

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:	Faculty: Engineering; School: School of Chemical and Process Engineering
Subject(s):	Petroleum Engineering
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Oil & Gas
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BENG/MENG

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

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

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 learning outcomes were clearly communicated and evidenced in the answers to questions in the exam. The learning outcomes from reports writing at both individual and team level were evident in the paperwork I reviewed.

- 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 would say this is one of the best Petroleum Engineering modules in the Country. The staff pull together very well, the teaching and learning points are highly relevant to the oil & gas but even more so now as we enter the possible era of fracking for gas.

- 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.*

As in previous year systems and marking/assessment are exemplary.

- 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.*

I saw several research projects and generally they were very well written. Whilst there was diversity in standards and level of complexity they were all fit for purpose and supported the ILOs. I had the opportunity to meet some of the students and they were highly complementary of the course, staff and their experience in Leeds.

- 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 were some minor changes from previous year that continued to keep the course relevant and updated...it is an excellent course in every respect in the PETROLEUM ENGINEERING field and very little at the moment I can see to improve it with the possible exception of a little more emphasis on fracking technologies which might interest INEOS and lead to some possible placement opportunities for the students.

- 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.

...as above....excellent all round and the leading edge research of the staff keeps the topics and training highly relevant in this field.

- 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**

- 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 – highly efficient admin staff – everything was sent in advance if requested and information readily available on the day (and evening) sessions for evaluation

- 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 – our tasks were very clear as externals

- 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. Questions were of a high standard and generally answered well reflecting the good communication and teaching from the departmental staff.

- 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 and if anything too much material available but benefit was a broader overview of capabilities of the various team activities (research project reports). All scripts were available.

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

Excellent.

- 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. We were welcomed to lunch with the department team ahead of their meeting and it was conducted in a very appropriate and efficient manner. The use of electronic formatting and updating in real time significantly improved our experience and led to an efficient meeting

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

Yes and one or two were discussed in detail during the afternoon session in the review. Information was readily available and appropriate staff obviously well briefed.

Other comments

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

An extremely pleasant experience and good to see this course growing well and appropriate for industry interest and application.

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

7 November 2016

Dear

External Examiner's Report 2015/16 – MEng/BEng Petroleum Engineering

Thank you for your 2015/16 External Examiner's Report for the School of Chemical and Process Engineering MEng/BEng degree programme in Petroleum Engineering. This has been copied to the School's Director of Student Education () and Head of Petroleum Engineering ().

I would like to thank you for your very positive remarks about the programme structure, our assessment standards and quality of questions, as well as support from our staff. Your comments on your overall experience and progress of our course are also welcome.

Your remarks on "more emphasis on fracking technologies" are noted. For your information, the School is proposing a new module on "Unconventional Oil and Gas Reservoirs" for our level 4 cohort in 2017/2018 which would cover this aspect.

Once again, many thanks for your efforts this year. This concludes your External Examiner duties for 2015/16 and we look forward to seeing you again next June.

Yours sincerely

cc. QAT

Head of School