in the autumn and spring terms which was made available to all Module Organisers; they plan to routinely monitor engagement on a termly basis and continue to take steps throughout the year to encourage participation and engagement.

LSHTM Online library
All reading lists are reviewed annually by the module tutors and updated as necessary. Where a specific session author has been commissioned to undertake an update, they would also review and update the reading list.

For most of the LSHTM programmes, there is no requirement for the LSHTM DL students to use the University of London (UoL) Online Library as extensive online library resources in the subject area are held within LSHTM. However, the GHP students benefit from politics and policy journals at the UoL and the course team would find it beneficial to be provided with a more concrete list of resources available to their DL students. There is no requirement for students to access a physical library to complete their programme.

Students undertaking the Project Modules (Epi, ID, GHP and PH) are required to undertake training in literature reviewing (intermediate level), which is conducted by the LSHTM library online via the VLE. This training received considerable praise last year when it was first piloted.

University of London online library

Access to the Online Library is provided to all students of the International Programmes once they have registered for their chosen programme. It provides access to academic journals, a growing number of e-books and a number of essential and further readings. Access is available 24 hours a day via the Student Portal. An enquiry service is available from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday, staffed by professional librarians.

- Of all inter-library loans requested/supplied during the period August 2104 to July 2015; all LSHTM Programmes accounted for 7.6% overall (of these, Epidemiology held 3.94% of these).
- The online library reference service by programme statistics showed that LSHTM students made 203 enquiries (3% of overall users).
- LSHTM students accessed the Online Library databases 2236 times last year (1% of overall users). Across Postgraduate programmes, LSHTM students were 4% of users.

6. Programme and student performance

The Student information and performance statistics were considered at the APPR meeting. The summary table below includes data key indicators relating to programme performance. The full Student information and performance statistics are available on request. This data is also published on the website

Clinical Trials, Epidemiology, Infectious Diseases, Public Health and Global Health Policy (MSc, PG Diploma, PG Certificate and Individual Modules)		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	PG Average for 2014-15
Incoming Students	Applications	1364	1313	1116	n/a
	Offers	990	1021	977	n/a
	New registrations	773	680	669	n/a
Current students	Active	2687	2876	2771	n/a
Examinations	Sat	-	4832	4694	n/a
	Pass Rate	-	90%	90%	90%
	Mean	-	3.1	3.1	n/a
Graduates	Awards	324	331	305	n/a
	Ave. time to complete	-	4.1	3	3.6
Leavers	Withdrawn/Inactive	-	175	288	n/a
Progression	Non-continuation from 2012-3 cohort	-	10%	15%	25%
	Ave. no. of exams passed	-	1.8	2.6	2.4

Source: Student Information and Performance Statistics 2014-15 (version 1.3 as at 13 January 2016)

The programme performance data were considered during the APPR process. The following insight is given to the data in relation to:

Recruitment
Applications:
Clinical Trials: The number of applications for the Clinical Trials programme has significantly decreased over the last few years. See comments below under "New registrations".
Epidemiology: Total applications were slightly lower than in the previous two years.
Global Health Policy: MSc: 80 applications, PGDip: 6 applications, PGCert: 17 applications.
Infectious Diseases: 163 applications.
Public Health: The total number of applications was slightly lower than in the preceding year: MSc 379; PgDip 15; PgCert 22.

Offers:
Clinical Trials: The number of offers has declined as a result of the decline in the number of applicants.
Epidemiology: Total offers were slightly lower than 2013 but higher than previous years otherwise.
Global Health Policy: MSc: 60, PGDip: 5, PGCert: 21.
Infectious Diseases: 143

Public Health: The total number of offers was also slightly lower than in the preceding year: 236 were offered a place: MSc 268; PgDip 5; PgCert 63.

New registrations:
Clinical Trials: The number of applications, and hence offers and new registrations, for the Clinical Trials programme has significantly decreased over the last few years, and is of concern to the programme team. In previous years some scholarships had been provided by the European & Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership and GlaxoSmithKline, which led to higher numbers of applicants and offers. These scholarships ended in 2013/14 leading to a reduction in applications and offers. The Course Directors are working on a marketing plan with the School's External Relations team to increase student numbers. Both the application and registration deadlines in 2014/15 were extended to maximise application numbers, and these extended deadlines will continue to be in place for 2015/16.

In March 2015 the Clinical Trials Course Directors were approached by an alumnus based at the Clinical Trials Unit of King's College interested in sending a number of their staff members to study the PG Certificate Clinical Trials course over the next few years. With King's College paying the PG Certificate fees over two years, 12 Kings' staff initially registered for the programme in October 2015. This initiative should help to increase CT programme numbers over the next few years and has several advantages for the students who are gaining recognition of their studies from their workplace and facilitation of group support. It is hoped that many of the students will wish to continue onto the full MSc if they able to self-fund the remainder of their studies.

Epidemiology: Total new registrations were slightly lower than in the previous two years.
Global Health Policy: MSc: 46, PGDip: 4, PGCert: 12 new registrations. The overall shape of GHP applications and their conversion to registration has changed since the course was launched. Applications have declined to some extent. However, as a greater proportion of those applications are being converted to offers, and also to registrations, this is evidence of improvements in ensuring that the most appropriate candidates are finding out about the course and applying. There has been a downward trend in applications/offers/registrations across all LSHTM DL courses, and the GHP figures reflect that trend as well, but data from the past two years demonstrates the GHP figures are likely to hold steady and not decline any further.

The LSHTM External Relations team has put in considerable effort in further promoting GHP. The Programme Directors have also taken part in LSHTM Open Day events to promote the programme.

Infectious Diseases: 81
Public Health: Whilst the number of applications and offers was lower than in 2013/14, the number of students who accepted a place was higher than in the preceding year. In 2014/15 213 accepted a place on the programme (MSc 180; PgDip 5; PgCert 28), compared to 161 in 2013/14.

Progression
Clinical Trials: The total number of current students in 2014/15 was 255, compared with 296 the previous year. The main reduction in student numbers was due to fewer students registered on the MSc (194 in 2014/15 compared to 222 in 2013/14).
Epidemiology: This appears fairly constant, with around 600 students currently registered.
Global Health Policy: 252.
Infectious Diseases: 391.
Public Health: In 2014/15 the total number of students was slightly lower than in the preceding year - 1072 students compared to 1140 in 2013/14.

Examinations taken/passed:

Clinical Trials: 69% of those registered on Clinical Trials modules attempted the assessment of at least one module in 2014/15, with 62% passing at least one module.

Epidemiology: There are currently no concerns surrounding examination performance. The DL Epi Exam Board routinely compares assessment results for each module across the previous 3 years as part of the moderation process.

Global Health Policy: 67% of GHP students have passed at least one module, and 68% have attempted at least one. In 2015, GHP students each passed an average of 2.8 modules, above the average in LSHTM DL programmes.

Infectious Diseases: 545/476 by ID students. All ID modules had pass rate of 80% or higher. 28 non ID modules were taken and passed, 4 were failed but they are compensated (pass rate of 87.5%). 76% of ID students entered at least one examination and 58% passed at least one course/module.

Public Health: There are currently no concerns surrounding examination performance. The DL PH Exam Board routinely compares assessment results for each module across the previous 3 years at the July Exam Board Meeting.

Awards made:

Clinical Trials: A total of 29 students passed the MSc in 2014/15, with 2 passing at Distinction level.

Epidemiology: A total of 66 students passed the MSc in 2014/15 (4 in July and 62 in November), including 5 passing at Distinction level.

Global Health Policy: A total of 23 students passed the MSc in 2014/15. The team are pleased to see a substantial increase in the number of students complete the MSc in the past year, which demonstrates that progression within this 5 year-old MSc will be strong. The team are expecting an even greater proportion of awards in the coming year, 15/16, with many more students completing their projects this year than ever before.

Infectious Diseases: A total of 45 students passed the MSc in 2014/15, including 3 who passed at Distinction level.

Public Health: A total of 136 students passed the MSc in 2014/15, including 5 passing at Distinction level.

Retention

Leavers:

Clinical Trials: The number of leavers in 2014/15 remains very low. Only 9% of those registered for the MSc in 2013/14 did not register for modules in their second year, 2014/15, well below the Postgraduate average of 25%.

Epidemiology: 72 students left the programme in 2014/15. The majority of these students had not completed any modules, but 46% had completed 4 modules or more (the statistics suggest some students completed more than 12 modules, but this would not be possible given the structure of the DL Epi course). It would be interesting to know more about reasons why these students chose to withdraw from the course. We continue to email students who have not registered for any modules in a previous year, offering study planning advice and encouraging them to resume their studies.

Global Health Policy: 14 (of whom 12 did not undertake/pass any modules).

Infectious Diseases: 50 (as at 31st August, this data is non-inclusive of projects); five of which took and passed between 1 and 3 modules; eleven which took and passed between 4 and 7 modules; five of which took and passed between 8 and 11 modules; and two who passed 12 or more modules.

Public Health: 116 students left the programme in 2014/15. The majority of these students had not completed any modules, but a few had completed up to 12 modules.

7. Student experience

International Programmes Student experience survey
The Student experience survey closed at the end of April 2014 and a full report was submitted to AC in May. The key findings were presented at the Programme Director's forum in May. At this meeting Programme Directors agreed to respond to programme specific issues on their VLE.

LSHTM specific channels of student communications

These mechanisms are used by the School's programmes for collecting and monitoring feedback from students, which is in addition to the Student Experience Survey conducted by the International Academy and student feedback received by the Student Advice Centre.

Student Satisfaction Survey. This annual LSHTM survey is emailed to all students in July 2015. Additional surveys were carried out for EPM105, EPM201 and those taking the Project in the autumn since the completion date for these modules was later in the year.

Student Representative. Feedback from students is invited by the Student Representative prior to each Course Committee meeting, which is then summarised by the Student Representative and presented to the Committee. (Last year the GHP Student Rep undertook a detailed survey which gained a good response, and the findings of which were presented to the Course Committee.) A written response is then provided to the students.

Meetings with students. The course teams continue to take the opportunity to meet with students when they visit LSHTM, for example, the DL annual reception, graduation ceremonies and meeting with DL students studying modules in London via the blended learning study option. These occasions are used to invite informal feedback.

VLE discussion fora. Informal feedback from students is frequently given on discussion fora within individual modules, and this is routinely passed on to the Programme Directors from Module Organisers. Additionally, some courses (e.g. GHP) have a helpdesk discussion forum which is a frequent source of informal student feedback. In 2014/15 some PH modules set up a specific feedback facility within Moodle in which they invited feedback on selected material. This facility is being used more widely in 2015/16.

The results of the DL student satisfaction survey are forwarded to Module Organisers for their consideration alongside feedback from other sources (e.g. moderator reports). Module Organisers are asked to complete an Annual Module Review and Action Plan (AMRAP) document which includes a summary of this feedback. In Epidemiology, the Course Director and Course Content Director then hold individual / grouped meetings with the MOs to discuss the AMRAPs, followed by review by the Faculty Taught Course Director. The final AMRAP forms are posted up on the LSHTM VLE for students to view.

From time to time, key issues may be directly addressed to all students from the Course Directors. In 2014/15, an example of this was recognition that students wanted more elective module options. The Course Director undertook direct consultation with students about which potential modules they might want to take, and as a result GHP now offers five additional elective modules from 2015/16 onwards.

The Epidemiology team included the Student Experience Survey results in an overall summary evaluation document for 2014/15 which was discussed at their Course Committee meeting in November 2015.

Student enquiries recorded at the Student Advice Centre
The Student Advice Centre (SAC) provided a report that was considered at the APPR meeting including data and detailed overview of the questions that prospective and current students ask about the programme.

The Student Advice Centre have received 7,789 enquiries for the LSHTM programmes this academic year. There has been a 3% increase in enquiries received from current students, compared to last year. Prospective student enquires have fallen by 11%.
The majority of enquiries typically relate to students navigating their way through the student lifecycle and often refer to: online registration, exceptional requests for late registration, reinstating lapsed registration and extension requests.

In June 2015 a message was sent out to over 100 LSHTM students via ESD who had inactive registrations. This proactive action encouraged a number of students to re-register on the programme.

Many students complained about the CD-ROM for EPM 202 (Statistical Methods in Epidemiology) being faulty. The Study Materials Office were made aware of this and students were dispatched new copies within a matter of days.

A significant number of enquiries were received regarding complications with payments made by sponsors. These included delays to issuing invoices and students not having access to the VLE whilst awaiting payment from their sponsor (see SAC suggestions below).

The SAC made three suggestions in their report;
- Whether it would be possible to review the payment by sponsor procedure and whether students can gain provisional access if there is a long wait time for invoices.
  'Some sponsors already work with UOLIA to permit sponsored students provisional access to their programme. Work is ongoing to accept further approved sponsors and potentially allow the same provisional access to other sponsored students.'
- If it could be made clearer to students that they need to submit an examination entry for all modules.
  'This has already been achieved, students are now prompted to submit an exam entry when they register for their module'
- That there were a significant number of enquiries from students unable to access their VLE via the login page. The Technical Support Team identified this as a 'Pop up blocker' issue within the internet browser. The SAC advised students to 'Allow pop up blocker' in their internet browser settings in order to access the VLE.
  'A message was placed on the Student Portal notifying students of how to complete this procedure and access their VLE'.

The SAC produce an in-depth report for the APPR which provides a comprehensive review of 2014/15. Any further items identified will be followed up to ascertain their utility and implemented if deemed of value.

Feedback to students on assessments

All students receive personal feedback and a grade on each assignment submitted during the year. This includes Formative Assignments which are optional and do not contribute to their overall module grade, and Assessed Assignments (AAs) which are compulsory. Personal feedback is not given on unseen written examinations, but examiner commentaries on examination and assessment performance on a generic level are posted up on the LSHTM VLE together with the past examination papers towards the end of the calendar year. Clinical Trials also provide students with copies of past AAs.

In Global Health Policy, the modules have activities embedded in the lecture materials, students are encouraged to post their responses on Moodle and comment on the responses of others, encouraging peer-evaluation. Students are also given feedback and further question prompts from tutors on the VLE in direct response to their postings.

