Quality Assurance Team
Received 15/12/2014

# 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):* | *Chemical Engineering* |
| *Programme(s) / Module(s):* | Nuclear Fuel Cycles |
| *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.

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 intended learning outcomes and structure of the programme are aligned with its role of supporting the integrated PhD/MSc in Nuclear Fuel Cycles.

**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, and their levels, are comparable to MSc programmes in the related subject of chemical engineering 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 assessment methods and their marking were appropriate to the ILOs of the programme. The teaching methods are similar to those in other MSc courses in the UK and are of reasonable quality, based on student performance.

**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 course give ample opportunities for the students to demonstrate their attainment of the ILOs of the programme. The level of student performance in within what could be expected in comparable MSc courses.

**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 have not been significant changes to the course during the last 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 relevant to the research interests of the academic supervisors. Some of the taught modules incorporated elements of current research.

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

Modules and project work in the programme were fully aligned with the associated training for a PhD.

## 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 information was provided for me to act effectively as an External Examiner. All materials and information that I requested was provided to me.

**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.*

The necessary documentation of the programme was sent to me, and all information was made available to me 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?**

I was provided with a selection of the draft examination paper and was able to comment on them. The nature and level of the questions were appropriate to the aims and ILOs of the respective modules.

**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 materials, including examination scripts, were available for me to evaluate the standard of the student work. In general, the exam scripts were clearly marked, however, there were a few cases where the colour of the pen used for marking was the same as that the student used to complete the script.

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

The topics of the dissertations were appropriate to the aims of the programme. The marking scheme and methods of assessment were well documented, and the standards of assessment were maintained through a solid second marking scheme.

**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 administration of the external examination process and the Board of Examiners was satisfactory. I was able to attend the Board of Examiners meeting and was in agreement with the recommendations.

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

It was clear that procedures were in place to consider and act on mitigating circumstances.

## Other comments

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

The project dissertations and associated assessment materials are already available in electronic form. It would be nice to have access to these materials online prior to 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.