

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

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18    QAT Received 03/01/2019

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

School of Food Science and Nutrition

*Subject(s):*

All modules in MSc programmes

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

FOOD5421 FOOD5016M FOOD5055M FOOD5115 FOOD5125 FOOD5472 FOOD5206  
FOOD5235 FOOD5270M FOOD5481

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

MSc Food Science, MSc Food Science (Biotechnology) and MSc Food Quality and Innovation

**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.*

There are innovative elements of assessment as well, particularly in the integrated (or "capstone") modules which in my opinion are very beneficial to the programme.

Other elements mentioned in previous years:

- 1) the high quality of the final year project work and the support offered. I found excellent projects in many different areas of research, from colloidal science (which was to be expected) to optical systems and nutrition.
- 2) the ability given to the student to choose different profiles that will yield specialisations. The student's choice allow to accommodate different professional profiles in one MSc programme.
- 3) the integration of the product development project and the multidisciplinary approach taken provides students with an excellent opportunity to develop the NPD skills.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

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

Marking Schemes are now provided in most of the modules for external examiners. This facilitates the review and reporting.

Some Improvement reports have been made available as well denoting evidence of addressing the elements of attention highlighted in previous years.

**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*

There are no matters of urgent attention to the programme.

**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 an 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
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y
7.	Have you acted as an External Examiner Mentor?	Y

*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*

My experience in the 4 years tenure as external examiner has been very good. I've seen a very proactive School, with appropriate structures to deliver, monitor and improve the quality of the academic programmes they are leading. The School team has engaged in a meaningful way to resolve any issues that have been identified during these years under a clear academic leadership.

The academic standard achieved by the School is of my highest consideration internationally in my opinion. While we've experienced a variability in cohorts during these years, the School has consistently trained students to the highest level.

The marking and assessment of the School is appropriate, with double marking and/or other measures where needed. During the last 4 years there has been a significant improvement in the information available to external examiners to assess marking and assessment standards and procedures and with this I believe that quality improvement is assured. A demonstration on this is the corrections on final year project marks resulting from our review.

**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

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

The programme learning outcomes are appropriate for the award intended and the content of the programme and structure provides the students with an excellent learning opportunity, both in diversity (with the different options) and in depth (reflected in the application of research expertise in the advanced training of students).

The standards and student achievement is of high level and demonstrate the work of a group with a high commitment towards the student achievement.

The programme aims and ILOs are of equivalent if not superior level than equivalent programmes nationally and internationally.

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

*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)*

A clear fingerprint of the School's research is reflected in the structure, content and delivery of the programme, both in the modules and the final year projects executed by the students.

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>		
<b>NA</b>		
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>		
<p>The learning and assessment components of the programme are appropriated and provide enough diversity to accommodate student cohorts.</p> <p>Given the biggest participation of international students in the programmes a big effort is made to adapt students to the specific assessment environment. I believe that more work needs to be done in this area, specifically at the examination point as this issue has been extensively discussed during my 4 years tenure and I believe needs still focus from the academic team</p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		
<b>I am not aware of accreditation</b>		

### 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>		
<p>I've revised the exam scripts prior to si and sii for the season 17/18 (for 4 years now) and during my annual visit I have reviewed the marking of students of exams and projects during my visit.</p> <p>I had an opportunity to meet the head of studies of the School and to discuss my observations/comments of this review. Further to that I have met with several lecturers regarding the marking and classification of the students.</p> <p>Based on the visit and the meetings, it is my opinion that the programme has rigorous methods of assessment, which are complete and address the ILOs and that the School has an appropriate structure to manage the quality improvement of this process.</p> <p>The arrangements for the marking of modules are appropriate and the classification of awards is assessed with careful attention to each individual student and with fairness.</p> <p>The academic breadth and level of achievement of the graduates of the programmes is very high, as indicated by their ability to respond complex exam questions and to develop integrated projects in their areas. As such there are several examples of good practice that I've identified and discussed with the Head of Studies of the School. IN the same way, I've found some small evidence of duplication, further discussion to this has clarified any aspect of this to my satisfaction.</p> <p>The integrated product development and the research project showcase a high level of integration of the training and the ability of the students to use the skills.</p>		
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>		

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

The academic performance demonstrated by these students is of equivalent if not superior level than other programmes I have experience of internationally.

This specific cohort 17/18 was slightly weaker than other years and issues such as adaptation to UK exam practices became more evident., however the School managed still to bring the student achievement and performance to a very high level.

Another small issue that has raised repeatedly during the last 4 years are the possible overlaps in the examination questions. External examiners have pointed at very similar questions in different module examinations and this needs to be monitored by the School to avoid a student scoring twice with the same knowledge.

### 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

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

I wasn't able to attend the re-scheduled progression and awards meeting unfortunately, however we were provided with enough documentation and did leave comment for it.

### Other comments

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

All examinations were reviewed and level of achievement was very significant. Despite the fact of receiving a very mixed cohort of national and international students the student performance is very good, with some areas (5421 , 5472) level of achievement a benchmark internationally

### **FOOD5421 STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION OF FOOD MOLECULES**

18/92 Failed similar to previous years.