Assessment offences
A total of 14 assessment offence cases were received for LSHTM programmes in 2014/15.

	No further action	Action taken	Unresolved cases
Exam Offence	1	0	0
Plagiarism	1	10	2
Total	2	10	2

Penalties awarded:

Of the 10 cases where action had been taken a 'no report' for element was applied.

'No report' means that the assessment in question will not be recognised as a valid attempt. A zero will appear on the student's transcript and it will reduce the number of permitted attempts at that particular assessment by one.

All unresolved cases are awaiting responses from the students.

No further action can be taken for a number of reasons, including that there is insufficient evidence, that the invigilator took appropriate action to prevent an offence occurring, that the offence was minor, etc.

If you would like to discuss any aspects relating to assessment offences, please contact assessment.offences@london.ac.uk

Rechecks
A total of 750 rechecks were conducted across all UOLIA Programmes.

LSHTM programmes

Number of rechecks	Total number of exams sat	Errors
15	4341	0

Other assessment matters

Appeals and complaints
In 2014-15 a total of forty seven cases have been investigated by the directorate of Quality, Standards and Governance of the University of London International Academy. 31 of these were classified as an 'appeal', and 16 were classified as a 'complaint'. It should be noted that on many occasions the individual submitting a complaint or appeal will not necessarily use these specific terms. In these cases, a judgement has been made based on the information submitted. Many complainants submit multiple concerns.

No complaints were received for the LSHTM programmes in 2014-15. Two appeals were received in 2014-15.

One LSHTM appeal was upheld within the reporting period. This allowed the student to make an application for retrospective mitigation.

8. Good practice identified in the course of the APPR process

External Examiners reports

The Quality Manager spoke to the content of the External Examiners reports, in which the programme was commended in many areas. The main areas of good practice identified in their reports were:

Students are offered the opportunity to submit formative assessments and receive comprehensive feedback from academics. The feedback given is extensive and identifies to students where they can improve their work.

'Students are encouraged to submit formative assessments for feedback as part of their preparation for summative assessments. Although not taken-up by all students, this opportunity is clearly of value. Feedback to students highlighted where more marks could have been gained – including for the highest scoring students.'

'The quantity and quality of feedback provided to students on the programme is excellent, clearly identifying the strengths and weaknesses of students' work as well as justifying the mark awarded. This allows students to learn from their experience and improve their marks in subsequent assessments.'

'A particularly commendable aspect was the level of feedback provided on the marking of projects. In general, the feedback was substantial and was clearly directed at enabling students to understand how they gained their marks, how and where they dropped marks and how to improve. In one example, a student who gained a very low score received over 3 pages of detailed feedback.'

The marking and moderation process is robust, with examiner rationale for the moderation of marks clearly recorded.

'There are excellent systems in place for first and second-marking assessed work, with effective oversight by Module Leaders.'

'A very commendable innovation has been the availability to the External Examiners of a written 'conversation' trail between markers so that the process of grade reconciliation is in most cases apparent and defendable. This is especially important in the small number of instances where a student has appealed a grade assignment and requested referral to the External Examiners for comment.'

'Markers discussions are now available for the Projects as well as the Assignments which is a further welcome enhancement of the transparency of the marking process and significantly facilitates evaluation of marking standards and practices.'

The utilisation of relevant campus-based programme material to facilitate online learning.

'The increasing sharing of materials from the equivalent face-to-face modules online, including recorded lectures, the increasing use of additional and updated online teaching materials and use of webinars on all modules, are all enhancing the students' experience with largely very positive feedback.'

Considered and focused question setting to ensure students are examined in a way that fosters analytical and critical thinking.

'There had been an effort this year to ensure that examination questions on all modules pushed students to be more analytical and apply critical thinking to a greater extent (including questions that cut across different sessions). This is definitely a positive move and in my view entirely appropriate for Master's level students.' (4th year External Examiner)

Study group with LSHTM students at Kings College, London
Clinical Trials Programme Director met with a group of Clinical Trials students in an informal study group organised at their place of work (KCL)

Open day LSHTM
For the campus-based Open Day this year, LSHTM dedicated a stand to the distance learning programmes on offer. It is hoped that for those students who cannot study in London, they will be more aware of the distance learning programmes on offer.

Planned enhancements
The Associate Director: Admissions, Registration & Learning Resources spoke to the fact that LSHTM Programme resources were only available online to new students from 1 October in each academic year. Student Registration opens on 1 May, so new students may have to wait for a number of months before they can access their study materials. Plans are underway to engage students from their initial registration; one idea to develop a short online course for LSHTM students in the gap between early registration and the availability of online course resources in October. It is thought that this enhancement to the programme will support new students and reduce the numbers that leave the programme before starting their studies (45% of student leavers in 2014/15 did so before the completion of any modules).

A welcome pack is also being designed to welcome new students to their programme, more will be reported on this initiative as it is developed.

Changes to the Assessment Policy: Assessment Principles and Toolkit
Following a period of extensive discussion and consultation the University of London International Academy (UOLIA) has adopted new Assessment Principles for the UoLIA programmes. These allow new and existing programmes to depart from the previous assessment policy which required an overall maximum 60:40 ratio between written examinations and coursework for postgraduate programmes and an overall maximum 70:30 ratio between written examinations and coursework for undergraduate programmes.

LSHTM Programme Directors were pleased to receive this news and plan to take into account these assessment changes when making future enhancements to the programmes.

Programme resources
That LSHTM are exploring the various methods of delivering programme resources to students; including the potential to provide online textbooks (e-books), pre-loaded kindles or memory sticks.

Student Representative. Feedback from students is invited by the Student Representative prior to each Course Committee meeting, which is then summarised by the Student Representative and presented to the Committee. (Last year the GHP Student Rep undertook a detailed survey which gained a good response, and the findings of which were presented to the Course Committee.) A written response is then provided to the students, which has been identified as a method of good practice.

LSHTM Distance Learning Reception
The 2016 Distance Learning Reception will be held in the LSHTM Keppel Street Library in London on Friday 4 March. The reception is proudly held for our Distance Learning community, including alumni, staff and students. This event is in addition to the Universe of London Graduation ceremony the following week and provides an informal setting for LSHTM staff to celebrate their achievements.

The London Newsletter and the Programme Teams' forum are the principal means of sharing good practice between the Lead Colleges and International Programmes. Colleagues may use either of these methods to update and disseminate features of good practice in the LSHTM programmes. Contact the Programme Manager for more details.

9. Programme changes

Changes that became effective during the review year 2014-15
No significant changes were made.

Changes made to the programme for the current year 2015-16
Global Health Policy: The following electives have been made newly available to GHP students from 2015/16 to offer a broader choice: CTM203 Project Management and Research Coordination, CTM204 Regulatory Affairs, Good Clinical Practice and Ethics, CTM205 Data Management, IDM202 Nutrition and Infection, and PHM213 Principles and Practice of Health Promotion. The GHP team are working towards the development of further GHP-specific modules – Global Health, Research Design and Methods for Political Analysis and Global Mental Health. These modules are currently going through early approval processes at LSHTM.

Infectious Diseases: ID are planning to migrate their digitised module materials to a new responsive design which allows students to view the material on mobile devices and complies more completely with accessibility legislation. A significant update of withdrawn module, IDM210 Water and Sanitation is due to be released in October 2016, IDM215 Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.

Public Health: One new module began in 2015/16, PHM219 (Evaluation of Public Health Interventions). The module is being provided totally online via the LSHTM VLE and in its first year is only available to PG Dip/MSc Public Health students and individual module students. The materials for an existing module, PHM203 (Economic Analysis for Health Policy), have been updated and are

also being provided online for the first time. Emails were sent to all students registered on the PHM203 module last year to inform them of the change in learning materials, which now comprise a number of audio lecture recordings with additional exercises.

There were changes to all LSHTM Programme Regulations for 2015/16, these changes are stated in the section 'Changes to the Regulations 2015-16' on page two of each set of the relevant Programme Regulations.

Changes under consideration for 2016-17 and beyond
There are plans to launch a new LSHTM programme, Demography and Health (MSc, PGDip, PGCert and individual modules). The proposed programme is moving through the various University of London Governance committees and is due to launch for the 2016/17 academic year.

There are some module changes planned and any relevant information will be specified in the 'Changes to the Regulations 2015-16' on page two of each set of the relevant Programme Regulations.

Talks are ongoing between UOLIA and LSHTM about the potential to launch a Certificate in Pharmacoepidemiology and Pharmacovigilance. The Programme Development and Project Planning team hold this potential project currently.

Alignment with the CAF
All LSHTM programmes fully align with the Common Awards Framework.

10. Periodic Programme Review

Last periodic programme review

Clinical Trials (2012)
Epidemiology (2015)
Global Health Policy (Programme launched in 2011)
Infectious Diseases (2010)
Public Health (2012)

All actions from the Infectious Diseases and Epidemiology Periodic Programme Reviews have been completed. Actions from the Clinical Trials and Public Health PPRs are progressing and will be reported at their next PPRs (2016/17).

Next periodic programme review
Clinical Trials (summer 2017)
Epidemiology (5 year cycle, 2019/20)
Global Health Policy (2016/17)
Infectious Diseases (2015/2016)
Public Health (2016/2017)

11. Public information

The following public sources of information are reviewed annually by the Programme Manager and the Programme Team.

- International Programmes website (Course pages)
- LSHTM Programme handbooks
- Prospectus
- Programme specification
- Programme regulations.

12. Links with teaching institutions

There are no links with teaching institutions for LSHTM Programmes.

13. Matters not considered elsewhere

Cost of replacing lost textbooks

Each year students contact the programme team and request replacement text books for those that have been reported lost, damaged or otherwise unavailable. The APPR attendees discussed whether a policy to provide a framework for apportioning costs for replacement of study materials was needed but agreed that this was not necessary, and such cases should continue to be dealt with on an individual basis

External Examiners Summary

Attendees of the LSHTM APPR requested a summary of the contents of the External Examiners (EE) report prior to the meeting. Listing the key comments made by all examiners would permit the readers of the 12 EE reports to review the salient points ahead of the meeting discussions.

2014 LSHTM Educational Review

LSHTM conducted an Educational Review of their programmes in 2014, approximately 80 recommendations were made. A working group has been established to consider the recommendations.

Demography and Health joint exam board

The Demography and Health programme plan to establish a joint campus-based and Distance Learning examinations board which will allow closer integration with the on-campus Demography and Health programme.

LSHTM run student survey

LSHTM has used the DotMailer software to distribute their student surveys, this software also allows the school to send reminders to complete the survey. Use of the DotMailer has resulted in a higher response rate to the survey. LSHTM are considering participation in the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) for Distance Learning students.

Published programme start dates

Epidemiology are keen to ensure that Programme Directors (and Managers) are kept informed about key academic information that is provided to both prospective and current students by UoL, and given an opportunity to contribute to this. The various UOLIA departments have distinct responsibilities when communicating key academic information to students; so the Programme Manager will invite departments to be alert to programme specific information when communicating general information to students.

Monitoring of student progression

LSHTM raised the question of how progression can be more closely monitored and proactive steps taken to encourage completion within the 5 year registration period. Part of the University of London approach to enhancements is to better support students in their studies. This will include gaining a deeper understanding the myriad of reasons students choose to leave their programmes. Efforts can then be tailored towards supporting students in their various circumstances so they may go on to complete their University of London award.

Scholarships

The University of London International Programmes are undertaking an evaluation of the current scholarship opportunities available to students.

Appendices

Appendix A: Action sheet
Appendix B: External Examiners' reports and LSHTM's response to the External Examiners' reports

Annual Programme Report for Clinical Trials, Epidemiology, Global Health Policy, Infectious Diseases and Public Health Programmes - Appendix A

Action sheet from the LSHTM Annual Programme Planning and Review meeting

Date of meeting: 14 January 2016

Agreed actions from the 2014-15 APPR meeting are summarised in the table below. Any on-going actions from the previous reporting period or from the latest Periodic Programme Review are marked as such and are also included in the table.

	Issue	Agreed action	Taken forward by	Timelines
1	The non-continuation rate for students indicates that more support may need to be offered to students to support them in continuing their studies.	Report on wider UOLIA work for the retention of students.	**Director: Student Services** & Associate Director: Student Experience	Report to the 2015/16 APPR
Update:				
2	There are 12 External Examiners (EE) reports to consider as part of the APPR meeting which number 68 pages (from a total of 135 pages for the APPR papers).	A summary of the contents of the EE reports prior to the meeting would assist colleagues in reviewing the salient points.	Quality Manager (AD)	In place for the 2015/16 APPR
Update:				
3	External Examiners (EE) work at a geographical distance and this raises consistent challenges in correspondence with International Programmes.	A proposal to introduce a formal induction process for new EE is being explored by the Quality Assurance team.	Quality team	Ongoing from 2014/15 APR (issue #7), report to 2015/16 APPR
Update:				
4	One EE highlighted the need to monitor the grade distributions of IDM101 and IDM104 to ensure stability in marks is re-established.	As a result of this observation LSHTM academics are implementing a review of IDM101.	PGS	Report to 2015/16 APPR
Update:				

Key: AD – Annemarie Dulson; PGS - Dr Patricia Gorak-Stolinska (LSHTM ID Course Director).

Note: Issues 1-6 from the 2014/15 APPR Action Sheet (Appendix A) were closed.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON | INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY

External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Part 1	Summary

Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report *(e.g. BSc Economics, MSc Public Financial Management)*	MSc, PG Diploma and PG Cert in Clinical Trials
Subject Area or Modules covered *[if applicable]*	Clinical trials
Academic/calendar year covered *(e.g. 2014-2015 or 2015)*	2014-5
Date(s) of Board of Examiners meeting	July 24th, 2015; Oct 23rd, 2015
Name of External / Intercollegiate Examiner	Stephen Allen
Home institution and/or professional affiliation	Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine
External Examiner ☒	Intercollegiate Examiner ☐
Year of Service *[Extension to 5th year of service under exceptional circumstances only]*	1st ☒ 2nd ☐ 3rd ☐ 4th ☐ 5th ☐
Date of the report	October 23rd 2015

1.1   Standards

(a) The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject.   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

1.2   Student performance

(a) The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar.   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

(c) If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.

