

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18 QAT Received 30/10/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

School of Engineering – SWJTU-Leeds Joint School

Subject(s):

Programme(s) / Module(s):

English for Engineering XJFY0100 & Engineering Communication Skills XJFY 1000

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

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

XJFY 0100

- The assessment includes an opportunity for the individual assessment of oral skills and for students to be assessed as part of a group.
- Good range of assessment types.
- The Sustainability Report works well and is a good test of understanding in relation to the conventions/practices of academic writing.

XJFY 1000

- Good – that is, extensive, criteria-focused and constructive – feedback given to students in relation to the presentations.
- Good quality audio and video which makes the work of the External much easier.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.

The addition of XJFY 1000 can be regarded as an “enhancement” in that it provides students with an additional range of relevant skills. As I indicate below, I understand that this module will be altered/improved in some way and it would be good to have an early sighting of the changes and the rationale for them.

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

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
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y
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

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

The structure of these modules and their learning outcomes are appropriate to this particular setting and focus on a set of contextualised academic skills which will be really useful to the target cohort.

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)

There is evidence of current best practice in the delivery and assessment of these two modules.

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

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

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

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

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
-----	---	---

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.

The two modules taken together have a good range of appropriate assessment types which have the potential to allow students to better exploit English language and academic skills within an engineering context.

18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y

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:

In the sample I was provided with there was evidence that some students are performing at a very high level on these modules which is evidence of engagement on the part of the students and of focused and well-prepared teaching from the delivery team. Standards generally are comparable to those in similar courses in the sector.

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:

Across both modules students are provided with a range of feedback which is to be commended. Sometimes however this feedback is somewhat *hidden* and more transparency in terms of both feedback and of the use of double marking would be welcome.

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

35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
-----	--	---

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:

The arrangements for the PAB meeting were efficiently communicated to me in a timely way and the meeting itself was well-managed and business-like. At present I am not provided with an opportunity to comment on draft exam papers (see 25 above) but would be very happy to see these and provide feedback if this is university policy.

Other comments

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

XJFY0100 English for Engineering

For the **Group Presentation** candidates are provided with appropriate topics. The marking criteria are appropriate and were fairly applied across the sample I received. There was evidence of input from a second marker. Most students were provided with feedback although in some cases the feedback was somewhat minimal. With the **Individual Presentations** the criteria are clear and appropriate and candidates were provided with some written feedback. As I have indicated above it is good to see that marks are given for both individual and group oral ability. The **Sustainability Report** is a good piece of assessment and I notice that Turnitin is used. It is to be hoped that this is seen as part of a process approach to extended writing in which Turnitin is used not just as a plagiarism detection device but as teaching and developmental tool. This piece of assessment places an appropriate focus on academic writing conventions such as referencing skills, text organisation and structure and so on. A little more by way of feedback would have been good to see but the highlighting of the criteria made it clear how marks were awarded. The **Glider Project Report** - similar to a lab report - is a very structured piece of work which exploits a process approach (proof-reading and correction is done in class) and has clear marking criteria. Although some written feedback was provided in relation to the sample I looked at, it was not easy to see whether or not a second marker was involved in the process. It was good to see the use of a resource booklet for the **Reading Test**. The test itself involves a useful range of question/task types including skimming for gist, notes completion, text analysis, summary completion, a cloze-type exercise and so on.

XJFY 1000 Engineering Communication Skills

The **Presentation** which is a part of this module has appropriate marking criteria. Useful and extensive feedback is provided through a Word document. Students who did well in this part of the assessment had very little dependence on their written notes and exploited slides which were clear and uncluttered. There was good eye contact with the audience and paralinguistic features were appropriately exploited. Weaker candidates struggled to express their ideas and lacked a grammatical and lexical store through which to express their ideas. The presentation stresses, appropriately, the need for criticality and encourages students to present a viewpoint clearly and logically. The **Project** – a 1500-word report – is a useful piece of assessment in this particular context. The assessment criteria are clear and appropriate and students are given extensive feedback, all of which is firmly related to the relevant criteria. Annotated feedback is provided through Turnitin. I understand that changes will be made to this module for session 2018/19 and I would be happy to comment on these modifications when they are available.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Year 1 module, English for Engineering, Year 2 Module English Communication Skills

Programme(s) / Module(s):

XJFY 0100, XJFY1000

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

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Director of Year 1

Faculty / School of:

SWJTU-Leeds Joint School, Faculty of Engineering

Address for communication:

Faculty of Engineering, 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 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

As a result of feedback received last year, we have reverted to the use of an Integrated Skills exam in the final semester. We are confident that the range of assessment types remains good, although we will not have separate listening and reading exams as summative assessment types this year.