Question 4 (AT/JS) and 7 (LM) seems to have a failed average

The module seems to have caught up with some programmes (this year more FS&N as opposite to last year FQ&I) more than others.

From all students that failed two students received a continuous assessment below 60, with one student receiving 76 in the continuous assessment and still failing.

The course review is proposing appropriate measures, however it should take into consideration that different years have pointed to different programmes.

The intake of mixed ability students is evident in the exam performance, but not in the continuous assessment. From this my understanding is that **adaptation to the Leeds examination process needs to be addressed.**

I support the proposal by the head of studies in regards the worries on writing exam answers and the expectation use of writing exam answer support, seminars that can help to get more familiar with the examination practice. **This is not addressed in the improvement report.** Suggestion: e-help with example questions and answers and with typical mistakes that have to be avoided by a MSc student, Mock exams (conducted by all the MSc team rather than this module only),

Marking Scheme is provided and very detailed, Thanks!

Marking is fair and there is a clear difference between high and lower achievement. The exams that were revised and had a failed mark were clearly not achieving the learning outcomes of the module.

FOOD5016M Physical Properties

No Marking scheme

Section A marking of questions are not presented. I can't comment on this section any further, although the average results of this is a failure (14.1/30)

In this module there is a correlation between the exam mark and the continuous assessment. A student with a weak exam (26%) managed to obtain a 10/10 in the lab and 6.5/10 in the examples, but all the other students are clearly performing bad in exam and labs.

Question 2 and 6 on maillard are overlapping with question 6 section C 5421 (both questions asking the student an open question on Maillard and aroma or flavour and Strecker. Students seem to have used the SAME type of answer in question 6 (a) with the same type of material and got the advantage of scoring in two exams.

The programme committee need to revise the **overlapping of both these areas** to spread the resources more effectively.

In previous years evidence of double marking or moderation was clear, however this year I can't see any evidence of this marking.

There is one student in this. Module that has simply written down the questions in the exam in a behaviour very difficult to explain. The student should be referred to student services.

**Feedback in exam is very good.**

4/15 failed

### **FOOD5055M FOOD PROCESSING**

Marking Scheme is available, thank you

2 failings that had a reasonable performance in the CA part of the module (>75%)

Marks in CA are unusually high here with >90% average. Maybe the module leaders need to discuss CA and their effect. MCQ questions seem to be quite easily completed by students.

Question 4 on control of enzymatic browning is different, however **overlaps with 5421** question on PPO and browning (Q5). Students are answering Q4 with material similar to 5421 Q5 and obtaining double scores for the same material

### **FOOD5115 Colloids and Dairy Science**

4/13 failed similar to last year

marking scheme available for mcq ,thank you.

Assessment is varied (MCQ and open) with no choice

The performance on the MCQ part is much higher (8.8/10) than on the open questions (9.3/20 and 7.2/20 which is within the failure). Maybe the module team should discuss this

Q5b in 5472 Sensory Science and Q11c in this exam both deal with the dynamic nature of oral processing. The two questions seems to requiring independent answers, and students, although they introduced information on sensory perception in the answer of this module don't seem to have been marked for it (Creamy perception, astringency perception mentioned)

### **FOOD5125 Food Biotechnology**

Model answers available, thank you

No failure and no evident issue (a small number of students that is manageable).

Marks in CA and Exam are similar in average and seem reasonably correlated..

### **FOOD5472 SENSORY SCIENCE**

Marking Scheme provided, thank you

No failure in the module

This year the continuous assessment level of achievement is comparable to the exam performance

Q1 and Q2 have an average below the fail threshold. This seems to be the result of a number of students (7-8) leaving Q1-3 and focusing on questions 4 and 5 and scoring enough marks on those to pass. As the lecturers in the module indicate there is a certain unbalance in the questions answered and the material delivered maybe a suggestion to require from the student to answer a number of questions from semester one might give a more balance assessment of the whole module learning outcomes.

Q4 on fluids and rheology **might be overlapped within the learning outcomes of other modules** and while it has not been a similar question in exams in other modules this year it is likely that it will be in the future. The programme team might need to monitor this area.

### **FOOD5206 ANTIBODIES, GMOS AND PCR**

No failures in the year. Marks in exam and CA are within the same range and reasonably correlated.

Exam is based on MCQ which this cohort seems to be reasonably familiar with.

Not using negative marking on a MCQ at MSc level might be giving away a lot of marks and from the programmes I am familiar with at MSc level they all apply corrections for chance.

Marking solution provided, thank you.

I would suggest that the future use of MCQ with bigger groups as a tool to facilitate assessment (combined, possibly at the choice of the programme team, with other types of assessment) could be easily examined and reflected with the evidence provided in this module.

### **Food5235 Food and the allergic reaction**

1 Fails.

Section B average is a fail in the exam compared with Section A which seems to have a better performance.

The examination strategy has been changed and this year there is no question picking possibility for students (2017 note).

The introduction of MCQs in this module seems to have been relatively successful and the one student failure is justified.

