

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

School of Chemical and Process Engineering

Subject(s):

Chemical Engineering/process engineering

Programme(s) / Module(s):

CAPE modules

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

BSc 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.
Well organised as usual. Project coursework and exam papers well laid out and easy access for appraisal. Staff always on hand.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.
Standards for marking were notably improved over the previous year with use of red ink – a few minor issues one marker providing comments for the students which is against code.

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 apart from the minor point above which I am sure will be rectified next year (marker was new recruit)

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	Y / N
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses 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 an 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

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
<p>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</p> <p>Excellent course – keeps up to date with changes in external world that would impact graduates and their job prospects e.g. this year fracking was introduced....highly controversialand handled well internally with no bias.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y / N
<p>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)</p> <p>As above the School introduces new topics for study as well as research groups taking these forward – can only enhance the student experience in my opinion and prepare them better for job opportunities in industry.</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	Y / N
<p>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y / N
<p>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y / N
<p>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</p> <p>ICHEME accredited course.</p>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y / N
<p>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.</p> <p>The marking schemes were appropriate for both multiple choice and essay type answers. The quality of the teaching was reflected in the degree of difficulty in the questions. Coursework was of the appropriate depth and quality.</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></p> <p><i>This visit it was not possible to arrange any meetings with students on the course but in previous years I would have said performances were comparable with the different subjects studied.</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 Examiner's 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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p>		

Other comments

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

This was my last year at Leeds and I would like to express my thanks to the admin team and staff for their diligence, support and friendship during this time. The course has evolved over the 4 years in a very positive way reflecting the commitment and professionalism of the staff. I am sure the students passing through had a good experience – verified with those students I have spoken to over the years here. Significant improvement has been made over my 4 years here and all recommendations and minor points for improvement have been actioned. An excellent experience for me also!

Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)***Title and Name of Examiner:*

Subject(s):

Petroleum Engineering

Programme(s) / Module(s):

CAPE and SOEE modules

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

BEng/MEng

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

School of Chemical and Process Engineering

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 gat@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

Thank you for the positive feedback.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

All exam papers were marked using red pen and we apologize for the comments given on some exam papers. This has been discussed and all module leaders will be reminded to follow the standard procedures.

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:

n/a – see previous comment.

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:

We appreciate the positive feedback and acknowledge that our program has evolved over the last 4 years to reflect changes in the petroleum sector and provide our graduates with the necessary skills to transition into industry. Last year we introduced a module on Unconventional Oil and Gas Reservoirs which has been well received by our students and this year we will introduce a module on Flow Assurance and Oil Field Chemistry. In addition, we have been increasing the amount of time students spend running drilling practicals on our drill simulator which runs in parallel with our Drilling and Production Technology module. From 2018/19 this module will alternate between lectures and drilling practicals. Joint with Chemical Engineering we have invested in a Virtual Reality learning environment. Two of the four environments relate to the oil and gas industry and we are designing appropriate teaching material for this new teaching method.

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:

We are currently in discussions with the IChemE about accrediting our Petroleum Engineering BEng/MEng programs. In the past this has not been an option and we have accredited our program through the Energy Institute. However, we recognize some benefits of an IChemE accredited Petroleum Engineering program and will further our discussions with the institute in 2018. See comment above also.

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:

Two students had agreed to meet and discuss the program with yourself but unfortunately on the day the students could not attend. This is not ideal and next year we will invite a total of 5 students from Years 3 and 4.

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:

Thank you for the positive feedback.

Other comments

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

Thank you for your time over the last 4 years we greatly appreciate your input and have worked to implement the suggested changes to improve the program. I am glad you recognize that our program is improving and staying relevant to industry needs. Thank you again.