

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:	Civil Engineering
Subject(s):	<i>Water, Sanitation & Health Engineering</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	
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 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

Nothing to report

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?

This is a new course, so there were no previous External Examiners' reports.

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

Not applicable

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.*

If there was a controversial decision in the design of this course, it was the inclusion of so much initial health content taught by another department. It seems to have been the making of the course. A minor point; I don't think I have seen ILOs for individual modules.

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.*

I have seen no reason to doubt that the University is applying its usual high standards to this course. It compares very favourably with those offered elsewhere in the UK where I have also served as external examiner, such as <> and <>.

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 examination papers which I saw were well-designed, and my conversations with staff and students support the view that assessment is being carried out appropriately. It would not be wise to judge student performance on the basis on only three students, but student *satisfaction* was very high, especially for a new course such as this.

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.*

See answer to 3 above; there were only 3 students in the cohort.

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

As far as I am aware, this course has no such component.

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.

This is a new course, so there was no previous year. The openness toward a significant part of the course being given by another faculty (Medicine & Health) is salutary, and worthy of wider dissemination as interdisciplinary courses become more popular.

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.

Most of what we now know about appropriate technology for (& health benefits of) water, sanitation & hygiene in developing countries is largely the result of recent 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

Not applicable

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.*

It was more than sufficient; if anything, there was more than I had time to digest before my visit.

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 did.

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, and the questions were appropriate, at least after my recommended changes had been implemented.

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, but with only three students, little inference can be drawn.

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

Yes, and yes.

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 did attend the meeting and was satisfied with the whole process; in particular, I was satisfied with the operation & recommendations of the Board of Examiners.

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

I think so; the acid test of these will be next year, with a fuller class.

Other comments

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

A good beginning to this new course.

2268

29 September 2014

<>

Dear <>

MSc (Eng) Water, Sanitation and Health Engineering

Thank you for agreeing to be the External Examiner for the above programme and for your favourable comments. It is very pleasing to know that you felt the course had run well in its first year of operation although we note that you felt that it would be unreliable at this stage to assess the outcomes due to the small cohort.

We were also particularly pleased to hear that the joint teaching with the Nuffield International School of Health had worked well, both in terms of content and student satisfaction and we continue to work closely with Nuffield staff to ensure good coordination between the two programmes and the effective integration of the students in both Schools.

I am aware that several useful modifications were made to examination scripts on the basis of comments you provided and these have also been passed on to the subsequent year.

We will continue to monitor the performance of this new course closely.

Once again I thank you for your support and guidance and I look forward to seeing you next year.

Yours sincerely

<>