1.3	**Conduct of processes**	
(a)	The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	If not, please explain why.	
(c)	If processes are of a higher standard, please elaborate.	

1.4	**Area for commendation**
(a)	Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes of value to external audiences.
It is clear that very close attention is paid to processes of assessment and reviewing student performance. Rather than focussing on a specific aspect of clinical trials, the final compulsory module requires the students to submit an assignment integrating their learning from the previous modules and covering several different aspects of clinical trials. This is an excellent way to complete the course for the students and also gives a useful internal check of the student's performance and achievement throughout the course.	
(b)	Please comment on any aspects of the programme that are useful to current students.
Students are encouraged to submit formative assessments for feedback as part of their preparation for summative assessments. Although not taken-up by all students, this opportunity is clearly of value. Feedback to students highlighted where more marks could have been gained – including for the highest scoring students.	

Part 2   Standards

(a)	Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts. You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.	
	• Please refer to the Framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ). • For the *International Foundation Programme* please refer to the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF). • Where applicable, please refer to the Subject Benchmark Statements.	
(b)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(c)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level as for College-based students. *[Only answer if you are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing College-based students]*	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒

(d)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level at my own University of London College. *[Only answer if you are an Intercollegiate Examiners]*	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒
(e)	The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(f)	Please comment on the standards of student performance. You may want to include: • the relation to the specified learning outcomes • candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.	

Many students demonstrate a high level of performance at least equivalent to that achieved on face-to-face courses. This confirms the effectiveness of the support that is provided for distance learning - at least for many of the students. The proportion of students gaining either merit of distinction was lower this year than last. However, this appears to be due to expected variation in the student cohorts rather than in lower education provision or more difficult assessments.

Part 3   Programme and assessment design

(a)	The aims and learning outcomes for the programme / module(s) are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment *(i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertations, etc.)* in relation to • the subject • the students • the respective level of study • the expected learning outcomes.	

For the modules that I have reviewed, there was a good balance between focussed questions requiring specific information in unseen written exams and broader questions requiring students to read around topics for assessed assignments. There was some unevenness in the amount of assessment for modules carrying the same number of credits.

(c)	Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.

I am not aware of any issues in the students accessing or navigating the VLE. The study materials appeared well focussed and directly relevant to clearly stated learning outcomes.

(d)	Please comment on the overall quality of assessment design and structure.

Overall very good. Given the international nature of the student body, important to ensure that students are sufficiently familiar with the settings of clinical trials used for assessments.

Part 4	Assessment Process

4.1 Information

(a) Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment? — Yes ☒ No ☐

(b) Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment *(e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marking criteria)*? — Yes ☒ No ☐

(c) Did you receive this information in good time? — Yes ☒ No ☐

(d) Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements? — Yes ☒ No ☐

(e) Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.

Excellent. Full access to marks awarded by each examiner and details of discussions to reach agreed mark where required. Felt very well supported by the admin staff - always helpful and respond promptly to enquiries.

4.2 Paper-setting *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a) Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see? — Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(b) Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate? — Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(c) Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments? — Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒

(d) Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process.

As this is my first year, I have not yet been involved in paper setting.

4.3 Marking and sampling *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a) Did you receive the scripts or other assessed examination material in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment? — Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(b) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent? — Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(c) Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail? — Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(d) Were you satisfied with the standard of marking? — Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(e) Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked? — Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

Dissertations / project reports *[if applicable]*			
(f) Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
Oral assessment *[if applicable]*			
(g) Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment?	Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☒

(h) Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work.

The number of scripts for moderation has been reduced to six (2 top, 2 borderline, 2 bottom) but with an additional 2 scripts at each level provided if further evaluation of marking needed.

4.4 Board of Examiners meeting(s)			
(a) Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒	No ☐	
(b) Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒	No ☐	
(c) Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting?	Yes ☒	No ☐	
(d) If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?	Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☒
(e) Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(f) Were you happy to endorse the decisions of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒	No ☐	

(g) Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.

Very useful discussions about many aspects of distance learning, the course, assessment and student performance. Helpful in gaining greater insights into the course quickly.

Part 5   Other Comments

(a) Please provide comments relating to Professional Body requirements, if applicable.

The course provides comprehensive and detailed training in clinical trials directly relevant to students' professional development in clinical research.

(b) How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?

Unable to comment - first year as external examiner

(c)	Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.
Unable to comment - first year as external examiner	
(d)	If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the International Programmes.
N/a	
(e)	Please provide any other comments you may have.
Overall, I have been impressed by the high level of student retention and their achievements on this distance learning course. It is clear that the course is very well managed. Assessment is undertaken to a high standard. I look forward to engaging further with the course and the supporting team over the next couple of years.	

Professor Stephen Allen

09 February 2016

Response to External Examiners Annual Report Academic year 2014-2015 by Professor Stephen Allen

Dear Professor Allen

Thank you for submitting your External Examiner's Annual Report for 2014-2015. The report has been shared with the University of London International Programme (UoLIP) as part of our review process and will be included in our Annual Programme Review Report which will be available on the UoLIP website (with your details redacted). As part of the review process we would like to formally respond to your comments.

Your comments on assessment were very useful. We were pleased to read that you felt that very close attention is paid to the processes of assessment and reviewing student performance. Your thoughts on the value of the Integrating Report were appreciated as this mode of assessment is not as common at M-level study as a final dissertation. Thank you for stating that this approach to integrated rather than specialised learning is "an excellent way to complete the course" and also for your comment on the value of the optional formative assessments and the feedback that is given to students.

Your comparison between performance levels of our students and those achieved on face-to-face courses were useful. You argued that perfermance levels are equivalent and that "this confirms the effectiveness of the support that is provided for distance learning." Learning at a distance is a challenging mode of study and those who achieve the PGCert, PGDip and the MSc show a substantial comitmemt to their studies. We appreciate the view that out support systems for distance learners are appropriate.

You observed that the proportion of students gaining either merit of distinction was lower this year than last but were clear that this relates to expected variation in the student cohorts rather than in lower education provision or more difficult assessments. This is our view also.

You were asked to comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment. While you felt that there was "a good balance between focussed questions requiring specific information in unseen written exams and broader questions requiring students to read around topics for assessed assignments," you observed some unevenness in the amount of assessment for modules carrying

the same number of credits." We were not quite sure what was being referred to here. All the core modules are assessed on the basis of a 2¼ hour examination, and all the elective modules except (CTM201 and CTM210) are assessed on the basis of a 2¼ hour examination which carries 80% of the module marks, and an assessed assignment (AA) which carries 20% of the module marks. The Integrating module (CTM210) is assessed based on the Integrating Report alone. We think that you might be referring to CTM201 in which the usual balance of 80% marks for examination and 20% for the Assessed Assignment is reversed. In CTM201 the bulk of the work for the module took place in the protocol development task set for the Assessed Assignment for 80% of the module marks. This meant that the examination which was the same task as for other modules accrued only 20% of the marks. It was agreed at the last Board of Examiners meeitng that this would be addressed and Senate Learning and Teaching Committee has been asked to approve a change to the module to allow the examination to be dropped and 100% of the module marks to be gained through the Asessed Assignment, 20% of which are available for an assessent of individual contribututions to the group work involved.

We were pleased to read that you felt that the study materials are "well focussed and directly relevant to clearly stated learning outcomes".

You were asked to comment on the assessment design and stucture. You felt that this is "overall very good". You emphasised the importance of ensuring that the scenarios used in our assessments are sufficiently familiar to our international student body. This was noted in the Course Committee Meeting minutes at which it was discussed, and has been communicated to our Module Organisers responsible for assessment question setting.

We were pleased to read that you found the Board of Examiners meeting to be useful, and appreciate your positive comments about the course and its management and the achievements of our students.

Thank you for this detailed and positive feedback and for the work that you do as an external examiner which is essential to maintaining the smooth running and standards of the course.

Yours sincerely

Diana Elbourne and Claire Snowdon

Course Directors

External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Part 1	Summary

Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report *(e.g. BSc Economics, MSc Public Financial Management)*	MSc Clincial Trials
Subject Area or Modules covered *[if applicable]*	
Academic/calendar year covered *(e.g. 2014-2015 or 2015)*	2014-2015
Date(s) of Board of Examiners meeting	28th July 2015, 23rd October 2015
Name of External / Intercollegiate Examiner	Prof Kerenza Hood
Home institution and/or professional affiliation	Cardiff University
External Examiner ☒	Intercollegiate Examiner ☐
Year of Service *[Extension to 5th year of service under exceptional circumstances only]*	1st ☒ 2nd ☐ 3rd ☐ 4th ☐ 5th ☐
Date of the report	*01/01/2016*

1.1	Standards	
(a)	The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	If not, please explain why.	

1.2	Student performance	
(a)	The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	If not, please explain why.	
(c)	If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.	

1.3	**Conduct of processes**	
(a)	The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	If not, please explain why.	
(c)	If processes are of a higher standard, please elaborate.	

1.4	**Area for commendation**
(a)	Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes of value to external audiences.
	I think that the integration report is a very good way of assessing the learning across the course.
(b)	Please comment on any aspects of the programme that are useful to current students.
	The formative assessments seem to be useful to students (from their feedback)

Part 2	**Standards**

(a)	Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts. You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.	
	• Please refer to the [Framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ)](#). • For the *International Foundation Programme* please refer to the [Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF)](#). • Where applicable, please refer to the [Subject Benchmark Statements](#).	

This is a coherent programme with core and optional parts which allow flexibility for students to develop within that coherency. As a Director of a CTU I also think this is a program which is very good for the development of the clinical trial workforce.

(b)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level.	Yes ☒ No ☐	
(c)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level as for College-based students. *[Only answer if you are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing College-based students]*	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐	
(d)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level at my own University of London College. *[Only answer if you are an Intercollegiate Examiners]*	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒	
(e)	The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.	Yes ☒ No ☐	

(f)   Please comment on the standards of student performance. You may want to include:
- the relation to the specified learning outcomes
- candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.

In general the standards of performance of the students are good, although there is understandable variability from year to year.

Part 3   Programme and assessment design

(a)   The aims and learning outcomes for the programme / module(s) are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b)   Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment *(i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertations, etc.)* in relation to
- the subject
- the students
- the respective level of study
- the expected learning outcomes.

Overall the types of assessment suite the learning objectives. There was some discussion about one exam being more suited to a piece of coursework, but it was still a valid and fair assessment of the module.

(c)   Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.

Good

(d)   Please comment on the overall quality of assessment design and structure.

Overall this is a well designed course that gives solid foundations as its core and with options that provide for specialistation across the range of areas of clincial trials. The assessments match the design of the course well and provide a good opportunity for the studnets to show their learning.

Part 4   Assessment Process

4.1   Information

(a)   Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b)   Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment *(e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marking criteria)*?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(c)   Did you receive this information in good time?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(d)   Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(e) Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.			
Good			

4.2 Paper-setting *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*			
(a) Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(b) Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(c) Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(d) Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process.			
Overall good. The online system is also very helpful for managing the process			

4.3 Marking and sampling *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*			
(a) Did you receive the scripts or other assessed examination material in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(b) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(c) Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(d) Were you satisfied with the standard of marking?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(e) Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
Dissertations / project reports *[if applicable]*			
(f) Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
Oral assessment *[if applicable]*			
(g) Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment?	Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☒
(h) Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work.			
The integration report as opposed to the more standard dissertation I am used to worked extremely well and I felt was an innovative approach to assessing the broader learning and combination of learning provided across the course.			

4.4 Board of Examiners meeting(s)		
(a) Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒	No ☐

(b)	Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒ No ☐	
(c)	Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting?	Yes ☒ No ☐	
(d)	If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒	
(e)	Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐	
(f)	Were you happy to endorse the decisions of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒ No ☐	
(g)	Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.		

Part 5   Other Comments

(a) Please provide comments relating to Professional Body requirements, if applicable.

(b) How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?

I observed last year and the process fo the exam baords seemed very similar, although there had been improvements in the data presentation which was facilitative of discussion.

(c) Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.

(d) If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the International Programmes.

(e) Please provide any other comments you may have.

Professor Kerenza Hood

09 February 2016

**Response to External Examiners Annual Report Academic year 2014-2015 by Professor Karenza
Hood**

Dear Professor Hood

Thank you for submitting your External Examiner's Annual Report for 2014-2015. The report has
been shared with the University of London International Programme (UoLIP) as part of our review
process and will be included in our Annual Programme Review Report which will be available on the
UoLIP website (with your details redacted). As part of the review process we would like to formally
respond to your comments.

We agree with your comments that the Integrating Report is "a very good way of assessing the
learning across the course" and works "extremely well" and that the formative assignments "seem
to be useful to students."

We were particularly pleased to read that you feel that the Clinical Trials courses we offer are of
direct relevance to the needs of a clinical trial workforce. The course is intended to equip the next
generation of trialists with the academic and practical skills and insights that they will need to work
in his challenging field of research.

You were asked to comment on the assessment design and stucture. You felt that "the assessments
match the design of the course well and provide a good opportunity for the students to show their
learning". Thank you for your comments.

You felt that the process of setting assignments was good. We have worked to clarify for those
involved what is rather a complex process and so appreciated your view that the online system we
use is helpful.

You commented on the procedures and arrangements for the Board of Examiners compared with
those used in previous years. We agree that the improvements in the data presentation used in the
meeting was helpful and facilitated discussion.

Thank you for these comments and for the work that you do as an external examiner which is
essential to maintaining the smooth running and standards of the course.

Yours sincerely

Diana Elbourne and Claire Snowdon

Course Directors

External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Part 1	Summary

Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report *(e.g. BSc Economics, MSc Public Financial Management)*	Postgraduate Diploma/MSc in Clinical Trials
Subject Area or Modules covered *[if applicable]*	
Academic/calendar year covered *(e.g. 2014-2015 or 2015)*	2014-2015
Date(s) of Board of Examiners meeting	28th July 2015
Name of External / Intercollegiate Examiner	Richard Kay
Home institution and/or professional affiliation	RK Statistics
External Examiner ⊠	Intercollegiate Examiner ☐
Year of Service *[Extension to 5th year of service under exceptional circumstances only]*	1st ☐ 2nd ☐ 3rd ⊠ 4th ☐ 5th ☐
Date of the report	*01/11/2015*

1.1 Standards

(a) The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject. Yes ⊠ No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

1.2 Student performance

(a) The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar. Yes ⊠ No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

(c) If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.

