

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:	Chemical and Process Engineering
Subject(s):	
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Energy and Environment
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MSc

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.

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

These were highlighted at the appropriate time

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 taught programme provides students with the appropriate level of ILOs within the Energy and Environment engineering fields. The structure and content of the course allows students to develop their problem solving ability and a greater understanding of the knowledge, theory and issues within this very important field. This basic knowledge was then used to support a research project.

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 appropriate and are similar to MSc degrees offered at other 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 assessment methods for the taught element of the programme are varied and suitable for the type of degree offered. These range design and research project work through to examinations and associated coursework. The assessment is well placed throughout the programme and the student progression criteria is clearly understood by the students

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 examination scripts, coursework and research project were assessed. The examination papers were at a level where students of differing abilities could attempt the questions and their ability would be reflected in the overall assessment mark. The individual projects examined were also at an appropriate level and of a very good quality for this type of degree.
- The entry standards of the course ensured that the students were suitable to undertake such a demanding course. Those who did not perform in a timely and consistent fashion, received marks that reflected their effort

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.

The school has put in place additional steps to ensure better examination script management and verification procedures

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 influence of the research on teaching and learning is clearly evident in the course where the individual project is usually attached to a research group and the modules offered are associated with individual lecturer research areas. Again this is traditional for the type of course offered and is in line with other degree schemes offered within the University sector.

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

This programme is ideally suited to provide additional training modules for the Low Carbon technology integrated PhD programme offered within the school

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.

All the necessary guidelines and all other relevant information for my role as the external examiner was received in good time

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.

Received all relevant documentation

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?

All draft examination papers and model solutions were received for comment and review. The nature and level of the questions were appropriate for the course. Unable to comment of suitability of the arrangements for consideration of my comments since there was no feedback given.

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?

All assessed and examination scripts were made available which allowed evaluation of the standard of student work with full confidence. Marks were visible on the scripts, but some totals were not included at the end of each question or at the front of the answer book. This then raised issues with regard to visibility of the verification process

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

The choice of subjects offered for dissertations for students to consider gave the opportunity to work in a range of research themes which was both topical and challenging. The method and standard of assessment was both fair and appropriate. The quality of the dissertations were very good

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 present at the full board of examiners meeting. The arrangements of the Board and its operation was Exemplary and the recommendations made for each student was fair and satisfactory

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

Yes, this was undertaken by a small committee to which the outcomes were highlighted at the full board. This was seen as appropriate since many other universities now adopt the same procedure

Other comments

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

It would be prudent to encourage module leaders to use the same colour pen when marking scripts, this tends to be red at many other Universities. Visibility of the verification process needs to be improved by a clear indication within the script and the same colour. Again most universities I have been in contact with use green. It would also improve traceability of marks if the actual total and the adjusted mark out of a 100 was included in each script.

Faculty of Engineering

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

Q. A. T

11 NOV 2014

RECEIVED



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

10 November 2014

Dear

External Examiner's Report 2013/14 – MSc Energy and Environment and DTC/MSc Low Carbon Technologies

Thank you for your External Examiner's Report for our MSc degree programmes in Energy and Environment and Low Carbon Technologies. As usual, I have copied this to our Director of Student Education () and Head of Process Engineering (), and their comments are incorporated with mine below.

Once again, I would like to thank you for the very positive comments about the quality and content of the programmes, the operation of the Examinations Board and the high standards and variety of projects.

In response to your comments about script management and verification, as you know we have made great efforts to improve this in the last year. The School's Taught Student Education Committee (STSEC) is currently reviewing these improvements and will be making further proposals in due course which will hopefully satisfy your remaining concerns in this area.

Once again, many thanks for your efforts this year. This concludes your duties for the MSc programmes for 2013/14, but we look forward to seeing you again next June for the 2014/15 UG Examinations Board.

Yours sincerely

Head of School.