

**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 Chemical and Process Engineering
Subject(s):	<i>Chemical Engineering</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Advanced Particulate Materials
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MSc/PhD

**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*

N/A

**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?*

N/A

**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*

N/A

## Standards

- 1. 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.*

The aims and ILOs of the course were at the MSc level and are aligned with the associated PhD programme. The awards appeared to be consistent with the attainment of the ILOs, based on viewing a sample of examination scripts, dissertation projects, etc.
  
- 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.*

The aims and ILOs are comparable to MSc programmes in chemical engineering, a related subject, that I am familiar with in other UK universities.
  
- 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 design and structure of the assessment methods were effective in determining the attainment of the ILOs. The classification of awards was aligned to achievement of the ILOs. The performance of the students was similar to what can be expected on similar MSc courses.
  
- 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.*

The general student performance was at a level comparable to those on other MSc chemical engineering programmes. The dissertation projects were of good standard, however, in general, the clarity of the presentation (e.g., use of colours, captions, etc.) of their data and other results (e.g., model predictions) could have been improved.
  
- 5. For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum**

N/A
  
- 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.*

There were no significant changes to the course in the previous year.
  
- 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 topics of the dissertation projects were taken from current research problems.
  
- 8. Where the programme forms part of an Integrated PhD, please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD**

The content and aims of the MSc course was well aligned with the PhD programme.

## 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

N/A

## 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.*

Sufficient guidance and materials were provided for me to act effectively as an external examiner and evaluate the programme.

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.*

All necessary documentation was made available. The programme specifications and course handbook were provided before the examiners' meeting. All marking criteria were provided on request.

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?

Relevant draft examination papers were provided, and I was given the opportunity to comment on them. The questions were aligned to the aims and ILOs of the programme, and their level was appropriate to an MSc.

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?

Enough assessed and examined work was provided for me to confidently evaluate the standard of the student work.

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

The topics of the dissertation were well aligned with the aims and learning objectives of the course and the PhD programme. The standards of assessment were good. There was both a clear marking scheme and a procedure of second marking to maintain consistency of marking.

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?

I was able to attend the meeting of the Board of Examiners and was in agreement with the recommendations of the board. The administration of the meeting, as well as the external review process, was satisfactory.

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

From attending the Board of Examiners, it appears that an adequate process was in place for the consideration of mitigating circumstances.

## Other comments

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

The dissertations and associated assessment materials are already in electronic form; it would be nice to have these materials available online before the External Examiners' Meeting.

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 Reports 2013/14 – MSc Chemical Engineering and Pharmaceutical Science and Engineering, MSc/PhD Advanced Particulate Materials and Nuclear Fuel Cycles.**

Thank you for your External Examiner's Reports for our MSc degree programmes in Chemical Engineering and Pharmaceutical Science and Engineering, and MSc/PhD programmes in Advanced Particulate Materials and Nuclear Fuel Cycles. I have copied these to our Director of Student Education ( ) and Head of Process Engineering ( ), and as usual I have incorporated their comments with mine below.

Firstly, I would like to thank you for the very positive comments about the quality, content and standards of the programmes. Your remarks about the level and variety of projects and dissertations are also much appreciated.

Secondly, I note that you have asked whether the project reports could be made available to you before your visit. As these are all uploaded to the University's VLE, we will arrange for you to have access to these for next year.

Finally, the University's Quality Assurance Team have asked me to point out that next year you only need to submit one composite report rather than separate ones for each programme. If there are any comments to be made for a specific programme, these can simply be highlighted in the appropriate section of the form.

Once again, many thanks for your efforts this year. This concludes your duties for 2013/14, and we look forward to seeing you again next year.

Yours sincerely

Head of School.