1.3 Conduct of processes

(a) The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted. Yes ⊠ No ☐

(b)	If not, please explain why.

(c)	If processes are of a higher standard, please elaborate.

1.4   Area for commendation

(a) Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes of value to external audiences.

(b) Please comment on any aspects of the programme that are useful to current students.

Part 2   Standards

(a) Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts. You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.

- Please refer to the Framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ).
- For the *International Foundation Programme* please refer to the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF).
- Where applicable, please refer to the Subject Benchmark Statements.

(b) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level.

Yes ☒   No ☐

(c) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level as for College-based students.

[Only answer if you are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing College-based students]

Yes ☐   No ☐   N/A ☒

(d) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level at my own University of London College.

[Only answer if you are an Intercollegiate Examiners]

Yes ☐   No ☐   N/A ☒

(e) The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.

Yes ☒   No ☐

(f) Please comment on the standards of student performance. You may want to include:
- the relation to the specified learning outcomes
- candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.

Part 3   Programme and assessment design

(a) The aims and learning outcomes for the programme / module(s) are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.	Yes ☒ No ☐

(b) Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment *(i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertations, etc.)* in relation to
- the subject
- the students
- the respective level of study
- the expected learning outcomes.

Good balance across different types of assessment

(c) Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.

Study materials very comprehensive

(d) Please comment on the overall quality of assessment design and structure.

Very good

Part 4   Assessment Process

4.1   Information

(a) Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b) Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment *(e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marking criteria)*?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(c) Did you receive this information in good time?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(d) Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements?	Yes ☒ No ☐

(e) Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.

A lot of material to read and evaluate but appropriate for the task

4.2   Paper-setting *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a) Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(b) Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(c) Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(d) Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process.

All comments were considered and where appropriately incorporated into revisions

4.3   Marking and sampling *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a)   Did you receive the scripts or other assessed examination material in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(b)   Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(c)   Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(d)   Were you satisfied with the standard of marking?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(e)   Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

Dissertations / project reports *[if applicable]*

(f)   Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

Oral assessment *[if applicable]*

(g)   Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment?   Yes ☐   No ☐   N/A ☒

(h)   Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work.

4.4   Board of Examiners meeting(s)

(a)   Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b)   Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(c)   Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting?   Yes ☐   No ☒

(d)   If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(e)   Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(f)   Were you happy to endorse the decisions of the Board of Examiners?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(g)   Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.

I attended the meeting via teleconference.

Part 5   Other Comments

(a)   Please provide comments relating to Professional Body requirements, if applicable.

(b)   How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?

In line with previous years

(c)   Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.

(d)   If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the International Programmes.

(e)   Please provide any other comments you may have.

Professor Richard Kay

09 February 2016

Response to External Examiners Annual Report Academic year 2014-2015 by Professor Richard Kay

Dear Professor Kay

Thank you for submitting your External Examiner's Annual Report for 2014-2015. The report has been shared with the University of London International Programme (UoLIP) as part of our review process and will be included in our Annual Programme Review Report which will be available on the UoLIP website (with your details redacted). As part of the review process we would like to formally respond to your comments.

Thank you for your positive comments on the balance of different types of assessment used in the course which you felt was good. We were pleased that you feel the study materials are very comprehensive and appoved the quality of assessment design and structure.

We appreciate the effort that external examiners are required to put in to reading material, and are pleased that despite the size of the task you felt that it was appropriate for your role.

You were asked to comment on the assessment setting and evaluation process. As the External Examiner's comments and evaluations are a major part of the process and greatly add to the quality of the questions, marking schemes and specimen answers, were were pleased to read that you felt that all of your comments were considered and where appropriate were incorporated into revisions.

Thank you for the work that you do as an external examiner which is essential to maintaining the smooth running and standards of the course.

Yours sincerely

Diana Elbourne and Claire Snowdon

Course Directors

External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Part 1	Summary

Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report *(e.g. BSc Economics, MSc Public Financial Management)*	MSc Epidemiology (DL)
Subject Area or Modules covered *[if applicable]*	EPM102, EPM202, EPM304, EPM500
Academic/calendar year covered *(e.g. 2014-2015 or 2015)*	2014-2015
Date(s) of Board of Examiners meeting	23/7/15 and 24/11/15
Name of External / Intercollegiate Examiner	Hazel Inskip
Home institution and/or professional affiliation	University of Southampton
External Examiner ☒	Intercollegiate Examiner ☐
Year of Service *[Extension to 5th year of service under exceptional circumstances only]*	1st ☐ 2nd ☐ 3rd ☒ 4th ☐ 5th ☐
Date of the report	*24/11/2015*

1.1 Standards

(a) The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject. Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

1.2 Student performance

(a) The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar. Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

(c) If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.

1.3 Conduct of processes

(a) The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted. Yes ☒   No ☐

(b)	If not, please explain why.
(c)	If processes are of a higher standard, please elaborate.

1.4 Area for commendation

(a) Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes of value to external audiences.

The processes are exemplary and I am extremely impressed with the rigour and care with which the examinations are set and marked.

(b) Please comment on any aspects of the programme that are useful to current students.

Students can be reassured that every effort is made to ensure that the assessment is fair to all students and the exam scripts, assessed asignments and the projects are marked with great care and diligence

Part 2 Standards

(a) Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts. You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.

- Please refer to the Framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ).
- For the *International Foundation Programme* please refer to the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF).
- Where applicable, please refer to the Subject Benchmark Statements.

(b)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(c)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level as for College-based students. *[Only answer if you are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing College-based students]*	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒
(d)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level at my own University of London College. *[Only answer if you are an Intercollegiate Examiners]*	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒
(e)	The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.	Yes ☒ No ☐

(f) Please comment on the standards of student performance. You may want to include:
- the relation to the specified learning outcomes
- candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.

Student performance seemed comparable with previous years. Some perform to a very high standard but there are others who find the course very challenging

---

Part 3   Programme and assessment design

(a) The aims and learning outcomes for the programme / module(s) are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment *(i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertations, etc.)* in relation to
- the subject
- the students
- the respective level of study
- the expected learning outcomes.

The appropriateness and balance seem right to me. The modules cover a range of issues within the field so address the subject appropriately; they test the students in a variety of ways providing opportunities for those with strenths in different assessment methods (eg exam versus assignments), the level seems fine and the expected learning outcomes are those I would expect for a course of this nature.

(c) Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.

The study materials are of a very high quality.

(d) Please comment on the overall quality of assessment design and structure.

Excellent

Part 4   Assessment Process

4.1   Information

(a) Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment *(e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marking criteria)*?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(c) Did you receive this information in good time?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(d) Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(e) Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.

It is very irritating to have to have a new contract and arrange that every year. If that could be sorted out it would be helpful.

Although I managed to complete the work in the time available, receiving the projects earlier would have helped. They arrived only a few days before the examiners' meeting.

4.2   Paper-setting *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a) Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(b)	Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(c)	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(d)	Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process.			

I feel that my comments were considered very seriously and were taken on board appropriately.

4.3 Marking and sampling *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a)	Did you receive the scripts or other assessed examination material in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(b)	Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(c)	Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(d)	Were you satisfied with the standard of marking?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(e)	Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐

Dissertations / project reports *[if applicable]*

(f)	Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐

Oral assessment *[if applicable]*

(g)	Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment?	Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☒
(h)	Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work.			

Some students, particularly those who failed, tended to have rather broad topics for their projects and they failed at least in part because the scope was too wide. Ensuring that weak students in particular are guided towards projects with clearly defined objectives would be my recommendation.

4.4 Board of Examiners meeting(s)

(a)	Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒	No ☐	
(b)	Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒	No ☐	
(c)	Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting?	Yes ☒	No ☐	
(d)	If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?	Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☒
(e)	Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐

(f)	Were you happy to endorse the decisions of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒ No ☐

(g)	Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.

These are run well and there is good discussion and opportunities to ensure that decisions taken are fair.

Part 5   Other Comments

(a)	Please provide comments relating to Professional Body requirements, if applicable.

(b)	How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?

Very similar

(c)	Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.

My suggestions have always been considered seriously and taken on board appropriately

(d)	If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the International Programmes.

(e)	Please provide any other comments you may have.

London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine

Keppel Street, London WC1E 7HT
United Kingdom
Switchboard: +44 (0)20 7636 8636

www.lshtm.ac.uk

LONDON
SCHOOL *of*
HYGIENE
&TROPICAL
MEDICINE

4th February 2016

Professor Hazel Inskip

Dear Professor Inskip

I am writing to thank you for all your work as External Examiner last year. We have reviewed the comments in your report, together with those from Professor Joe West, and included our response within the relevant sections of our formal annual Exam Board Comments and Action Plan (attached).

In particular, we noted the following points were raised, to which we have added action points (in italics).

1. With regard to Projects, one of the Examiners highlighted that

- those who failed tended to have rather broad topics for their projects and they failed at least in part because the scope was too wide and, related to this, that
- there was a need to ensure that weak students in particular are guided towards projects with clearly defined objectives.

Action: Review guidance to students and supervisors in terms of breadth of topic and the need for clear objectives (this will be taken forward by the Project Organisers)

2. In terms of overall process, the Examiners made the following points:

- Both Examiners highlighted the need to have more time to review the material for moderation, particularly the projects.

- One of the Examiners commented on the quantity of information sent and the method in which it is sent and suggested that the process was reviewed in this respect

- Clarification was sought on the exact role of the external examiners with respect to reviewing the projects, the feedback and the grades given.

London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
Keppel Street, London WC1E 7HT
United Kingdom
Switchboard: +44 (0)20 7636 8636

www.lshtm.ac.uk

Action: (i) Ensure External Examiners should be sent paperwork at least one week ahead of the meeting. Course Director to liaise with Support Office to streamline quantity and delivery of documentation.

(ii) CD to seek clarification of the role of the External Examiners in the project review process.

In relation to point 2 (ii), I have followed up on this and can clarify that the external examiners should be asked to endorse that the grades are correct on the sample of projects provided. If the external examiners do disagree with the grades, then any other projects which could be potentially affected in the same way, should be re-marked.

Please do let me know if you have questions on this and thank you for your continued help this year.

Yours sincerely

Anne Tholen
Course Director
PG Certificate, PG Diploma and MSc in Epidemiology
Distance Learning Programme

External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Part 1	Summary

Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report *(e.g. BSc Economics, MSc Public Financial Management)*	Distance Learning MSc in Epidemiology
Subject Area or Modules covered *[if applicable]*	
Academic/calendar year covered *(e.g. 2014-2015 or 2015)*	2014-2015
Date(s) of Board of Examiners meeting	23/07/2015 and 24/11/2015
Name of External / Intercollegiate Examiner	Joe West
Home institution and/or professional affiliation	University of Nottingham
External Examiner ☒	Intercollegiate Examiner ☐
Year of Service *[Extension to 5th year of service under exceptional circumstances only]*	1st ☒ 2nd ☐ 3rd ☐ 4th ☐ 5th ☐
Date of the report	25/11/2015

1.1	**Standards**	
(a)	The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	If not, please explain why.	

1.2	**Student performance**	
(a)	The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	If not, please explain why.	
(c)	If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.	

1.3	**Conduct of processes**	
(a)	The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.	Yes ☒ No ☐

(b)	If not, please explain why.
(c)	If processes are of a higher standard, please elaborate.

1.4	**Area for commendation**
(a)	Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes of value to external audiences.
The approach to assessment and feedback on this course is extremely rigorous and fair and because of this very impressive. Students taking this course receive a very high level of input both in terms of the quantity and quality of time taken by the assessors.
(b)	Please comment on any aspects of the programme that are useful to current students.
The rigorous approach to assessment is very useful for students to be aware of as it indicates the excellence of the course overall

Part 2   Standards

(a)	Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts. You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.
	• Please refer to the Framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ). • For the *International Foundation Programme* please refer to the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF). • Where applicable, please refer to the Subject Benchmark Statements.

The coherence and currency of the course is excellent. It aligns directly with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ) in terms of the learning outcomes and the qualification descriptors set out in this document.

(b)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level.	Yes ☒ No ☐	
(c)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level as for College-based students. *[Only answer if you are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing College-based students]*	Yes ☐ No ☐ ☒	N/A
(d)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level at my own University of London College. *[Only answer if you are an Intercollegiate Examiners]*	Yes ☐ No ☐ ☒	N/A
(e)	The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.	Yes ☒ No ☐	

(f)   Please comment on the standards of student performance. You may want to include:
- the relation to the specified learning outcomes
- candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.

The standards of student performance are good, they meet the specified learning outcomes and the candidates' performance seems similar or better in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.

Part 3   Programme and assessment design

(a)   The aims and learning outcomes for the programme / module(s) are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b)   Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment *(i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertations, etc.)* in relation to
- the subject
- the students
- the respective level of study
- the expected learning outcomes.

The appropriateness and balance of types of assessment for the students, subjects, level of study and expected learning outcomes is good.

(c)   Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.

The study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment are well designed with respect to the expected learning outcomes.

(d)   Please comment on the overall quality of assessment design and structure.

The overall quality of the assessment design and structure is excellent.

Part 4   Assessment Process

4.1   Information

(a)   Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b)   Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment *(e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marking criteria)*?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(c)   Did you receive this information in good time?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(d)   Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(e)   Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.

The majority of the information sent was useful and relevant. There was a great deal of information to get through however and if anything, perhaps, slightly less (i.e. some redundant information could be removed) could be sent in future. In addition, it would be really helpful if possible to have all the documentation/reports/scripts etc for the moderation process sent in only one email for each module

with the templates already labelled for that module. Even better would be some section in the VLE which is only accessible for external examiners to view and download the documentation for moderating purposes and upload completed forms.

4.2   Paper-setting *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a)   Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(b)   Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(c)   Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(d)   Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process.

