

# 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:	Engineering / Electrical and Electronic Engineering
Subject(s):	
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MSc / various (7 programmes in total)
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	

#### 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](mailto: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*

Nothing urgent academically; but see the last ('Other comments') 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?*

N/A

#### 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*

N/A

## 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.*

These are 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.*

Yes

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.*

Also appropriate

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.*

Yes, they were; and the cohort looks strong judging by their generally high achievements.

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.*

The previous year's comments on the assessment of projects in the (then) new joint course with Mech. Eng. were conveyed to the other Dept. and they have been acted on appropriately.

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 seems to be a significant aspect of the courses in EEE at Leeds.

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

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, it was

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

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, though I have asked for the envelopes containing scripts to have the module names added alongside the numbers.

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

Yes; and 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, they were; yes; and yes (again, as last year, 'tough but fair')

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

I asked about this – it was dealt with before my visit.

## Other comments

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

The electronic viewing system is quite poor (and was not working on the day I visited). I have therefore asked for all projects to be made available in paper form – external examiners have very little time during their visit, and need material to be available readily, and well ordered – accompanied by the scores of each project marker along with their commentaries about the project.

**Director of Student Education**

School of Electronic and Electrical Engineering  
Faculty of Engineering  
University of Leeds  
Leeds LS2 9JT

Phone +44(0)11  
Fax +44(0)113  
Direct line +44(0)113  
Email



**UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS**

4 January 2017

Dear

Many thanks for sending us your External Examiner's Report for the 2015-16 session.

As we discussed when you visited for the Board of Examiners meeting on October, the presentation of project marks using the virtual learning environment was inefficient, and indeed, unreliable (as we experienced IT issues on the day). I have since spoken with the module leader responsible for the MSc projects and we will take steps to provide the project reports in hardcopy along with marks/comments. Hopefully, this will make it much easier to assimilate the standard of students' project work and their respective grades.

Thank you again for your helpful comments during the visit; we greatly value your contribution as an External Examiner.

Director of Student Education