

## 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:	Food Science and Nutrition
Subject(s):	BSc Nutrition, Food studies and Nutrition, (international, industrial, European)
Programme(s) / Module(s):	FOOD3330, FOOD 2170, FOOD3340, FOOD2031, FOOD3050, FOOD2150, FOOD2160, FOOD2165, FFOD3070, FOOD3370, FOOD2300, FOOD3390
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BSc

**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*

NA

**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?*

NA

**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*

NA

**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.*

Overall satisfied with the quality and level of the work assessed. Year 2 work is challenging and current and pushes the students preparing them for final year – in particular Nutrition modules in year 2 e.g. 2300. Standards are appropriate for BSc level.

**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.*

This is not relevant for these programme of studies. For Nutrition degree, this could be accredited by the UKVRN – this was a plan for the course. I would be interested whether this accreditation has been applied for yet?

**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.*

A range of assessment methods were used. Seen and unseen examination paper. Seen journal articles used to base examination question on have been introduced to year 2. This is challenging at this level, but the students did an excellent job with these types of question. Project work was available to look at, as was practical workbooks, literature reviews and honours projects.

Particularly liked 3390 – examination questions at a high level – showed deep understanding and I really liked the in course assessment, which was a reflective dietary log – maybe the weighting of the marks however should be looked at. There was one student who didn't answer section B of the exam paper-but managed to achieve a pass mark because of the in course assessment. I know the numbers are small for this course, but it would be nice to see if there are any differences in the Section B marks, dependent upon which scenario the student chose to answer.

In the main part most examination papers were well annotated, with a breakdown of the marks given and compared with last year's marks. This was extremely useful. These annotated papers will help to give good feedback back to the students and I suggest that this is formalised in a tutorial session, to ensure returning year 3 students are fully briefed on their examination results. This year I received mark schemes which were really useful to see the standard expected by the lecturers teaching the modules.

Some in course pieces of assessment were submitted on line – and I saw the eventual print out – would be good to see this in situ on line.

**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 was a good spread of marks in general – however 'top' marks were not always given. Some questions achieve 18/20. This may be a bit tough – and the lecturers shouldn't be afraid to give top marks if the students deserve them. 3330 – Disappointing lack of spread in the marks, but the average was OK and comparable with the rest of the module marks. It was really nice to see international students doing well – some misconceptions in answers. As the students struggled with this module, but the questions are appropriate, maybe a review of the teaching strategies need to be made. 2165 – Had very low marks; however the very similar module 2160, which is taught alongside was better and more reassuring. Questions 2 and 6 had very low marks – but as very few students attempted these questions difficult to conclude.

**5. For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum**

NA

**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 honours project and the group project are highly commendable pieces of work. For the honours project I like how they are written up in a paper style. Have you thought about trying to get these pieces of work published? There is a journal which will do this 'UCI Undergraduate Research Journal'.

**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.*

Honours projects – really good spread of project type– from dietary surveys, intervention studies, protein ELISA and sensory food analysis – so should be commended on this.

Use of current articles in 'seen' examinations in year 2 and 3 is an excellent way of showing research on the curriculum.

This type of question was well used on the nutrition course.

#### 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

NA

#### 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.

Sufficient material supplied.

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.

Yes.

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?

Yes.

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?

Yes. It would be helpful if for next year if a sample of 1<sup>st</sup> class, 2;2 and 3<sup>rd</sup> class papers are pulled out to the top of the module pile –to make it easier for us to find these papers and check the spread. Or at least have the papers 'ranked'. This could be easily done by the module leader.

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

Honours projects – really good spread – from dietary surveys, intervention studies, protein ELISA and sensory food analysis – so should be commended on the spread.

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?

Yes – I was looked after very well and everything was well organised. <> should be commended for all <> hard work.

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

Yes.

I was also asked to double check some marks where there were discrepancies between 2 markers to ensure fairness.

#### Other comments

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

School of Food Science and Nutrition

The University of Leeds  
Leeds LS2 9JT



**UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS**

Dear

Thank you for your recent External Examiner's report, School members were pleased to view your very positive comments on the programmes and on our student's performance.

Your positive comments on FOOD3390 were welcome, and the module manager will be asked to consider the weighting of the marks with respect to students being able to achieve a pass even if not attempting a whole section of the examination paper because of a high coursework mark.

With regard to your suggestion of sharing the comments on examination papers with students, it is the School's intention that Personal Tutors will give feedback on these to students during their meeting to discuss tutee's progress.

For the next Examiner's Board we will ensure that there is access to work submitted on-line in situ rather than as a print out.

Markers are encouraged to use the full range of marks, and on some papers answers were awarded 20/20. We will of course further encourage all staff to use the full range of marks – and award full marks where it is warranted.

Thank you for the information with regards to the 'UCI UG Research Journal' and the School Taught Student Education Committee will discuss the possibility of submitting final year project papers for publication.

I am happy to inform you that the BSc Nutrition programme was accepted for accreditation by the Association of Nutritionists.

May I thank you once again for your diligence and hard work as External Examiner. As always we appreciate the comments, observations and suggestions that you have fed back to staff,

Best wishes,

Head of School