

**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 Civil Engineering
Subject(s):	<i>Civil Engineering</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Civil Engineering
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MEng/BEng

**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*

None.

**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.*

The ILOs are commensurate to the level of award. The structure and content is also 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, the Leeds' programme in civil engineering is highly regarded by the academic community.
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 programme employs a wide range of assessment methods to evaluate student learning. This is a common feature of engineering course and provides a good opportunity for students to demonstrate learning using a number of formats.
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.*

The examination scripts and course work I reviewed demonstrated that the students had adequate opportunity to demonstrate their learning relative to the ILOs
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 impression I gained was that the delivery of these programmes was relatively stable and no significant enhancements had been undertaken in the past year.
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.*

The majority of teaching group delivering the programme are research active and there was evidence that this fed through into the teaching programme, through exam bases assessment, course work exercises but most importantly design and dissertation work.
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.

- 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.

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

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?**

Excellent, recommendations were appropriate.

- 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

Faculty of Engineering

School of Civil Engineering

University of Leeds  
Leeds LS2 9JT, UK

T (direct Line) +44 (0) 113  
W [www.engineering.leeds.ac.uk](http://www.engineering.leeds.ac.uk)



**UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS**

10 May 2017

Dear

Thank you very much for your External Examiner's report for the 2015/16 session at Leeds and please accept my apologies for the delay in responding. It is, however, very pleasing to see that you feel the programmes at Leeds are achieving the high academic standards we strive for and that students are able to demonstrate this through the examination process, in particularly through the design and dissertation based modules.

I am also pleased that you find the assessment processes are working well and that you felt we had made appropriate arrangements for you to examine students work and examination performances.

With very best wishes.

Yours sincerely