

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):	Pharmaceutical Science
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

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 content and structure of the course were aligned with its aims and intended learning outcomes. The awards given were consistent with the attainment of the ILOs.

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 of the programme are comparable to MSc courses in chemical engineering, a related subject.

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.*

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.*

There were many opportunities for the students to demonstrate their achievement of the ILOs. As a whole, the students performed similarly to those 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 were no significant changes to the course during 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 relevant, current research problems. A few of the modules had coursework where the students critiqued a research paper.

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

N/A

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 materials and information that were necessary for me to make the required assessment of the course were made available to me, either directly or by request.

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 required documentation, including programme specifications, marking criteria, etc., were made available to me.

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?

Several draft examination papers were provided for me to comment on and make suggested edits; the nature and level of these papers were appropriate to the aims and ILOs of the course.

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?

A sufficient amount of assessed work and exam scripts were provided, so that I was able to confidently determine the general standard of the work of the students.

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

The topics of the dissertation projects were appropriate. The methods of assessment of the projects were robust, and the standard and consistency of assessment was ensured with a good 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?

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 discussions in the Examiners' Board, it appears that there are appropriate procedures 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.