4.3   Marking and sampling *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a)   Did you receive the scripts or other assessed examination material in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?   Yes ☐   No ☒   N/A ☐

(b)   Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(c)   Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(d)   Were you satisfied with the standard of marking?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(e)   Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

Dissertations / project reports *[if applicable]*

(f)   Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

Oral assessment *[if applicable]*

(g)   Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment?   Yes ☐   No ☐   N/A ☒

(h)   Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work.

Further to my answer to point 4.3 (a) I did receive all the scripts for moderation in good time for the July board meeting but not for the November board meeting. I only received the projects and feedback completely by approximately 11.30am on 23/11/2015. This, I understand, was due to a technical issue with email which I hope will be rectified for next time. However, the question of how much time is "enough" in which to assess 8 full dissertations and the feedback given (which is what I received) remains unclear - certainly the timescales available do not allow for full moderation in the same way that is carried out for the other assessed modules. Clarification therefore on what the exact role of the external examiners is with respect to reviewing the projects, the feedback and the grades given would be appreciated. It appears to me currently that we are not expected to "moderate" the projects but are expected to give our view on the feedback and grades informally. This, to me, is an ambiguous task.

4.4	Board of Examiners meeting(s)	
(a)	Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒　No ☐
(b)	Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒　No ☐
(c)	Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting?	Yes ☒　No ☐
(d)	If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?	Yes ☐　No ☐　N/A ☒
(e)	Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes ☒　No ☐　N/A ☐
(f)	Were you happy to endorse the decisions of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒　No ☐
(g)	Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.	

The meetings were well conducted and decisions appropriate.

Part 5　　Other Comments

(a)	Please provide comments relating to Professional Body requirements, if applicable.

Not applicable

(b)	How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?

Not applicable

(c)	Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.

Not applicable

(d)	If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the International Programmes.

Not applicable

(e)	Please provide any other comments you may have.

This has been an enjoyable and instructive process to be a part of. I am grateful to have been asked to be an external examiner on this course.

London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
Keppel Street, London WC1E 7HT
United Kingdom
Switchboard: +44 (0)20 7636 8636

www.lshtm.ac.uk

4th February 2016

Professor Joe West

Dear Professor West

I am writing to thank you for all your work as External Examiner last year. We have reviewed the comments in your report, together with those from Professor Hazel Inskip, and included our response within the relevant sections of our formal annual Exam Board Comments and Action Plan (attached).

In particular, we noted the following points were raised, to which we have added action points (in italics).

1. With regard to Projects, one of the Examiners highlighted that

- those who failed tended to have rather broad topics for their projects and they failed at least in part because the scope was too wide and, related to this, that
- there was a need to ensure that weak students in particular are guided towards projects with clearly defined objectives.

Action: Review guidance to students and supervisors in terms of breadth of topic and the need for clear objectives (this will be taken forward by the Project Organisers)

2. In terms of overall process, the Examiners made the following points:

- Both Examiners highlighted the need to have more time to review the material for moderation, particularly the projects.

- One of the Examiners commented on the quantity of information sent and the method in which it is sent and suggested that the process was reviewed in this respect

- Clarification was sought on the exact role of the external examiners with respect to reviewing the projects, the feedback and the grades given.

Action: (i) Ensure External Examiners should be sent paperwork at least one week ahead of the meeting. Course Director to liaise with Support Office to streamline quantity and delivery of documentation.

London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
Keppel Street, London WC1E 7HT
United Kingdom
Switchboard: +44 (0)20 7636 8636

www.lshtm.ac.uk

(ii) CD to seek clarification of the role of the External Examiners in the project review process.

In relation to point 2 (ii), I have followed up on this and can clarify that the external examiners should be asked to endorse that the grades are correct on the sample of projects provided. If the external examiners do disagree with the grades, then any other projects which could be potentially affected in the same way, should be re-marked.

Please do let me know if you have questions on this and thank you for your continued help this year.

Yours sincerely

Anne Tholen
Course Director
PG Certificate, PG Diploma and MSc in Epidemiology
Distance Learning Programme

External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Part 1	Summary

Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report *(e.g. BSc Economics, MSc Public Financial Management)*	MSc Global Health Policy
Subject Area or Modules covered *[if applicable]*	Global Health Policy
Academic/calendar year covered *(e.g. 2014-2015 or 2015)*	2014-15
Date(s) of Board of Examiners meeting	30/7/15 and 19/11/15
Name of External / Intercollegiate Examiner	Dr. Simon Rushton
Home institution and/or professional affiliation	University of Sheffield
External Examiner ☒	Intercollegiate Examiner ☐
Year of Service *[Extension to 5ᵗʰ year of service under exceptional circumstances only]*	1st ☐ 2nd ☐ 3rd ☐ 4th ☒ 5th ☐
Date of the report	23/11/2015

1.1   Standards

(a) The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject.

Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

N/A

1.2   Student performance

(a) The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar.

Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

N/A

(c) If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.

N/A

1.3   Conduct of processes

(a) The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.

Yes ☒   No ☐

(b)   If not, please explain why.

N/A

(c)   If processes are of a higher standard, please elaborate.

N/A

1.4   Area for commendation

(a)   Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes of value to external audiences.

The Global Health Policy modules are assessed through traditional means (essays; unseen examinations; projects). The standards for assessing that work are appropriate for Master's level, and the marking criteria and procedures are fair and robust. There are excellent systems in place for first and second-marking assessed work, with effective oversight by Module Leaders.

(b)   Please comment on any aspects of the programme that are useful to current students.

The quantity and quality of feedback provided to students on the programme is excellent, clearly identifying the strengths and weaknesses of students' work as well as justifying the mark awarded. This allows students to learn from their experience and improve their marks in subsequent assessments.

Part 2   Standards

(a)   Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts. You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.

- Please refer to the [Framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ)](#).
- For the *International Foundation Programme* please refer to the [Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF)](#).
- Where applicable, please refer to the [Subject Benchmark Statements](#).

The programme (I am specifically referring here to the core GHM modules) is coherent and well-designed. The learning outcomes are clearly specified and the assessed work I have examined demonstrates that students are achieving the desired outcomes and that they are being taught effectively.
The modules address key contemporary issues in Global Health Policy, ensuring that the material is relevant and up-to-date.

(b) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level.	Yes ⊠ No ☐	
(c) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level as for College-based students. *[Only answer if you are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing College-based students]*	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ⊠	
(d) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level at my own University of London College. *[Only answer if you are an Intercollegiate Examiners]*	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ⊠	
(e) The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.	Yes ⊠ No ☐	

(f) Please comment on the standards of student performance. You may want to include:
- the relation to the specified learning outcomes
- candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.

Overall the distribution of marks across the modules was in line with other Master's-level courses of which I have experience, and the standards demonstrated by the candidates comparable with those that I have seen in other institutions. The work of the strongest students was impressive in its demonstration of knowledge and insight and the overall standard is good. Few students failed, which is indicative of effective programme delivery.

On the projects (examined Nov 14): Eleven students completed projects in this academic year, of which I examined a sample of six. The overall standard of work produced was good, with no failures. It seemed clear that all of the students had been well supervised, indicating that the project process is running effectively. We noted at the board that the best projects were perhaps not as strong as the best from the previous year (none were awarded a mark of 5 in 2014/15, one was in the previous year) but given the small sample size this is not necessarily a cause for concern.

It is disappointing that no students graduated with a distinction this year. However, I do not think that this indicates a problem with the level of expectations or marking. I hope that in future years students will be able to achieve the very highest marks consistently across modules.

Part 3   Programme and assessment design

(a) The aims and learning outcomes for the programme / module(s) are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment *(i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertations, etc.)* in relation to
- the subject
- the students
- the respective level of study
- the expected learning outcomes.

The assessment methods for GHM101, 102, 103, 104 are unseen written examinations. For GHM201 there is an assessment in addition to a written examination. These are entirely appropriate ways of assessing students on these modules.

The assessments tested students appropriately on the knowledge and skills relevant to the modules in question, and were well-suited to assessing students against the Learning Outcomes.

(c) Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.

Students are provided with a good range of materials which are suitably tailored to meeting the Learning Outcomes.

(d)   Please comment on the overall quality of assessment design and structure.

Main board (July 2015): Detailed and suitable marking criteria were in place for each examination question, and the sample of scripts I received had been marked accurately according to those criteria. It was apparent from the additional materials provided to me that the double-marking process had been extremely rigorous and fair, with the reconciliation of marks between first and second markers being taken very seriously.

The examination papers (which I approved in late 2014) were well-designed and the questions were suitable for assessing students on the content of the modules. There had been an effort this year to ensure that examination questions on all modules pushed students to be more analytical and apply critical thinking to a greater extent (including questions that cut across different sessions). This is definitely a positive move and in my view entirely appropriate for Master's level students.

Project board (Nov 2015): The marking criteria and feedback guidance provided to project supervisors is excellent.

I also noted at the exam board (repeating what I said in November 2014) that the quantity, level of detail, and constructive nature of the feedback provided to students was admirable on all of the projects I examined. Students are given a very clear justification of their mark, with strengths and weaknesses identified and explained.

Part 4   Assessment Process

4.1   Information

(a)   Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b)   Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment *(e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marking criteria)*?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(c)   Did you receive this information in good time?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(d)   Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(e)   Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.

I was provided with all of the information I needed relating to both the programme itself and the examination process.

4.2   Paper-setting *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a)   Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(b)   Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(c)   Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(d)	Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process.			

The paper setting process was very efficient, with those minor comments I had on the draft questions being fully addressed.

4.3	**Marking and sampling** *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*			
(a)	Did you receive the scripts or other assessed examination material in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(b)	Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(c)	Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(d)	Were you satisfied with the standard of marking?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(e)	Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐

Dissertations / project reports *[if applicable]*

(f)	Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐

Oral assessment *[if applicable]*

(g)	Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment?	Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☒

(h)	Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work.			

See above.

4.4	**Board of Examiners meeting(s)**			
(a)	Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒	No ☐	
(b)	Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒	No ☐	
(c)	Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting?	Yes ☒	No ☐	
(d)	If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?	Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☒
(e)	Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(f)	Were you happy to endorse the decisions of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒	No ☐	

(g)   Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.

The provision of material and information for both exam boards was extremely efficiently and professionally carried out – my thanks to the Global Health Policy Course Manager in particular, and also to the other staff involved. I found the reports of the individual Module Organisers extremely useful. This is an excellent example of good practice.

Part 5   Other Comments

(a)   Please provide comments relating to Professional Body requirements, if applicable.

N/A

(b)   How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?

As always, the process was conducted extremely efficiently and properly.

(c)   Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.

The comments and suggestions I made last year had all been considered and acted upon. These steps were reported back to the July board.

(d)   If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the International Programmes.

I have served as the External Examiner on this programme since it first launched, four years ago. In that time it has been pleasing to see the programme establish itself well and attract a significant number of students – with a healthy number of graduates from the programme already having been produced. I am strongly supportive of the idea of a Master's in Global Health Policy and believe that the course offered at LSHTM is of a high quality.

Throughout my time as External Examiner for this programme I have been impressed by the efficiency and professionalism of all of the staff involved in delivering and administering the programme. There have been very few significant problems over the last four years, and where they have arisen they have been dealt with effectively and properly. The standards of assessment have always been in line with standards elsewhere, and the assessment processes are extremely rigorous, effective and fair to students.

As with all Distance Learning courses, it is essential that the teaching team continue to update the teaching materials over time, and it is pleasing to see that this is being done.

I wish LSHTM and all of the staff involved every success with the programme in future, and would like to record my thanks to all of those who have helped me in my role as External Examiner over the past four years.

(e)   Please provide any other comments you may have.

Click here to enter text.

Dr Simon Rushton

8th January 2016

Dear Dr Rushton

External Examiner's report for PG Cert/PG Dip/MSc Global Health Policy (International Programmes) 2014-15

On behalf of the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine Board of Examiners for Global Health Policy, I would like to thank you for your External Examiner's report for the University of London International Programmes PG Cert/PG Dip/MSc Global Health Policy for the 2014-15 academic year.

The External and Intercollegiate Examiner reports form an integral part of the assessment and quality assurance processes. All comments and points raised in the report have been considered and our formal response is outlined below:

As discussed at the exam board meeting and in view of your comments we are planning the routine update of teaching materials. Along with this and aimed at improving the interactivity of, and ability to update, teaching resources we are planning a transition from the currently used teaching software CAPTIVATE, to presenting materials directly in our Virtual Learning Environment, using the Moodle platform. We continue with our efforts to streamline our reading lists and to encourage students to read beyond the required texts, to develop critical thinking and to make extensive use of online fora. GHP students now have full access to the LSHTM Library online resources. Having expanded the list of elective modules that GHP students can take, we are also in the planning stages of more GHP elective courses.

We were pleased to note the following examples of good practice:

- Excellent systems for first- and second-marking of assessed work, with effective oversight by Module leaders
- Excellent quantity and quality of feedback provided to students on the programme
- Effective supervision of project students
- Excellent guidance provided to project supervisors and detailed and constructive feedback provided to project students
- Good design of examination papers suitable for assessing students' understanding of the material, as well as critical and analytical skills
- Detailed marking criteria and evidence of grade reconciliation between first and second markers

- Individual reports of Module organisers

Thank you again for your comments and for your support of the programme for the duration of your term as external examiner.

Yours sincerely

T. N. Seeley

Professor Janet Seeley
Chair, Examination Board

cc: Dr Preslava Stoeva (Course Director, LSHTM)
       Dr Catherine Dodds (Deputy Course Director, LSHTM)
       Ms Karen Ormsby (Course Manager, LSHTM)

External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Part 1	**Summary**

Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report *(e.g. BSc Economics, MSc Public Financial Management)*	Distance Learning MSc in Infectious Diseases
Subject Area or Modules covered *[if applicable]*	Click here to enter text.
Academic/calendar year covered *(e.g. 2014-2015 or 2015)*	2014-15
Date(s) of Board of Examiners meeting	23.7.15, 17.11.15
Name of External / Intercollegiate Examiner	Dr Dan Agranoff
Home institution and/or professional affiliation	BSUH NHS Trust, Brighton and Sussex Medical School
External Examiner ☒	Intercollegiate Examiner ☐
Year of Service *[Extension to 5th year of service under exceptional circumstances only]*	1st ☐ 2nd ☐ 3rd ☐ 4th ☒ 5th ☐
Date of the report	18/11/2015

1.1   Standards

(a) The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject.   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

Click here to enter text.