Good practice in terms of feedback and quality of audio and video material noted for XJFY1000. We will learn from this for other module.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

To clarify, XJFY1000 is offered as a supernumerary module for Year 2 students, so it is a continuation rather than an addition to Year 1.

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:

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:

N/A

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:

In terms of feedback, this year, in response to the external examiner's comments, we are doing all the marking on Minerva using Blackboard Rubrics and the Turnitin Feedback studio. We hope this will give immediate and efficient access to feedback for students. So this will solve the transparency of feedback issue. In terms of evidence of double marking, we are looking at ways to record this electronically. At the moment, this evidence will come in the form of instructions to staff about the procedure to follow

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 happy to share the drafts of the integrated skills exam, as in the first year, and can arrange for the external examiner to have sight of the range of assessments if required.

Other comments

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

Turnitin is definitely used a teaching tool. In the setting up of the glider project, this year a formative report was submitted via Turnitin and the various features of the Feedback Studio were explored by staff and students. In the second semester, students are given the opportunity to see their originality report for their draft coursework report, so they can learn from it.

A second or check marker was often involved in the marking of the glider project. We are looking at ways to make this more transparent in the most efficient way possible, bearing in mind the numbers of staff (8) and students (286) involved.

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QA Team received 16/07/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Faculty of Engineering, SWJTU-Leeds Joint School

Subject(s):

Physics and Mathematics in the Foundation Year

Programme(s) / Module(s):

XJFY0200, XJFY0210, XJFY0300, XJFY0310

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

None, Foundation Year only

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.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.

Matters for Urgent Attention

None.

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

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

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
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	N/A
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	N/A
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y
<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?	N/A
At this level of study I do not expect any influence of research on the curriculum.		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
I do not think that the foundation year is relevant to accreditation issues.		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<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>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y
<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>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i>		

--

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

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:
Regarding 24., I saw samples of Physics lab reports where some of the overall marks did not look plausible to me. There was no evidence of marking on the reports and no marking scheme provided.
Regarding 28., there was not enough time in the schedule to evaluate a sufficient amount of material, and no samples were provided for some of the assessment components.
Regarding 29., The lab reports that I saw showed no sign of marking at all; only some of the exam scripts that I saw were marked.

Other comments

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

I saw mathematics exam papers where students were apparently awarded marks without showing any working. Students should be encouraged to show all working, and markers should award marks only where working is shown.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Maths and Physics

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Year 1, South-West Jiaotong-Leeds Joint School

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

None – Year 1 only

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Year 1 Director, SWJTU-Leeds Joint School

Faculty / School of:

Faculty of Engineering

Address for communication:

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

N/A

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:

N/A

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:

Physics

There are 2 issues here – the organisation of the external examiner's visit and the assessment procedure. Both of these will be improved next year. In terms of the arrangement of the visit, (28) the examiner will be given all of the documentation and information required and more time will be allocated to examination of this within the schedule. (28) There is a marking scheme for the lab reports and this will be made available to the external examiner next year.

(24/29) Next year, we plan to have all lab reports submitted and marked online using Turnitin rubrics through Minerva. This will make the marking process more visible and the feedback will be provided directly to the students.

All markers will be shown this report and informed that they will need to show signs of marking

Other comments

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

Maths

The markers will be shown this report and reminded of the need to award marks only where working is shown.

However, it must be stated that the two markers who had to mark in Chengdu due to the unforeseen absence of the module co-leader, generally followed the detailed marking plan provided by the module leader well and to satisfaction