

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>Chemical Engineering</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Chemical 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

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

I had a very enjoyable experience as the External Examiner of the Advanced Chemical Engineering MSc programme. The main changes that I observed during my term was the transition to a single marking scheme, from the several that existed previously. The process for second marking the dissertations became more clearly documented. In addition, the marking of exam scripts became more explicitly and obviously signified.

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 intended learning outcomes are comparable to other MSc level programmes in chemical engineering within the United Kingdom. The overall content and structure of the course is suited to the learning outcomes. The final awards were

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 programme has similar aims and intended learning outcomes to other MSc courses in chemical engineering within the UK.

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 methods were appropriately designed and structured to evaluate the attainment of the ILOs. The distribution of attainment by the students were similar to previous years and to other analogous chemical engineering programmes within the UK.

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 course offered many opportunities for the students to demonstrate their level of achievement of the course aims and intended learning outcomes.

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 have been no significant changes to the programme since last 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.*

Research within the Department had a direct influence on the dissertation projects, where the students were not only able to perform research, but also given the opportunity to practice communicating results, through writing short "papers" and delivering presentations. Some of the taught modules also contained content informed by current research.

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.

Sufficient guidance and materials were provided by the School for me to effectively fulfil my duties as an External Examiner.

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.

I was provided with all the relevant documentation for the programmes for which I was the External Examiner. The policies and procedures were consistent with the duties that I was asked to perform.

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?

I was posted key draft examination papers and had access to all draft papers and assessments. The content and level of the questions were of an appropriate standard and comparable to those found in other MSc chemical engineering programmes in the UK.

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?

All assessed work was made available to me, and all scripts that I examined were clearly marked. I am confident in the assessment of the standard of the students' work.

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

There was an interesting and relevant set of topics for the dissertations. The method and standard of marking was clearly explained and appropriate.

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 and operation of the Board of Examiners were satisfactory, and I was in agreement with the recommendations of the Board.

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

From the minutes of the preliminary Board of Examiners meeting, as well as discussions during the Board of Examiners meeting, there appears to be a robust procedure for considering mitigating circumstances and medical evidence.

Other comments

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

none

EBM/TM
17 May 2017

Dear

External Examiner's Reports 2015/16: MSc Chemical Engineering and Integrated MSc/PhD – Nuclear Fuel Cycles, Next Generation Nuclear, and Complex Particular Products and Processes.

Thank you for your reports on our MSc programme in Chemical Engineering and Integrated MSc/PhD programmes in Nuclear Fuel Cycles, Next Generation Nuclear, and Complex Particular Products and Processes. I have copied these to our Director of Student Education (), Director of Taught Postgraduate Programmes () and Deputy Director of CDT in Complex Particulate Products and Processes ().

I would like to thank you for your positive remarks about the content and quality of the programmes. It is gratifying to note from your reports that you are satisfied with a more clear documentation of the procedure for second marking of the dissertations and reconciling differing report marks. Your comments on the project topics and dissertations are also very welcome.

Once again, many thanks for your efforts over the period of your appointment. This concludes your duties as the External Examiner of our MSc programmes.

Yours sincerely

Head of School