1.2   Student performance

(a) The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar.   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

Click here to enter text.

(c) If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.

Click here to enter text.

1.3   Conduct of processes

(a) The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

Click here to enter text.

(c) If processes are of a higher standard, please elaborate.

Click here to enter text.

1.4   Area for commendation

(a) Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes of value to external audiences.

As I have mentioned in previous reports I have been impressed throughout by the quality of the marking guides, rigorous adherence to the principles of double marking and, in many cases, the excellent detailed feedback provided to students for their assessed assignments and dissertations. I have in particular noted a progressive refinement over the past 4 years in the transparency of the discussions between individual markers where significant grade discrepancies have needed to be resolved. A very commendable innovation has been the availability to the External Examiners of a written 'conversation' trail between markers so that the process of grade reconciliation is in most cases apparent and defendable. This is especially important in the small number of instances where a student has appealed a grade assignment and requested referral to the External Examiners for comment. I have noted that marker discussions are now recorded for the majority of Assessed Assignments and, for the first time this year, for the Projects.

(b) Please comment on any aspects of the programme that are useful to current students.

The feedback provided to the students has been consistently of a very high standard.

Part 2   Standards

(a) Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts. You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.

- Please refer to the Framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ).
- For the *International Foundation Programme* please refer to the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF).
- Where applicable, please refer to the Subject Benchmark Statements.

As before, the course continues to provide an up to date and comprehensive range of modules well-aligned to the course objectives. This continues to be supported by an appropriate range of learning resources. For several modules (especially those such as module 501 which deal with a rapidly moving field of knowledge and practice), it is reassuring to see that learning materials, assignments and exam questions are updated on an annual basis to reflect new developments in the field.

(b) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level.	Yes ☒ No ☐	
(c) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level as for College-based students. *[Only answer if you are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing College-based students]*	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐	
(d) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level at my own University of London College. *[Only answer if you are an Intercollegiate Examiners]*	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒	

(e) The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.	Yes ☒ No ☐

(f) Please comment on the standards of student performance. You may want to include:
- the relation to the specified learning outcomes
- candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.

The programme is clearly an effective one with many candidates achieving good to excellent results, with some impressive performances in the in-course assessments. The year on year statistics show broad consistency in the distribution of grades for most modules, although it is noted that for several core modules (e.g. IDM101 and IDM104) there has been a fairly dramatic change in grade distributions in the past 3 years which has been attributed to a significant modification of the syllabuses 3 years ago. I would not consider this in itself as a cause for concern but it will be helpful to review trends in the marks for these modules over the next couple of years to confirm that year on year stability is re-established.

Part 3   Programme and assessment design

(a) The aims and learning outcomes for the programme / module(s) are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.	Yes ☒ No ☐

(b) Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment *(i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertations, etc.)* in relation to
- the subject
- the students
- the respective level of study
- the expected learning outcomes.

There is a reasonable balance between modules weighted towards the imparting of largely factual knowledge (particularly in some of the core modules) and those where the emphasis is on the development and application of specific organisational and logistic thinking. The assessment methods (short notes answers, calculations and essays involving critical evaluation of data) are generally appropriately mapped to these types of content.

(c) Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.

Click here to enter text.

(d) Please comment on the overall quality of assessment design and structure.

In my opinion the assessment processes are robust and appropriate, with evidence of incremental refinements over the 4 years of my tenure. I have seen a steady improvement in marker agreement over the past 4 years across most of the modules, which I'm sure is at least in part attributable to the quality of the detailed marking guidelines provided for many of the assignments. Curiously, Module 501 has consistently exhibited the greatest proportion of grade discrepancies (discrepancies of 2 or more grade points in 21% of assignments this year) despite having overall one of the most consistent final grade distributions year on year. The module is clearly difficult to mark, but I have not seen any finally agreed marks which seemed to me unreasonable.

As I have mentioned on many occasions previously, the evidence for the process of grade reconciliation provided via the email discussions made available to the external examiners, lends confidence in the robustness and fairness of this process.

As before, the style of exam questions remain generally appropriate with a reasonable balance between the factual and discursive. The structure of the course has remained essentially constant over the past 4 years, but continues to provide an appropriate balance between in-course assessments, written examinations and dissertation-type projects which can be offered in place of 3 optional modules. This seems to me a perfectly sensible and appropriate course model.

Part 4   Assessment Process

4.1   Information

(a) Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment *(e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marking criteria)*?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(c) Did you receive this information in good time?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(d) Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements?   Yes ☒   No ☐

(e) Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.

As in previous years, I was provided with all relevant material in good time. I was particularly happy this year to see that the markers discussions regarding grade reconciliation etc. had been extended to cover the Projects as well as the assignments.

4.2   Paper-setting *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a) Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(b) Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(c) Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?   Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(d) Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process.

Good practice continues to be applied in the context of paper-setting.

4.3 **Marking and sampling** *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a) Did you receive the scripts or other assessed examination material in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?

Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(b) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?

Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(c) Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?

Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(d) Were you satisfied with the standard of marking?

Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

(e) Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked?

Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

Dissertations / project reports *[if applicable]*

(f) Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate?

Yes ☒   No ☐   N/A ☐

Oral assessment *[if applicable]*

(g) Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment?

Yes ☐   No ☐   N/A ☒

(h) Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work.

As I did last year, I focussed on the Assessed Assignments, while my co-external reviewed the written exam scripts. Again, I was able to access all scripts and reviewed a representative sample of AAs from all the optional modules, which for each module included at least one representative script from the highest, middle and lowest grades. I also reviewed all scripts where a grade discrepancy of 2 or more grade points occurred. In all, I was able to review 52 AAs in some detail, which represents a sample of approximately 9%.

I also reviewed 7 of the 14 projects (submitted by some candidates as an alternative to 3 taught modules), while my co EE reviewed the other 7. As in previous years I found that the inter-marker agreement was generally very consistent which reinforces my previous view that marking standards remain consistent and robust year on year. I was pleased to see that my comments from last year suggesting that marker discussions for the projects be made available to the Externals, have been taken on board and I would strongly recommend that this excellent practice be maintained! There was one instance of a grade point discrepancy of >1 among the projects I reviewed, but an appropriate agreed final mark was awarded, fully supported by the explicit 'discussion trail'.

4.4 **Board of Examiners meeting(s)**

(a) Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?

Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?

Yes ☒   No ☐

(c) Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting?

Yes ☒   No ☐

(d) If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?

Yes ☐   No ☐   N/A ☒

(e)	Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(f)	Were you happy to endorse the decisions of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒ No ☐

(g)	Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.

Very pleasing to see year on year evidence of continued good and consistent practice in relation to all procedures, processes and practical arrangements. I have always felt very welcome at the exam board meetings and have gone away with the impression that my comments have been taken seriously and indeed, acted upon. Excellent communication and provision of materials by the course organisers.

Part 5   Other Comments

(a)	Please provide comments relating to Professional Body requirements, if applicable.

Click here to enter text.

(b)	How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?

Consistent year on year

(c)	Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.

Markers discussions are now available for the Projects as well as the Assignments which is a further welcome enhancement of the transparency of the marking process and significantly facilitates evaluation of marking standards and practices.

(d)	If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the International Programmes.

It has been a great pleasure to have been an External Examiner for this programme over the past 4 years. Throughout I have been impressed by the professionalism and helpfulness of everyone in the organisation and the receptiveness of the other members of the Exam board to my comments. I have been given what I believe to have been unfettered access to all course materials, marking guidelines and markers comments at appropriate stages in their development and have generally been very impressed with the quality and breadth of the course and the high standards in the spheres of exam setting, marking and provision of feedback. A major theme during my tenure has been the steady improvement in the transparency of the process for reconciling discrepant grades awarded by the 2 markers for each assessed piece of work. While it is inevitable that there will always be differences in opinion between individual markers due to experience, familiarity with the specific subject matter and individual stances, it is in my opinion vital for the credibility of the marking process, that a transparent and explicit process is followed for arriving at an agreed grade. In my first year, an agreed grade was simply stated without any documented discussion. In the past few years, following recommendations by myself and my co-external, opportunities have been provided for markers to record detailed 'conversation trails' documenting the process through which a final grade has been agreed. This is now available for the Assignments, Exam scripts and for the first time this year, the Projects. There are still occasional instances where significant grade discrepancies are not supported by documented discussion and I would urge the board to try to make it an expectation for all examiners to record a discussion whenever there is a significant (>=2) grade point discrepancy. Disseminating examples of best practice to all markers might be a worthwhile strategy.

(e)   Please provide any other comments you may have.
Click here to enter text.

██████████████████████████████████
████████
██████
██████

30th November 2015

Dear Dan,

Thank you very much for being External Examiner for the Infectious Diseases programme (distance learning) for the past 4 years. The ID programme has benefited greatly from your contributions and suggestions at the Exam Boards and within your written reports.

I'm writing in response to your examiner's report. First, I would like to thank you for your observations on the quality of the course and our assessment procedures and practices. I am pleased that you have seen a progressive refinement in the transparency of the grade reconciliation process. For modules which deal with rapidly moving fields of knowledge we will endeavour to maintain regular updating and, to ensure all modules remain current, we have implemented a programme of module reviews. Thank you also for highlighting the need to monitor the grade distributions of IDM101 and IDM104 to ensure stability in marks is re-established. In particular, as a result of this observation we are implementing a review of IDM101.

It has been a great pleasure to working with you and I wish you all the very best on behalf of the ID team.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Patricia Gorak-Stolinska
Course Director

External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Part 1   Summary

Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report *(e.g. BSc Economics, MSc Public Financial Management)*	Distance Learning MSc in Infectious Diseases
Subject Area or Modules covered *[if applicable]*	Click here to enter text.
Academic/calendar year covered *(e.g. 2014-2015 or 2015)*	2014-15
Date(s) of Board of Examiners meeting	23/7/15 and 17/11/15
Name of External / Intercollegiate Examiner	Prof Geoff Hide
Home institution and/or professional affiliation	University of Salford, UK
External Examiner ☒	Intercollegiate Examiner ☐
Year of Service *[Extension to 5th year of service under exceptional circumstances only]*	1st ☐ 2nd ☒ 3rd ☐ 4th ☐ 5th ☐
Date of the report	19/11/2015

1.1   Standards

(a) The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject.

Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

Click here to enter text.

1.2   Student performance

(a) The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar.

Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

Click here to enter text.

(c) If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.

Click here to enter text.

1.3   Conduct of processes

(a) The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.

Yes ☒   No ☐

(b)	If not, please explain why.

Click here to enter text.

(c)	If processes are of a higher standard, please elaborate.

Click here to enter text.

1.4   Area for commendation

(a)   Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes of value to external audiences.

A key feature of this course is its delivery by world class scientists in the areas of infectious diseases. They and their international contacts ensure that the course is up to date, relevant to current disease issues and is underpinned by enviable expertise. Marking is diligently conducted and, on the whole, there is a high degree of traceability in terms of the resolution of discrepant marks. This is due to a commendable system of recording the "conversation" of email trails between alternative markers. My key responsibilities this year were to comments on the exam scripts and the projects. The exam scripts were marked to a high standard and fitted well with benchmark expectations.
A particularly commendable aspect was the level of feedback provided on the marking of projects. In general, the feedback was substantial and was clearly directed at enabling students to understand how they gained their marks, how and where they dropped marks and how to improve. In one example, a student who gained a very low score received over 3 pages of detailed feedback.
Another commendable aspect was where markers (this year not the supervisor , for the first time) commented on good and very good reports and encouraged publication if appropriate or provided detailed feedback (as a if reviewing a paper) to indicate how a manuscript could be improved for publication. (see more later).

(b)   Please comment on any aspects of the programme that are useful to current students.

Feedback on aspects of the assessed work (e.g. see above) is of high quality. This will benefit the current students in striving to improve.

Part 2   Standards

(a)   Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts. You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.

- Please refer to the Framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ).
- For the *International Foundation Programme* please refer to the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF).
- Where applicable, please refer to the Subject Benchmark Statements.

The programme has a diverse set of subjects within the Infectious Diseases portfolio. All are current areas of interest and delivered in a relevant and up to date manner. The calibre of the scientists teaching on this course is directly responsible for the high standards of content, delivery and timeliness.

(b)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(c)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level as for College-based students. *[Only answer if you are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing College-based students]*	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒

(d)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level at my own University of London College. *[Only answer if you are an Intercollegiate Examiners]*	Yes ☐　No ☐　N/A ☒
(e)	The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.	Yes ☒　No ☐
(f)	Please comment on the standards of student performance. You may want to include: • the relation to the specified learning outcomes • candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.	

This programme delivers high quality students as evidenced by their ability, in particular, to formulate, conduct and present good final research projects. Although there are, as will be the case anywhere, a range of abilities students are clearly able to flourish in the distance learning environment created. Marked work demonstrates that students meet the expectations of the learning outcomes of the programme. The level of performance of candidates is equal to or better than students on comparable programmes elsewhere.

Part 3　　　Programme and assessment design

(a)	The aims and learning outcomes for the programme / module(s) are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.	Yes ☒　No ☐
(b)	Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment *(i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertations, etc.)* in relation to • the subject • the students • the respective level of study • the expected learning outcomes.	

The assessments are wide ranging (in the context of what can be achieved through a distance learning programme). There is a good balance between factual learning and addressing questions, as tested by exams, and research based enquiry as tested by the coursework elements.

(c)	Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.

This appears to be comprehensive.

(d)	Please comment on the overall quality of assessment design and structure.

My specific responsibility this year was to look at the marked exam papers. Judging by the questions and the quality of the downstream answers to those questions, the questions relate to the course content and are appropriately set at the correct level. Overall, the design of assessments seems robust to me. Exam questions are clearly written and there is a robust system in place for verifying questions – including enabling me as an external examiner to have an input.

