

# The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2013– 2014

### Part A: General Information

#### Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	School of Process, Environmental and Materials Engineering (PEME)
Subject(s):	Chemical Engineering Programmes (MEng, BEng Chemical Engineering)
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MEng/BEng Chemical Engineering; MEng/BEng Chemical and Energy Engineering; MEng/BEng Chemical and Materials Engineering; MEng/BEng Chemical and Mineral Engineering; MEng/BEng Chemical and Nuclear Engineering; MEng/BEng Pharmaceutical Chemical Engineering
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MEng, BEng

#### Name and home Institution / affiliation of Examiner

#### Completed report

The completed report should be attached to an e-mail and sent as soon as possible, and no later than six weeks after the relevant meeting of the Board of Examiners, to [exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk).

Alternatively you can post your report to: **Head of Quality Assurance**  
Room 12:81, EC Stoner Building  
The University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT

### Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards

#### Matters for Urgent Attention

*If there are any areas which you think require urgent attention before the programme is offered again please note them in this box*

There is no area that requires urgent attention.

#### Only applicable in first year of appointment

*Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?*

#### For Examiners completing their term of appointment

*Please comment on your experience of the programme(s) over the period of your appointment, remarking in particular on changes from year to year and the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching provision, on standards achieved, on marking and assessment and the procedures of the School*

#### Standards

- Please indicate the extent to which the programme Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were commensurate with the level of the award**
  - The appropriateness of the Intended Learning Outcomes for the programme(s)/modules and of the structure and content of the programme(s);*
  - The extent to which standards are appropriate for the award or award element under consideration.*

Considering the detailed information in the Undergraduate Student Handbook, the examination questions, the coursework, the design projects, the research dissertations and posters I inspected, I confirm that the structure and content of the programmes and their intended learning outcomes are appropriate for the degree programmes. The standards followed in the teaching and assessment of all the modules of all the programmes are also appropriate for the award or award element under consideration.

**2. Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?**

- *The comparability of the programme(s) with similar programme(s) at other institutions and against national benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.*

Based on my personal experience of examining in my own school as well as other UK and overseas universities (IChemE accredited), the programmes, their aims and ILOs at the School of PEME compare very well indeed with similar programmes at other institutions in the UK and they meet the expectations of the national subject benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.

**3. Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs**

- *The design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards;*
- *The quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.*

The students' learning (ILO) was assessed through a combination of examinations, coursework and poster presentations. I was able to check samples from the students' examination scripts as well as some of the coursework, design projects, research dissertations and posters. The structure and contents of the examinations were appropriate to assess most of the ILOs and the rest were assessed through course/project work appropriately. The marking I sampled from examination scripts and the course/project work seemed to be fair and appropriate.

There were some very good performances indicating good quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods but also a few poor performers as would be expected in a normal population of students with heterogeneous abilities.

**4. Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the Aims and ILOs?**

- *The academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses;*
- *The strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort.*

I was given the opportunity to check random samples from students' examination scripts, design projects, research projects and posters. I also interviewed three students. The students' academic standards as a cohort were similar to others' in comparable courses and ranged from very good to some poor performances.

**5. For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum**

NA

**6. Please comment on the nature and effectiveness of enhancements to the programme(s) and modules since the previous year**

*It would be particularly helpful if you could also identify areas of good practice which are worthy of wider dissemination.*

I was very pleased to see posters associated with the research projects. This adds another dimension to students' learning and training experience.

**7. Please comment on the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching**

*This may include examples of curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research.*

The requirement of the IChemE for accreditation shapes most of the curriculum design that is associated with the teaching of the fundamentals of chemical engineering. Research however, still has an influence on the curriculum, learning and teaching through the wide range of dissertation projects offered, and other infrastructure acquired through research but can also benefit teaching (for example, laboratory practicals and computational projects).

**8. Where the programme forms part of an Integrated PhD, please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD**

NA

**For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements**

**9. If you have acted as a mentor to a new External Examiner or have received mentor support please comment here on the arrangements**

NA

## The Examination/Assessment Process

**10. The University and its Schools provide guidance for External Examiners as to their roles, powers and responsibilities. Please indicate whether this material was sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner.**

*Whether External Examiners have sufficient access to the material needed to make the required judgements and whether they are encouraged to request additional information.*

Yes, the guidance and information I received was very useful.

**11. Did you receive appropriate documentation relating to the programmes and/or parts of programmes for which you have responsibility, e.g. programme specifications or module handbooks, marking criteria?**

*The coherence of the policies and procedures relating to External Examiners and whether they match the explicit roles they are asked to perform.*

I was sent all the necessary information about the programmes, the ILO of the modules, the examination papers with their model answers and marking schemes.

**12. Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments? Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate? If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?**

I received all draft examination papers. The questions and the marking schemes were appropriate for the assessment of the ILOs.

**13. Was sufficient assessed / examined work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work? Were the scripts clearly marked/annotated?**

I had access to the marked examination scripts, coursework, design projects, research dissertations and posters. All these were marked appropriately and annotated where needed.

**14. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate? Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?**

The range of subjects for dissertations was very good and interesting. They were appropriate as dissertation subjects and some were even suitable for PhD programmes (perhaps there were already PhD students working on those topics). Their assessment involved several components including poster presentations and all these gave students all the opportunity to demonstrate their effort and learning. The standard of assessment of all these varied components was very appropriate.

**15. Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Board of Examiners? Were you able to attend the meeting? Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?**

The administrative arrangements were excellent indeed. I was able to attend the meeting on the 26<sup>th</sup> June 2014 and I was satisfied with the recommendation of the Board of Examiners.

**16. Were appropriate procedures in place to give due consideration to mitigating circumstances and medical evidence?**

Yes, all these seem to be in place and were given due consideration.


## Other comments

**Please use this box if you wish to make any further comments not covered elsewhere on the form**

I do not know whether the students are given any formal/written feedback on their major work such as the design project and the research dissertation. If not, this may be considered useful. Taking up the invitation by the school, I plan to attend the research students' poster presentations next year.

Faculty of Engineering

School of Chemical and Process Engineering  
University of Leeds  
Leeds LS2 9JT, UK



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

16 December 2014

Dear

**External Examiner's Report 2013/14 – MEng/BEng Chemical Engineering,  
Chemical and Energy/Materials/Minerals/Nuclear/Pharmaceutical  
Engineering.**

Thank you for your External Examiner's Report for our MEng/BEng degree programmes in Chemical Engineering and Chemical and Energy/Materials/Minerals/Nuclear/Pharmaceutical Engineering. I have copied this to our Director of Student Education ( ) and the Head of Process Engineering ( ), and as usual their feedback is incorporated with mine.

Firstly, thank you for the positive remarks about the content and standards of our degree programmes. Your comments on the quality of the individual year 4 research projects and the associated posters are also appreciated and these will be conveyed to the teaching team. I was also pleased that you considered our administrative arrangements, including the operation of the Examination Board, to be excellent.

Secondly, in answer to your query concerning feedback to students on their design and research projects, this is normally given verbally but shorter versions are also communicated to them via the University VLE. We will let you know the date of the Research Day for year 4 projects in due course, although it is usually arranged for around the end of April.

This marks the conclusion of your duties for 2013/14. Once again, thank you for your efforts this year and we look forward to seeing you again next session.

Yours sincerely

Head of School.