

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	Faculty of Engineering/School of Chemical and Process Engineering
Subject(s):	
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Petroleum Engineering
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MEng/BEng

Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards

Points of innovation and/or good practice

Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.
I was particularly impressed with the standard of the design projects and a lot of thought had gone into the innovation content and remit. The practice of student lead in the project akin to coordinator was particularly effective in producing some excellent examples of the design reports.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.
A big improvement over the visibility of second markers and clear evidence checks and changes were being made and taken into account on the marked papers I reviewed. The changes were clear and appeared well justified and some simple mistakes like minor mark errors corrected in the appropriate boxes for markers to see.

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 I picked up required urgent attention but there were a few little niggles where improvements could be made for next year such as many markers still not marking in red pen. Some marking was also done in same ink as answers making it, in some cases, very difficult to see the marks and in one case I saw a mark had been left out (no impact on the overall result though). There were several papers e.g. 077 where I couldn't even see a mark on the page but mark sheet was clear. Another paper 083 didn't have the last section marked but it was already an excellent paper marked at 71 so no problem with overall result there. I only came across one error 466 where total added up to 15 but was recorded as 14. Overall good steady progress few errors with minor impact if any. It would be real help if the marking in red could be implemented 100%

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiners Handbook?	Y / N
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?	Y / N
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	Y / N

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y / N
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y / N
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y / N
7.	Have you acted as a External Examiner Mentor?	Y / N

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 have seen a steady and progressive improvement during my period of appointment with the staff showing excellent attention and commitment. The admin and organisation for externals was exemplary and really helped to make this an efficient and worthwhile experience.

Standards

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Y / N
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y / N
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y / N
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y / N
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y / N

Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.

Excellent, Topical and relevant to many sectors of industry. The course content and approach gives the graduates flexibility in their career path with solid curriculum learning many skills.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y / N
-----	---	-------

Please explain how this is/could be achieved (examples might include: curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research)

The design projects this year were the best I've seen from the school and clearly a lot of thought going into them giving the students a broad and relevant experience. One of the design projects (Tight Gas) was one of the best I have seen in any design project here or elsewhere.

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	Y / N
-----	--	-------

Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y / N
-----	--	-------

Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y / N
-----	--	-------

Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:

ICHEME. Standard are high and School is well equipped to meet standards in my view

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y / N
<p><i>Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs, in particular: 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.</i></p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y / N
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y / N
<p><i>Please comment on 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 did have the opportunity to talk to a couple of the students and their experience was excellent. They did suggest a few changes they wanted to make and said staff were very receptive to these ideas. A good learning experience at Leeds and some good career advice also.</i></p>		
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p>		

The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiners role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?	Y / N
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y / N
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y / N
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y / N
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y / N
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y / N
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y / N
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y / N
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y / N
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y / N
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:
I would like to make the comment that the staff were totally open with the external examiners present at the progression meetings and not holding back with any internal discussions or opinions – I was impressed by this openness.

Other comments

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

The school has a very slick and efficient process in place. The admin support for externals is excellent. Continuously improving.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:	
Position*:	Head of Petroleum Engineering
Faculty / School of:	Faculty of Engineering/School of Chemical and Process Engineering
Address for communication:	School of Chemical and Process Engineering University of Leeds
Email:	
Telephone:	

*If the individual responding to the report is not the Head of School please state their position within the School.

Completing the School response

The completed School response (including the full original report) should be attached to an e-mail and sent to the Pro-Dean for Student Education in the relevant Faculty. Following approval by the Pro-Dean for Student Education, the School must send the response (including the full original report) directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at qat@leeds.ac.uk. External Examiners should receive a formal response no later than six weeks after receipt of the original report.

Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice

We will continue to introduce new field locations and production methods. For 2081/19 we shall consider a SAGD (Steam Assisted Gravity Drainage) project in Alberta.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

n/a

Response to Matters for Urgent Attention

If any areas have been identified for urgent attention before the programme is offered again please provide a specific response to them here:

We will implement red pen marking in 2018/19 to differentiate between student and assessor. All marks are double checked.

Response to questions 1-7 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

n/a

Standards**Response to questions 8 to 16 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

Currently accredited by the Energy Institute. Will have discussions with IChemE and IoM3 in 2018.

Assessment and Feedback**Response to questions 17 to 19 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

n/a

The Progression and Awards Process

Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

n/a

Other comments

Response to items included in the 'Other Comments' section of the report

The School would like to thank kind comments regarding the School's processes and the admin support for external examiners.