Part 4　　　Assessment Process

4.1	**Information**
(a)	Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment?	Yes ☒　No ☐

(b)	Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment *(e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marking criteria)*?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(c)	Did you receive this information in good time?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(d)	Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(e)	Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.	

I was presented with all the relevant materials in a timely manner.

4.2   Paper-setting *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a)	Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(b)	Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(c)	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(d)	Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process.	

Exam paper setting followed good principles, including the use of input by the external examiners.

4.3   Marking and sampling *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a)	Did you receive the scripts or other assessed examination material in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(b)	Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(c)	Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(d)	Were you satisfied with the standard of marking?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(e)	Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

Dissertations / project reports *[if applicable]*

(f)	Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

Oral assessment *[if applicable]*

(g)	Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment?	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒
(h)	Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work.	

I focussed on the exam scripts this year (although I had access to coursework which I sampled to investigate correlation between coursework and exam marks). I sampled a wide range of exam scripts covering poor to excellent answers. All were appropriately marked. In general there was a clear

electronic trail which enabled me to ascertain that marks discrepant between markers were resolved by discussion rather than simply averaged out. However, in some instances there were few or no comments provided between double markers. While these may have been resolved by face to face discussion there was not a clear evidence trail. I am not suggesting that all double marked work be accompanied by a justification of the mark but I would recommend that where first and second marks differ substantially, that there is a clear documented discussion of the resolution in all cases. Comments were appropriate to marks given and detailed feedback was generally provided to students. I made a detailed review of the exam scripts for IDM204, as requested, and found the exam script for this module to be marked appropriately and robustly.

I looked at 7 of the 14 projects this year. There was a range from 1 to 5. All of the 4s and 5s were of a high standard. This was the first year that projects had been marked by examiners other than the supervisor – this was a trial. The marks seemed robust, a good range of outcomes were achieved and, as far as I could tell, the trial seemed a success. Of particular note, there were several occasions, when marking projects at grades 4 and 5, when the non-supervisor markers encouraged the students to consider publishing their work. In some cases, this was without further comment and in other cases the markers provided this encouragement alongside detailed feedback (equivalent to a paper review). This encouragement would seem to be very positive to both student and supervisor – and the benefits to the student experience and future marketing of the programme, of publishing projects, are evident. On suggestion to improve this independent marking process would be to ensure that marks and feedback on projects are fed back to the original supervisor. This would ensure that the encouragement to publish was picked up and it would also enable the supervisor to refine their supervisory processes to ensure future improvement. Overall, I had a very positive experience reading the final projects.

4.4 Board of Examiners meeting(s)

(a)	Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(c)	Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(d)	If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒
(e)	Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(f)	Were you happy to endorse the decisions of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(g)	Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.	

The exam board was conducted in a professional manner. Adherence to regulations was apparent and the wide ranging aspects of the course were all represented. It was clear from the discussions that detailed attention was paid to two important areas – ensuring that the students were always represented in a positive way and that equity and parity between students were considered at all stages of discussion. The board and the associated external examiner arrangements were serviced in an expert and professional manner. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the academic and professional service teams for their efforts in this process.

Part 5　　　Other Comments

(a)　Please provide comments relating to Professional Body requirements, if applicable.

Click here to enter text.

(b)　How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?

Good – as was also the case last year

(c)　Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.

There is much greater transparency in project marking this year. Evidence that my other suggestions had been taken on board was evident.

(d)　If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the International Programmes.

Click here to enter text.

(e)　Please provide any other comments you may have.

Click here to enter text.

30th November 2015

Dear Geoff,

Thank you very much for your external examiners annual report, which I am writing in response to. Firstly, I would like to thank you for your observations on the quality of the course and our assessment procedures and practices. I am pleased that you have commended the level of feedback provided by our project markers and I have forwarded your comments on to the team. Thank you also for your observation on the calibre of the scientists having a direct impact on the standard of the course content, delivery and timeliness. Again I will be feeding this back through to the faculty management team to ensure staff contributions are recognised.   Thank you for commending our exam setting processes, we will continue to implement this system again this year. Regarding our trial of using non-supervisor markers to mark projects this year, we will be continuing this practice and have taken on board and implemented your suggestion that we should be ensuring marks and feedback on projects are fed back to the original supervisor. Thank you for that suggestion. Further to the discussions at the exam board, where you contributed your opinion, we will also be implementing a supervisor questionnaire and a mirror student questionnaire to enable supervisor comments to feed into the project marking process for the 2015/16 academic year.

It has been a great pleasure to working with you this year and I look forward to working with you again during the coming academic year.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Patricia Gorak-Stolinska
Course Director

External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Part 1	Summary

Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report *(e.g. BSc Economics, MSc Public Financial Management)*	MSc Public Health (Distance Learning)
Subject Area or Modules covered *[if applicable]*	
Academic/calendar year covered *(e.g. 2014-2015 or 2015)*	2014-2015
Date(s) of Board of Examiners meeting	28/7/2015
Name of External / Intercollegiate Examiner	Max Bachmann
Home institution and/or professional affiliation	University of East Anglia
External Examiner ☒	Intercollegiate Examiner ☐
Year of Service *[Extension to 5th year of service under exceptional circumstances only]*	1st ☐ 2nd ☒ 3rd ☐ 4th ☐ 5th ☐
Date of the report	*04/07/2015*

1.1   Standards

(a) The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject.　　　Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

1.2   Student performance

(a) The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar.　　　Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

(c) If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.

1.3	Conduct of processes	
(a)	The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	If not, please explain why.	
(c)	If processes are of a higher standard, please elaborate.	

The processes are meticulously organised, with several checks at every stage, yet still delivers timely information for quick decision making.
The marking guidelines and duplicated marking enhance the validity of the assessment

1.4	Area for commendation
(a)	Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes of value to external audiences.

Particular strengths of the standards and assessment processes were:
- a varied and appropriate range of assessment methods
- a consistent and thorough process of quality assurance for exam setting and marking, with substantial effort devoted to double marking (or more if examiners disagreed)
- detailed feedback to students on their disserations and policy reports.

(b)	Please comment on any aspects of the programme that are useful to current students.

No comment.

Part 2	**Standards**

(a)	Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts. You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.
	• Please refer to the Framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ). • For the *International Foundation Programme* please refer to the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF). • Where applicable, please refer to the Subject Benchmark Statements.

(b)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level.	Yes ☒ No ☐	
(c)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level as for College-based students. *[Only answer if you are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing College-based students]*	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐	

(d)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level at my own University of London College. *[Only answer if you are an Intercollegiate Examiners]*	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(e)	The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(f)	Please comment on the standards of student performance. You may want to include: • the relation to the specified learning outcomes • candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.	

The standard of performance was good, with relatively low failure rates in each component of the examination and in the overall combined assessment. The proportion of candidates obtaining distinctions was fairly low, as it has been in recent years, although distinctions have increased slightly in come modules.

Part 3   Programme and assessment design

(a)	The aims and learning outcomes for the programme / module(s) are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment *(i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertations, etc.)* in relation to • the subject • the students • the respective level of study • the expected learning outcomes.	

The balance of written exams, assessed course work and dissertation were appropriate, providing a range of perspectives on candidates' knowledge, understanding and skills. This is an exceptionally broad course, with a very wide range of optional modules, so it was appropriate that some types of assessment were modified to meet the needs of specific modules.

(c)	Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.

I have not seen the study materials or Virtual Learning Environment.

(d)	Please comment on the overall quality of assessment design and structure.

The assessement design and structure are rigorous and appropriate for the range of knowledge, understanding and skills being assessed.

Part 4   Assessment Process

4.1   Information

(a)	Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment?	Yes ☒ No ☐

(b)	Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment *(e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marking criteria)*?	Yes ☒ No ☐	
(c)	Did you receive this information in good time?	Yes ☒ No ☐	
(d)	Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements?	Yes ☒ No ☐	

(e) Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.

It would be interesting also to be able to see some of the teaching materials and methods of delivery - so far I have focused on the details of examinaton process itself. However, given the large number of modules it would not be manageable to see all of these in detail.

4.2 Paper-setting *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a)	Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(b)	Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(c)	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(d) Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process.

The process of exam setting, including modifications, was transparent and thorough.

4.3 Marking and sampling *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a)	Did you receive the scripts or other assessed examination material in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(b)	Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(c)	Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(d)	Were you satisfied with the standard of marking?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(e)	Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

Dissertations / project reports *[if applicable]*

(f)	Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

Oral assessment *[if applicable]*

(g)	Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment?	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒

(h)	Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work.

These were all well done. To be able to focus on students with borderline grades, where exams and dissertations were each examined by two examiners, it was useful this year to be provided with the marks initially given by each examiner, together with their final consensus mark and their justification.

4.4 Board of Examiners meeting(s)

(a)	Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(c)	Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(d)	If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒
(e)	Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(f)	Were you happy to endorse the decisions of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒ No ☐

(g)	Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.

These were conducted efficiently and thoroughly. It was useful as an external examiner to be be able to see the distributions of marks for each module and exam, and to discuss borderline candidates, before the full Board meeting.

Part 5   Other Comments

(a)	Please provide comments relating to Professional Body requirements, if applicable.

No comment.

(b)	How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?

More information was provided to external examiners, and earlier, helping to make input more considered and useful.

(c)	Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.

I didn't suggest any changes last year.

(d)	If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the International Programmes.

Not applicable.

(e)   Please provide any other comments you may have.
The examiners, the course lead, the Examination Board chair and the adminstrative support team are to be congratulated on doing a very good job thoroughly and on time.

London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine

Keppel Street, London WC1E 7HT
United Kingdom
Switchboard: +44 (0)20 7636 8636

www.lshtm.ac.uk

LONDON
SCHOOL *of*
HYGIENE
&TROPICAL
MEDICINE

17 February 2016

Sent individually to each External Examiner:
Professor Elizabeth Goyder
Prof Jane Barlow
Prof Tanja-Mulloli
Prof Max Bachmann

Dear Professor [name of External Examiner]

Thank you for submitting your External Examiner's Annual Report for 2014-15 and for all your work as an External Examiner over the past year. Your report has been shared with members of the PH (DL) Course Committee and the Exam Board Chair, together with the reports submitted by the other External Examiners and we have included a response to the points raised in the Exam Board and Course Committee Comments and Action Plans, copies of which are attached.

We were delighted to receive positive feedback from you, and the other external examiners, across all areas covered in the report. All four external examiners provided positive feedback in relation to the setting of exam papers and marking guidelines; marking procedures; steps taken to ensure that there is consistency across markers and the management of the Exam Board meeting.

There were just four points raised in the reports which require some action at this stage.

1. **Distinctions**: it was once again noted that few students were awarded a distinction. However, it was also noted that there has been some increase. One of the Examiners suggested that markers should be encouraged to use the full range of marks.

   Action: Assignment marking guidelines have been reviewed and revised in preparation for 2015/16. In most cases, the guidelines state what is required for each grade point. With regard to exam marking guidelines, these will once again include details of what is required for each grade point. Whilst markers will be encouraged to use the full range of grades, this is only possible, if the criteria set out in the marking guidelines is met.

2. **Access to module materials:** One Examiner noted that they did not have access to the course materials.

   Action: The majority of the materials can be accessed via Moodle. We will ensure that External Examiners are aware of this and provide guidance as appropriate

3. **Student participation on Moodle:** One Examiner commented on the low participation rate on Moodle and suggested additional encouragement may be needed.

   Action: We will continue to encourage participation in discussion on Moodle and the Collaborate sessions.

London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine

Keppel Street, London WC1E 7HT
United Kingdom
Switchboard: +44 (0)20 7636 8636

www.lshtm.ac.uk

LONDON
SCHOOL of
HYGIENE
&TROPICAL
MEDICINE

4. **Student Feedback.** One Examiner commented on the low response rate to the DL student survey and asked if students were aware of the importance of providing feedback. It was recommended that the importance of providing feedback is stressed at the start of the course and additional effort is made to encourage feedback*.*

   Action*:* In 2014/15 the survey was substantially revised – it was shortened and administered over a shorter period of time. Students were encouraged to complete the survey and several reminders were sent. Unfortunately, despite these efforts the response rate was lower than in the previous year. Approaches to obtaining feedback will be reviewed. At course level, we will once again engage the Student Representative in this process, and ask him/her to seek feedback prior to Course Committees and on a module level, we will encourage Module Organisers to make use of the feedback facility on Moodle, and seek feedback on the module and/or specific resources.

5. **Projects**: One Examiner suggested that it might be worth looking into whether there is a correlation between type of project and final grades and whether this is due to stronger (or weaker) students choosing particular options.

   Action: Consideration will be given to looking at this over the course of 2015/16.

We hope the above adequately addresses the points raised. Please let us know if you have any questions regarding the reports and our response to the points raised.

Yours sincerely

Rosalind Plowman and Nicki Thorogood
Course Director and Exam Board Chair

External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Part 1	Summary

Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report *(e.g. BSc Economics, MSc Public Financial Management)*	MSc Public Health
Subject Area or Modules covered *[if applicable]*	
Academic/calendar year covered *(e.g. 2014-2015 or 2015)*	2015
Date(s) of Board of Examiners meeting	28th July 2015
Name of External / Intercollegiate Examiner	Jane Barlow
Home institution and/or professional affiliation	University of Warwick
External Examiner ☒	Intercollegiate Examiner ☐
Year of Service *[Extension to 5th year of service under exceptional circumstances only]*	1st ☐ 2nd ☐ 3rd ☐ 4th ☒ 5th ☐
Date of the report	*01/07/2015*

1.1	**Standards**	
(a)	The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	If not, please explain why.	

1.2	**Student performance**	
(a)	The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	If not, please explain why.	
(c)	If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.	

1.3	**Conduct of processes**	
(a)	The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	If not, please explain why.	
(c)	If processes are of a higher standard, please elaborate.	
1.4	**Area for commendation**	
(a)	Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes of value to external audiences.	
(b)	Please comment on any aspects of the programme that are useful to current students.	

Part 2	**Standards**

(a)	Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts. You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.		

- Please refer to the Framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ).
- For the *International Foundation Programme* please refer to the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF).
- Where applicable, please refer to the Subject Benchmark Statements.

