

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:	Engineering / Process, Environmental and Materials Engineering
Subject(s):	<i>Nanotechnology</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Nanotechnology
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BSc

Name and home Institution / affiliation of Examiner

Title and Name of Examiner:	
Institution:	
Address for communication:	
Email:	
Telephone:	

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

none

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?

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

During my time as external examiner this multidisciplinary degree moved from being managed by a cross college centre into the Faculty of Engineering. This change was completed smoothly and did not impact on the quality of the degree. During the first 2 years of my appointment a number of changes were made to the course structure to help the students cope with the demanding nature of this inter-disciplinary degree. In particular the move to streaming into a Chemical or Physical Nanotechnology grouping has been very successful and ensures that the students have the required skill set for each 'flavour' of the course.

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.*

Fully commensurate, this is an excellent degree programme.

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.*

It is difficult to make an absolute comparison as there are very few competitor courses, but the standard of the course is clearly at the level one would expect for a science based degree within 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.*

These are all of high quality. The project work is of an exceptional standard and worth highlighting. This year one of the undergraduate students presented their work at a major UK conference – this is outstanding.

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 cohort was typical of that to be found within a Russell Group university – generally of a high standard but with of course some variation.

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.

No changes in 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.

This degree is heavily influenced by the research life at Leeds. In addition to the major project element there is a module based around the research seminar programme at the university – this is innovative and very successful.

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

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 fine.

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.

Yes again all access and arrangements were good.

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?

Yes. Although this year for the first time, there was a delay in receiving the draft examination papers which made it difficult to give feedback within the specified timeline.

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?

Yes.

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

Yes.

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?

Yes.

16. 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

I have greatly enjoyed my involvement with this course. Its very high quality and originality is something that Leeds University should treasure and the staff involved should be proud of.

Faculty of Engineering

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

W www.engineering.leeds.ac.uk/chemical



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

13 January 2015

Dear

BSc Nanotechnology (Chemical)

BSc Nanotechnology (Physical)

Many thanks for your final External Examiners report for the BSc Nanotechnology programmes and for acting for us in this capacity over the past three years. Your positive comments on both the structure and content of the programme, and the organisation within the School, are much appreciated by myself, and in the Student Support Office and the teaching staff.

It is unfortunate that the draft papers were delayed this year – this was due to the late receipt of papers for one module and our decision to send out the papers as a complete package rather than piecemeal. We are making continuing efforts to ensure that all staff comply with the deadlines for the receipt of examination papers and model answers and do not anticipate this to be a problem

Once again, my I express my thanks for your assistance and guidance with the undergraduate nanotechnology programmes at Leeds.

Regards

Head of School