

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 04/02/2019

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

Civil Engineering

*Subject(s):*

*Public Health Engineering*

*Programme(s) / Module(s):*

MSc (Eng) Environmental Engineering and Project Management and Water, Sanitation and Health Engineering programmes

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

MSc

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

**Points of innovation and/or good practice**

The WASH management course was excellent. The production of a logical series of reports was an excellent mix of project work relevant to practice with feedback (which was excellent and detailed). This module presented the students with the opportunity to grow real life skills with cycles of coursework and feedback that meant they could grow professionally in a PG taught environment.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

This is my first year as examiner. I have taken over following the untimely death of my predecessor

**Matters for Urgent Attention**

None

**For Examiners in the first year of appointment**

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	Yes/
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	Y / No but there are exceptional circumstances
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	Y /No

**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?	Yes /
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Yes /
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Yes /
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?	Yes
<i>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</i>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Yes / N
<i>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)</i>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	Y / No
<i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y / No
<i>Not applicable</i>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y / N
I assume so. But I don't have the details yet		

## Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Yes / N
Yes		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Yes / N
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Yes / N
<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>		
I took a close look at the Environmental Microbiology coursework, in part because it is my specialist area and in part because this course is evaluated by coursework alone. I raised the issue with the staff in the examiners meeting. They were content that the coursework was appropriate (and it is certainly an excellent exercise).		

## 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?	Yes / N
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Yes / N
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Yes / N
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Yes / N
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Yes / N
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Yes / N
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Yes / N
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Yes / N
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	No *
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Not always
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Yes /N
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Yes / N
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Yes / N
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Yes / N
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Yes / N
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Yes / N
<p>* Despite the very best efforts of the excellent administrator some coursework was missing. I have suggested that next year I would like a list of the material, a list of what is missing and the names of the staff responsible for the missing coursework.</p>		

## Other comments

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

I was pleased to be able to examine these two courses. They both looked interesting. The WASH course is of course new and therefore the courses looked fresh and exciting. The Environmental Engineering and Project Management course was more of a mixed bag. Most courses looked really stimulating (solid waste and indoor air quality). However, one or two might need freshening up. For example the advanced wastewater treatment course looked like "bog standard wastewater engineering" to me.

**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)**

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Civil Engineering

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Environmental Engineering and Project Management and Water, Sanitation and Health Engineering

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

MSc (Eng)

Title and Name of Responder:

Position\*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

Civil Engineering

Address for communication:

University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT

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](mailto: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**

We appreciate your positive comments about both the MScs as far as the overall quality of the programmes are concerned.

Regarding the MSc Environmental Engineering and Project Management programme we also appreciate the positive comments regarding some of the modules. The module leader for Environmental Microbiology was very pleased that you thought the River Aire field course and associated coursework (River Aire Report) was an excellent exercise.

Regarding the MSc Water, Sanitation and Health Engineering we also appreciate your positive comments, particularly about the WASH projects. The coursework for the Management of WASH Projects module is always appreciated by the students and we get consistent feedback from graduates that they are appreciative of the practical skills gained in this module.

**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:

n/a

**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:*

For the Advanced Wastewater Management module the module leader has been away on long term sick leave this academic year, so it was taught by an existing member of staff together with a retired member of staff. As a result of this the content of the module has remained largely the same as last year with the addition of a number of lectures on wastewater disinfection, membrane bioreactors, waste stabilisation ponds and resource recovery. The module leader is due to return soon and we will recommend that the material for this module is reviewed and updated to ensure that it provides an 'advanced' course on wastewater management as you suggest.

We are happy to confirm that both of these courses are accredited by the Joint Board of Moderators.

## 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:*

For Environmental Microbiology you raised the point in the meeting that perhaps all the module learning outcomes may not be demonstrated in the current coursework for the module. Having reviewed this in more detail we have decided to change the way the module is assessed. The current assessment and the proposed future assessment for the 2019/20 academic year are outlined in the table below.

Current Assessment	Proposed Assessment for 2019/20
Presentation 1 – Clinical Microbiology – 15%	Presentation 1 – Clinical Microbiology – 10%
Individual River Aire report – 70%	Individual River Aire report – 60%
Presentation 2 – River Aire – 15%	In-class Test – 30%

Please note that we have proposed to stay with the continuous assessment rather than coursework and exams and we look forward to your feedback on assessment at the end of this academic year.

## 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:*

We are sorry that some of the coursework submissions were missing this year; we have taken the necessary steps to remind staff that it is their responsibility to comply with the University regulations by ensuring that all student submissions are available for the Exam Board meeting.

## Other comments

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

Many thanks for your examiners report relating to the two MSc programmes. We very much appreciate the time and the support which you have provided to this process in your first year as external examiner. We are grateful for the positive comments you have given and the suggestions for improvement that you have suggested for the two programmes.

We are happy to confirm that both of these courses are accredited by the Joint Board of Moderators.