(b)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level.	Yes ☒ No ☐		
(c)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level as for College-based students. *[Only answer if you are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing College-based students]*	Yes ☒ No ☐	N/A ☐	
(d)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level at my own University of London College. *[Only answer if you are an Intercollegiate Examiners]*	Yes ☒ No ☐	N/A ☐	
(e)	The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.	Yes ☒ No ☐		

(f)   Please comment on the standards of student performance. You may want to include:
- the relation to the specified learning outcomes
- candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.

Spread of scores is as expected.

Part 3　　　　Programme and assessment design

(a)   The aims and learning outcomes for the programme / module(s) are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.　　　Yes ☒　No ☐

(b)   Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment *(i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertations, etc.)* in relation to
- the subject
- the students
- the respective level of study
- the expected learning outcomes.

Highly appropriate balance of types of assessment in relation to subject, students, level of study and expected learning outcomes.

(c)   Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.

Again, this is highly appropriate.

(d)   Please comment on the overall quality of assessment design and structure.

Excellent.

Part 4　　　　Assessment Process

4.1　　Information

(a)   Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment?　　Yes ☒　No ☐

(b)   Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment *(e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marking criteria)*?　　Yes ☒　No ☐

(c)   Did you receive this information in good time?　　Yes ☒　No ☐

(d)   Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements?　　Yes ☒　No ☐

(e)   Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.

4.2   Paper-setting *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a) Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see?   Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(b) Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate?   Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(c) Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?   Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☒

(d) Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process.

All highly satisfactory.

4.3   Marking and sampling *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a) Did you receive the scripts or other assessed examination material in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?   Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(b) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?   Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(c) Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?   Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(d) Were you satisfied with the standard of marking?   Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(e) Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked?   Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

Dissertations / project reports *[if applicable]*

(f) Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate?   Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

Oral assessment *[if applicable]*

(g) Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment?   Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(h) Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work.

All highly satisfactory.

4.4   Board of Examiners meeting(s)

(a) Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?   Yes ☒ No ☐

(b) Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?   Yes ☒ No ☐

(c) Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting?   Yes ☒ No ☒

(d) If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐	
(e) Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐	
(f) Were you happy to endorse the decisions of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒ No ☐	
(g) Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.		
All highly satisfactory		

Part 5   Other Comments

(a) Please provide comments relating to Professional Body requirements, if applicable.
N/A
(b) How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?
They were of the same high standard as usual.
(c) Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.
N/A
(d) If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the International Programmes.
N/A
(e) Please provide any other comments you may have.
The usual high standard was maintained.

External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Part 1	Summary

Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report *(e.g. BSc Economics, MSc Public Financial Management)*	DL MSc Public Health
Subject Area or Modules covered *[if applicable]*	PHM 107, 109, 202, 203, 212, 213
Academic/calendar year covered *(e.g. 2014-2015 or 2015)*	2014-15
Date(s) of Board of Examiners meeting	28 July 2015
Name of External / Intercollegiate Examiner	Prof Elizabeth Goyder
Home institution and/or professional affiliation	University of Sheffield
External Examiner ☒	Intercollegiate Examiner ☐
Year of Service *[Extension to 5th year of service under exceptional circumstances only]*	1st ☐ 2nd ☐ 3rd ☒ 4th ☐ 5th ☐
Date of the report	*30/07/2015*

1.1 Standards

(a) The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject.   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

1.2 Student performance

(a) The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar.   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b) If not, please explain why.

(c) If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.

Standards remain high but comparable to other courses. As noted before the course has a higher proportion of assessment by examination, as well as by submitted assignments for all the non-core modules, than other comparable public health courses at Masters level which allows for relatively robust assessment of student achievements.

1.3   Conduct of processes

(a)   The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.   Yes ☒   No ☐

(b)   If not, please explain why.

(c)   If processes are of a higher standard, please elaborate.

As previously noted, a combination of clear marking guides, independent double marking and an explicit, documented moderation process results in an extremely robust process for assessment. The quality of feedback provided to students on assignments is generally detailed and constructive.

1.4   Area for commendation

(a)   Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes of value to external audiences.

Systematic preparation for marking with comparison of exam questions marking by all markers, on sample scripts, discussion of marking criteria and thresholds, followed after marking by review of mark distributions across modules and between different pairs of markers to ensure consistent marking standards (as well as double marking and moderation) is good practice. Close examination of distributions is particularly relevant for courses with both a large student cohort (which makes distributions less prone to random variation as the main source of differences) and in the light of such courses often needing a relative large pool of markers who may have varying marking experience.

(b)   Please comment on any aspects of the programme that are useful to current students.

The increasing sharing of materials from the equivalent face-to-face modules online, including recorded lectures, the increasing use of additional and updated online teaching materials and use of webinars on all modules, are all enhancing the students' experience with largely very positive feedback.

Part 2	**Standards**

(a)   Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts. You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.

- Please refer to the Framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ).
- For the *International Foundation Programme* please refer to the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF).
- Where applicable, please refer to the Subject Benchmark Statements.

(b)   The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level.   Yes ☒   No ☐

(c)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level as for College-based students.	
	[Only answer if you are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing College-based students]	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒
(d)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level at my own University of London College.	
	[Only answer if you are an Intercollegiate Examiners]	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒
(e)	The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(f)	Please comment on the standards of student performance. You may want to include: • the relation to the specified learning outcomes • candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.	

There is a very wide range of student performance as reflected in the distribution of marks across all the modules reviewed. Overall standards are high in relation to other public health courses at Masters level and specifically in relation to Distance Learning courses (which generally have a high proportion of both international students for whom English may not be a first language and mature students who are returning to formal study after a relatively long gap).

Part 3   Programme and assessment design

(a)	The aims and learning outcomes for the programme / module(s) are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment *(i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertations, etc.)* in relation to • the subject • the students • the respective level of study • the expected learning outcomes.	

The course is unusual for a UK Master's level degree in Public Health for the proportion of the course assessed by written exams rather than by written assignment. The core modules PHM107 and PHM 109 are assessed only by written examination (with completion of assignments strongly encouraged by not mandatory or formally assessed). The optional modules PHM 202, 203, 212, 213 are all assessed by both exam and assignment. This ensures a robust assessment of a range of learning outcomes and both types of assessment require students to be able to apply their learning to public health issues, which is appropriate and important for a course at this level and with the range of learning outcomes required by the applied public health areas covered by these modules.

(c)	Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.

There have been a number of revisions and additions to the modules textbooks, some of which have been recently revised, notable for PHM107 (new second edition textbook now in use) and PHM 213 (new textbook to be in use from 2015 - 2016).

Use of Collaborate software and synchronous interaction with students has had variable success across

different modules and there may be outstanding technical software issues that may make it difficult for both staff and students to make best use of the available information technology. This suggests more technical support might be useful from staff with appropriate expertise in learning technology.

(d)	Please comment on the overall quality of assessment design and structure.

Both assessed assignments and written exams are consistently structured and designed to ensure students have to be able to understanding and apply the course content.

Part 4   Assessment Process

4.1   Information

(a)	Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment *(e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marking criteria)*?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(c)	Did you receive this information in good time?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(d)	Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(e)	Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.	

All relevant materials very easily accessible by weblinks from the LSHTM website or sent by email. Where any additional documentation, information or clarification was requested this was very efficiently provided, generally within a few hours of requesting it.

4.2   Paper-setting *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a)	Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(b)	Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(c)	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(d)	Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process.	

4.3   Marking and sampling *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a)	Did you receive the scripts or other assessed examination material in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(b)	Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

(c)	Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(d)	Were you satisfied with the standard of marking?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(e)	Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐

Dissertations / project reports *[if applicable]*

(f)	Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate?	Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☒

Oral assessment *[if applicable]*

(g)	Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment?	Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☒

(h) Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work.

4.4   Board of Examiners meeting(s)

(a)	Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒	No ☐	
(b)	Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒	No ☐	
(c)	Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting?	Yes ☒	No ☐	
(d)	If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?	Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☒
(e)	Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
(f)	Were you happy to endorse the decisions of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒	No ☐	

(g) Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.

Part 5   Other Comments

(a) Please provide comments relating to Professional Body requirements, if applicable.

n/a

(b) How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?

Extremely efficient as always, despite the absence of the course adminstrator. Head of Distance Education and Professional Development Office has vey effectively filled the gap in the Public Health Course Managers absence.

(c) Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.

Given the importance of this issue, and risks of student complaints if the full future implications are not made clear after a first breach, I am happy to note that when, even minor, issues of plagarism are identified this has resulted in students receiving very specific and feedback about the seriousness and about potential consequences.

(d) If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the International Programmes.

n/a

(e) Please provide any other comments you may have.

The course underwent a successful periodic review in 2013 and a subsequent Education Review in 2014. This should ensure a strategic view is taken of the changes required to update the course and there is a clear future strategy to build on current very positive developments. These include, for example, updating of course textbooks and online materials, ensuring more consistency with the face-to-face MSc modules which cover the same or similar course content, and more innovative use of the VLE to interact with DL students.

External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Part 1	Summary

Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report *(e.g. BSc Economics, MSc Public Financial Management)*	MSc Public Health Distance Learning
Subject Area or Modules covered *[if applicable]*	PHM101: Basic epidemiology, PHM106: Environemnt, health and sustaianble development, PHM205: Environmental epidemiology, PHM206: Environmental health policy, PHM209: Globalisation and health, PHM211: Medical anthropology in public health
Academic/calendar year covered *(e.g. 2014-2015 or 2015)*	2014-2015
Date(s) of Board of Examiners meeting	28/07/2015
Name of External / Intercollegiate Examiner	Prof Tanja Pless-Mulloli
Home institution and/or professional affiliation	emeritus
External Examiner ☒	Intercollegiate Examiner ☐
Year of Service *[Extension to 5th year of service under exceptional circumstances only]*	1st ☒ 2nd ☐ 3rd ☐ 4th ☐ 5th ☐
Date of the report	01/08/2015

1.1 Standards

(a)	The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	If not, please explain why.	

1.2 Student performance

(a)	The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	If not, please explain why.	

(c)	If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.

1.3 Conduct of processes

(a)	The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.	Yes ☒ No ☐

(b)	If not, please explain why.

(c)	If processes are of a higher standard, please elaborate.

1.4 Area for commendation

(a)	Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes of value to external audiences.

I found the intensity of effort for quality assurance during the marking process commendable. A particular example is the exercise of mock marking of scripts at different levels prior to receiving this year's scripts. The recording of markers' comments on the spreadsheets and their reflective nature created transparency and generated a trust in the process.

(b)	Please comment on any aspects of the programme that are useful to current students.

Part 2   Standards

(a)	Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts. You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.
	• Please refer to the Framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ). • For the *International Foundation Programme* please refer to the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF). • Where applicable, please refer to the Subject Benchmark Statements.

Given the enormous size of the student numbers (1100+) and the nature of the wide geographical distribution of students, the managing of varied student expectation is likely to be an ongoing issue that needs attention. This year this was apparent on a number of levels. Firstly, there was a trend to low response rates from student feedback. I wonder whether all students are aware of how seriously their comments are being taken, that they are indeed listened to, I suggest that at the beginning of the course this is stressed and additional effort is directed towards encouraging feedback. A second issue this year was a sometimes low response to moodle debates outside the examination periods. Students may need additional encouragement to play an active part in the debates from the beginning of the course.

(b)	The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level.	Yes ☒ No ☐

(c) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level as for College-based students. *[Only answer if you are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing College-based students]*	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(d) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level at my own University of London College. *[Only answer if you are an Intercollegiate Examiners]*	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐
(e) The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(f) Please comment on the standards of student performance. You may want to include: • the relation to the specified learning outcomes • candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.	

As in previous years a low number of very high marks was observed with the large majority of marks in the middle categories. This is a typical picture of comparable MSc courses. However, I suggest that before the beginning of the marking markers should be encouraged to use the full range of marks available, this may need to happen every year.

Part 3   Programme and assessment design

(a) The aims and learning outcomes for the programme / module(s) are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b) Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment *(i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertations, etc.)* in relation to • the subject • the students • the respective level of study • the expected learning outcomes.	

There seemed to be a good mix of asessments. I looked at unseen exam scripts (N=51) for six modules (2 core, 4 elective) as well as asessed assignments (N=36) for four elective modules.

(c) Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.

I did not assess this

(d) Please comment on the overall quality of assessment design and structure.

These are in line with other MSc courses, no issues raised

Part 4	Assessment Process

4.1 Information

(a) Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment?　　Yes ☒　No ☐

(b) Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment *(e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marking criteria)*?　　Yes ☒　No ☐

(c) Did you receive this information in good time?　　Yes ☒　No ☐

(d) Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements?　　Yes ☒　No ☐

(e) Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.

4.2 Paper-setting *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a) Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see?　　Yes ☒　No ☐　N/A ☐

(b) Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate?　　Yes ☒　No ☐　N/A ☐

(c) Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?　　Yes ☒　No ☐　N/A ☐

(d) Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process.

4.3 Marking and sampling *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

(a) Did you receive the scripts or other assessed examination material in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?　　Yes ☒　No ☐　N/A ☐

(b) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?　　Yes ☒　No ☐　N/A ☐

(c) Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?　　Yes ☒　No ☐　N/A ☐

(d) Were you satisfied with the standard of marking?　　Yes ☒　No ☐　N/A ☐

(e) Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked?　　Yes ☒　No ☐　N/A ☐

Dissertations / project reports *[if applicable]*

(f) Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate?　　Yes ☐　No ☐　N/A ☒

Oral assessment *[if applicable]*

(g)	Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment?	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒
(h)	Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work.	

4.4	**Board of Examiners meeting(s)**	
(a)	Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(b)	Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(c)	Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(d)	If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒
(e)	Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
(f)	Were you happy to endorse the decisions of the Board of Examiners?	Yes ☒ No ☐
(g)	Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.	

Part 5   Other Comments

(a) Please provide comments relating to Professional Body requirements, if applicable.

N/A

(b) How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?

N/A

(c) Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.

N/A

(d) If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the International Programmes.

N/A

(e)   Please provide any other comments you may have.
I have certainly enjoyed the task of being external examiner on this course. I do want to point out the considerable workload involved, which may make it a difficult task to accept for colleagues who are not yet retired. In total I think I have spend around three full days plus the day of the board of examiner meetings.