

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 Electronic and Electrical Engineering
Subject(s):	Nanofolio
Programme(s) / Module(s):	CDT - Molecular-Scale Engineering
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 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

This report relates to the final cohort on this CDT Masters programme, run jointly by the University of Leeds and the University of <<>>, hence there are no concerns requiring urgent attention.

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

Credit is due to the academic champions of this MSc degree programme. The programme has been run diligently and professionally, with careful attention given to differences in the degree awarding regulations of the two universities, ensuring that students were appraised appropriately and not disadvantaged.

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.*

Overall, the standards of this degree programme have been appropriate, with a well-balanced selection of modules from both Leeds and <<>> made available to these CDT students.

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.*

The challenges set within this degree programme were appropriate and commensurate with similar degree programmes at other institutions.

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 modules provided a range of learning opportunities and assessment methods. The quality overall of the examination papers presented this session was good, with a good mix of challenging questions.

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.*

All the students performed well, as would be expected for such cohorts progressing on to PhD study.

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 programme has been run in the same way as in previous 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.

It is evident that this CDT-MSc degree programme has been influenced strongly by many topical research themes.

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

This CDT-MSc degree programme has provided a good training ground for students aspiring to future, higher-level PhD study.

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, an external examiners handbook was provided.

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.

Sufficient information was provided.

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?

A range of draft examination papers were reviewed as part of the wider Nanofolio degree programmes offered by Leeds. The modules are embedded within the wider organisation for teaching within each University, as appropriate.

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?

Copies of assessed / examined work were made available for inspection electronically. The Citrix Receiver was downloaded to my PC and Leeds IT provided access rights to the appropriate CDT-MSE subfolder. These arrangements worked fine, allowing scripts and coursework to be reviewed by remote access, in advance of the final exam board meeting. The methods of assessment for each module varied, according to module convenor's discretion, which is fine.

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

Subjects for dissertations were appropriate and the methods of assessment were fair.

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?

The administrative arrangements were fine, with an appropriate agenda, marks profiles and a summary of degree awarding regulations, balanced across the systems of the two host universities, provided in advance of the final exam board meeting. I attended the final exam board meeting via skype, in view of the small number of students associated with this cohort.

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

Appropriate procedures were in place and all cases across the wider Nanofolio degree programme were handled with care and consideration.

Other comments

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

This CDT-Masters level programme in the area of Molecular-Scale Engineering has provided a valuable opportunity for next generation researchers to learn about materials science at the fundamental level. Overall, it is clear that this degree programme has been delivered appropriately and the cohort carefully appraised, with Masters degrees awarded fairly. All the students performed well, as would be expected for such a cohort, progressing to PhD study.

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 and for joining us by Skype for the Examination Board meeting in September. I'm pleased that this worked well and saved you the trouble of a visit to Leeds for the relatively small cohort of students we needed to discuss.

Of course, I'm also pleased that you have found the standard of the course and the assessments to be of a high standard and, I agree, the students we have had in this final cohort have been very strong. We hope all of these students will now go on to successfully complete the PhD stage of the programme.

Thank you, once again, for your contribution as an External Examiner.

Director of Student Education