

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR: 2015– 2016

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

Faculty / School of:	School of Chemical and Process Engineering
Subject(s):	<i>Aviation</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	BSc Aviation Technology and Management and BSc Aviation Technology with Pilot Training.
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BSc

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

There are no areas which need attention -urgent or otherwise.

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

I have found the aviation programme offered by Leeds University to be stimulating and well thought out. The continued high standard of student recruitment is a credit to the university when other institutions have lowered the bar to what I consider to be unacceptable levels. When exam papers have been sent to me they have for the most part only required a few minor alterations and then only for the sake of clarity. The only negative issue I have observed is the universities dual method of awarding marks. This has on occasion caused confusion so I'm glad to hear that just one system is being introduced next year. The teaching staff whom I have had the pleasure of meeting over my term of office are clearly very experienced and know their subject matter well. However, I must single out <<>> for outstanding stewardship of the administration of the course. <<>> attention to detail is exemplary and I can only wish my own staff were as good.

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 of the course are satisfactory and the award of a BSc is appropriate.

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.*

My own experience leads me to believe that Leeds compares very favourably with other institutions who offer aviation and in some cases even surpasses them.

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 programme seems to be highly organised and appropriate and although I have not seen any actual teaching, the quality of the assignments I have witnessed indicate a clear level of understanding by students.

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.*

By comparing Leeds students to my own former students I would say Leeds students are ahead in terms of the technical aspects of aviation although I would say dissertation submissions could be improved. Overall, I did not think this final year cohort were quite as good as previous years I have inspected but you have had some exceptional students during the four years I have been attending Leeds university.

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 has been a steady and incremental improvement in the quality of the exam papers over the past four years.

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.

From the dissertations I have seen there have been some very good research areas identified by students that would merit further investigation either as a subject for discussion or at PhD level. Air rage in particular being one area that stood out.

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

While the BSc does not form part of a PhD programme the course does provide students with the tools to be able to undertake a PhD if they so desired in the future.

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.

Yes. I have no complaints on this aspect.

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.

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. The question papers are varied, interesting and testing.

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?

Given the time available yes, there was plenty of student work for me to see.

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

The dissertations were for the most part interesting but I would prefer to see students tackle completely different topics. rather than have two or three students submit the same topic.

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 in all cases.

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

It is with some regret that I find my time as an external examiner at Leeds is now up. The four years have flown by and I have enjoyed the process very much. I just hope my comments have proved useful to the university.

I was only able to meet one student rep this year, <<>> who graduated with a 1st. While <<>> is a fine young man who should do well in the aviation industry I would have liked to have met a wider group of students as in previous years. While I appreciate it is difficult to get hold of students once it has gone down for the summer recess, perhaps it might be appropriate for externals to make a visit during term time and thus be able to not only see students but also to see examples of teaching and other course work. Other than that minor criticism Leeds can be proud of what you have achieved in aviation education. Great staff, Good facilities and high standards. It's a recipe for success and I wish my successor well.

<<>> .

Faculty of Engineering

School of Chemical and Process Engineering

University of Leeds
Leeds LS2 9JT, UK

T (direct Line) +44 (0) 113

F +44 (0) 113

E

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



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

6th November 2016

Dear

Response to External Examiner's Report

B.Sc. in Aviation Technology with Pilot Studies

B.Sc. in Aviation Technology with Management

This letter acknowledges your External Examiner report, for the School of Chemical and Process Engineering two Aviation Technology B.Sc. degrees. On behalf of the School, I wish to thank you for your insightful comments and constructive suggestions for enhancing the Aviation Technology Programmes.

Response to Matters for Urgent Attention: You identified no matters requiring urgent attention.

Response to Programme-Related Standards: My colleagues and I were delighted to note that overall you found the programme to be of a high standard, with sufficient documentation and examples of student work available to support this belief.

Response to comments regarding Level 3 Dissertations:

• **"dissertation submissions could be improved"**

Some students from this Level 3 cohort did seem to struggle with their commitment in their dissertations. There has always been a disparity within the group between those determined to take every advantage of their time at University to achieve their full potential and those prepared to settle for 'getting through'. Unfortunately it seems some did not do themselves justice in their final dissertations. We continue to encourage all our students to be the best they can, and to inspire them with our continued use of different learning styles and challenges.

• **"I would prefer to see students tackle completely different topics rather than have two or three students submit the same topic"**

The subject of each student working individually to produce their own, unique dissertation will be

discussed by the Aviation staff, with a view to the feasibility of implementation for the 2018 cohort entry.

We would like to thank you sincerely for all your help, advice and inspiration over the last four years. You have been a delight to work with and we all wish you well in your retirement from our External Examiner role. I will pass on your kind comments to _____, and thank you on _____ behalf.

Many thanks again.

With best wishes,

c.c. Quality Assurance Team