

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**  
**ACADEMIC YEAR: 2012– 2013**

**Part A: General Information****Subject area and awards being examined**

Faculty / School of:	Process, Environmental and Materials Engineering
Subject(s):	
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MSc Pharmaceutical Science and Engineering
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MSc

**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 Academic Quality and Standards**  
Academic Quality and Standards Team  
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*

No

**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?*

No previous External Examiners' reports (and corresponding responses from the School) were available for the programme.

**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 ILO's are of the appropriate level for an MSc level course, and the content is in-line with what is found in comparable engineering programmes.

### 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 intended learning outcomes of the programme are of a similar level to other MSc engineering programmes in the UK.

### 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 of the attainment of the ILO's was mainly through examinations, coursework, and the dissertation. The criteria and methods for marking the assessments and assigning degree classifications were transparent. The student performance was comparable to that found in other MSc engineering programmes

### 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 exams and dissertation projects offered sufficient challenge to the students for them to demonstrate their attainment of the aims and ILO's of the course. The range of abilities of the students on the course was comparable to other MSc level engineering programmes in the UK.

### 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 only change that I was informed of was the use of the 20-90 marking scheme and August re-sit exams. I am unaware of any other changes made to the course.

### 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.*

Several of the taught modules had content that was informed by current research, and all the dissertation projects had subjects that were relevant to current areas of research.

## For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements

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

A mentor, <>, was assigned to me soon after I was appointed as External Examiner. <> was helpful and available to answer any questions I had about the role.

## The Examination/Assessment Process

**9. 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.*

The materials posted to me by the School and available to me on the University of Leeds website provided good guidance to my responsibilities and allowed me to act effectively.

**10. 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 given sufficient documentation describing the programme and the associated procedures for assessment, etc., which was contained in the programme handbook, marking sheets & criteria for the dissertation projects

**11. 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?**

Draft examination scripts were provided to me in good time to allow me to comment on them.

**12. 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 the examination scripts and dissertations, as well as a selection of course work, were made available to me prior to the Board of Examiners meeting. All assessed materials were clearly annotated. The marking sheets of the supervisor and second marker for the dissertations were generally complete, however, in cases where a significant discrepancy existed between the two, there was little documentation as to how this was resolved.

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

The dissertation topics were all relevant to the general area of pharmaceutical science and engineering, and the dissertations themselves were rigorously assessed.

**14. 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 satisfactory. I was able to attend the Board of Examiners meeting and was satisfied with all the recommendations.

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

Yes

## Other comments

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

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**  
 ACADEMIC YEAR: 2012– 2013

**Part A: General Information****Subject area and awards being examined**

Faculty / School of:	Process, Environmental and Materials Engineering
Subject(s):	
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MSc Chemical Engineering
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MSc

**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 Academic Quality and Standards**  
 Academic Quality and Standards Team  
 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*

No

**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?*

No previous External Examiners' reports (and corresponding responses from the School) were available for the programme.

**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 ILO's are of the appropriate level for an MSc level course, and the content is in-line with what is found in comparable chemical engineering programmes.

### 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 intended learning outcomes of the programme are similar to other chemical engineering programmes in the UK.

### 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 of the attainment of the ILO's was mainly through examinations, coursework, and the dissertation. The criteria and methods for marking the assessments and assigning degree classifications were transparent. The student performance was comparable to that found in other MSc chemical engineering programmes that I am familiar with.

### 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 exams and dissertation projects offered sufficient challenge to the students for them to demonstrate their attainment of the aims and ILO's of the course. The range of abilities of the students on the course was comparable to other similar chemical engineering MSc programmes that I am familiar with.

### 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 only change that I was informed of was the use of the 20-90 marking scheme and August re-sit exams. I am unaware of any other changes made to the course. The manner in which the dissertation projects were assigned was

### 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.*

Current research in chemical engineering informed the content, to some level, of all the taught modules in the programme, in particular the module PEME5340 Advances in Chemical Engineering. In addition, the dissertation projects were typically in topics of interest in present day research.

## For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements

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

A mentor, <>, was assigned to me soon after I was appointed as External Examiner. <> was helpful and available to answer any questions I had about the role.

**9. 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.*

The materials posted to me by the School and available to me on the University of Leeds website provided good guidance to my responsibilities and allowed me to act effectively.

**10. 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 given sufficient documentation describing the programme and the associated procedures for assessment, etc., which was contained in the programme handbook, marking sheets & criteria for the dissertation projects

**11. 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 draft examination papers, and given the opportunity to make corrections and suggestions for improvement. The content and level of questions were appropriate to the subject and level of the course.

**12. 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 of the examination scripts and dissertations were made available to me prior to the meeting of the Board of Examiners. On the whole, the scripts were clearly marked to make obvious that they had been assessed. The marking sheets of the supervisor and second marker for the dissertations were generally complete, however, in cases where a significant discrepancy existed between the two, there was little documentation as to how this was resolved.

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

The topics of the dissertation projects were relevant to the field of chemical engineering and gave adequate scope for the students to explore more deeply particular aspects of the discipline. The standard of assessment was good, with a clear set of marking criteria, an appropriate level of feedback and justification for the assigned mark, and a transparent process of second marking. The process by which dissertation projects were selected is quite good.

**14. 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 Board of Examiners meeting and was satisfied with the recommendations of the Board. Overall, the administration of the MSc programme was good.

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

Yes.

Other comments

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

Faculty of Engineering

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



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

4 November 2013

Dear

**External Examiner's Reports 2012/13 – MSc Chemical Engineering and Pharmaceutical Science and Engineering**

Thank you for your External Examiner's Reports for our MSc degree programmes in Chemical Engineering and Pharmaceutical Science and Engineering. I have copied these to our Director of Student Education ( ) and Head of Process Engineering ( ), and their comments are incorporated with mine below.

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

Secondly, in response to two of your comments in the report:

- (a) I am sorry that we were unable to provide reports from the previous External Examiner, but we did not receive these. However, I can tell you that on visits to Leeds did comment that was generally satisfied with the courses.
- (b) We will ensure that, where there are differences between the two final report marks for the research project (PEME5000M), these are highlighted and the final outcome is fully transparent (question B12).

Once again, many thanks for your efforts this year. This concludes your duties for the MSc programmes for 2012/13, and we look forward to seeing you again next year.

Yours sincerely

Head of School.