

**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-19

QAT Received 14/01/2019

**Part A: General Information****Subject area and awards being examined***Title and Name of Examiner:**Faculty / School of:*

Chemistry

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

Chemical Biology &amp; Drug Design

*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 course has a good balance of taught modules and laboratory based project work. Chemical biology/medicinal chemistry is a major research strength at the University of Leeds, which makes this an ideal venue to host this course. I was impressed by the quality of the research reports and presentations, from the students, which I was able to view remotely online. The audio/visual quality of those presentations was also very good and if lecture courses are recorded in the same way for students to re-play at a later date then that would be very valuable for the students. Most of the research projects seemed to have a good balance of chemistry and biology. For those projects which that are based mainly in synthetic chemistry laboratories, it is important to ensure that students get some opportunities to work in a biology lab/environment. Exposing students to collaborative projects including colleagues from the faculty of biological sciences might also be valuable to the students.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

NA this is the first year as external.

**Matters for Urgent Attention**

NA

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

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

**For Examiners completing their term of appointment**

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	NA
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	NA

6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	NA
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
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y

The programme structure, design and aims are very good.

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

As explained above the course builds on strong research in Chemical Biology – particularly synthesis of bioactive small molecules and probes. Structural biology, is another strength at Leeds, It would be interesting to know how much structural biology research is influencing the curriculum. Chemical Biology is cross-disciplinary field and it is important in training the next generation of researchers, that the students get good exposure to both sides of the chemistry-biology interface.

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)?	Y / 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
-----	---	---

The design and structure of the assessment methods was appropriate. The marking of modules and the classification of awards was also appropriate. I have no doubt that the quality of teaching, training and supervision was very good.

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
The standards of the research reports and the quality of the research presentations is comparable with the output from MChem students at		
<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?	Y
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?	Y
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y
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?	N
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 / N
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i>		

### Other comments

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

21<sup>st</sup> February 2019

Dear

**RE: MSc Chemical Biology and Drug Design 2017/18**

I am writing on behalf of the School of Chemistry to provide a formal response to your Examiner's report for 2017/18.

I was very pleased to see your positive comments regarding the project reports and presentations and regarding our assessment procedures.

In line with the University's new procedures, I enclose a copy of your report, together with (in part C) our detailed responses.

- Lecture capture is available for essentially all lectures and this facility is appreciated by overseas students in particular.
- The importance of structural biology is reiterated throughout the programme and we will continue to do this.
- Several of the projects this year will be collaborations with colleagues from the faculty of biological sciences and we will endeavour to create opportunities for all students to experience work in a biological lab.

On a final note, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your considered contributions and we look forward to working with you in the coming year.

Yours sincerely,

Head of School

Cc

*Programme Manager  
Director of Student Education  
Academic Lead on Assessment*