There is a marking Scheme provided, thank you.

### **Food5270m food analysis**

**Note there is a 2009 examination attached.**

28/75 has duplicated fails since last year with many students from FS&N (note last year this was similar but with FQ&I, which now don't feature so heavily). This might require consideration by the team.

Questions 1 and 4 have an average <10, specially Q4.

Questions 2 was not a favourite, and the failure of students to attempt a question that contained Beer Lambert's law is worrying. It seems some students were busy preparing answers on fiber analysis.

Have a marking scheme, thank you.

Some of the student achievement is of very good level

### **FOOD5481 Food Quality Assurance and Quality Control**

1/42 Failed, this change in respect to last year is significant.

Examination has been changed to MCQ and this might have a significant role in this change of performance.

Content delivery in quality systems and management seems to have contributed to a coherent delivery as well

Average of the two elements of assessment (ex and ca) are in a similar range and reasonably correlated.

Marking Scheme Provided, thank you

Group thinking and topic picking has been addressed to the satisfaction of the lecturers.

**No student feedback received this year.**

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

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

All modules in MSc programmes

Programme(s) / Module(s):

FOOD5421 FOOD5016M FOOD5055M FOOD5115 FOOD5125 FOOD5472 FOOD5206  
FOOD5235 FOOD5270M FOOD5481

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

MSc Food Science, MSc Food Science (Biotechnology) and MSc Food Quality and Innovation

Title and Name of Responder:

Position\*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

Food Science and Nutrition

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 [qat@leeds.ac.uk](mailto: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**

Thank you for the acknowledgement and of the quality, range and support we provide in our research-based modules. Significant planning and attention is required to ensure that these modules successfully provide opportunities to learners to develop multidisciplinary/team skills and which also permit students to demonstrate individual academic ability. The research modules provide innovative and discriminatory practices and are essential to maintain high quality teaching standards.

**Response to Enhancements made from the previous year**

Thank you for the acknowledgment of the utilisation of marking schemes, specimen answers and low, mean and high grade assessments to facilitate efficient evaluation of module assessment. Consistency in the grading of scripts/assessment enables effective and equitable comparative evaluation and we will endeavour to deliver high quality assessment.

**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:

No issues requiring urgent attention were identified.

**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 External Examiner contributions and assessments and recognition that our teaching and assessment processes have shown continued improvement and are applied to the highest standards. As stated, we have sought to proactively address and resolve issues to continually improve or maintain standards and provide transparent processes for external evaluation. Standards are routinely assessed at programme/module level to ensure compliance to School CoPA and accommodate any changes raised at faculty or university level.

**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:*

The School appreciates the EE comments that programme/module standards are of superior level in comparison to other national/international institutions. Consideration of appropriate structure, content, delivery, support and assessment to a diverse student cohort has been acknowledged. As indicated, we will continue to enhance new material, technologies and learning approaches to ensure optimal delivery and assessment strategies. In particular, the school will evaluate coherence and relevance of examination formats across programmes.

**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:*

The school values the comprehensive and detailed evaluation provided the EE and recognises the importance of providing opportunity to discuss observations. Therefore we will continue to arrange meetings with programme/module leaders to discuss identified areas.

The rigour of the assessment methods and their relevance to learning outcomes is acknowledged and is important in supplying coherent feedback to students. The school is implementing standard formats for module handbooks to ensure consistent delivery to students and which will include information relating to marking criteria to inform correspondence in attainment levels and improve clarity in assessment and feedback.

The recognition of the application of equitable and appropriate classifications awarded is acknowledged. This is a routine process conducted to ensure high quality and objective assessment.

Recognition of internationally equivalent academic breadth and level of achievement of the students is acknowledged and which we will endeavour to improve and maintain these levels.

Programme/module reviews will endeavour to ensure appropriate assessment is conducted to satisfy learning outcomes and to minimise assessment duplication and maintain relevancy and the school will make any necessary changes to programme/module content to facilitate this aim.

**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:*

Please accept our apologies that you were not able to attend the re-scheduled meeting.

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

The detailed comments supplied much appreciated in providing an independent objective assessment. The School regularly reviews assessment and assessment type to ensure that learning outcomes are examined at appropriate levels. The school is implementing standard formats for module handbooks to ensure consistent delivery to students and which will include information relating to marking criteria to inform correspondence in attainment levels and improve clarity in assessment and feedback.

The specific observations and issues highlighted have been examined at programme level and the reasons have been identified or the following agreed actions have been suggested to resolve the issues relating to assessment and feedback.

## **FOOD5421 STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION OF FOOD MOLECULES**

18/92 Failed similar to previous years.

Question 4 (AT/JS) and 7 (LM) seems to have a failed average

The module seems to have caught up with some programmes (this year more FS&N as opposite to last year FQ&I) more than others.

From all students that failed two students received a continuous assessment below 60, with one student receiving 76 in the continuous assessment and still failing.

The course review is proposing appropriate measures, however it should take into consideration that different years have pointed to different programmes.

The intake of mixed ability students is evident in the exam performance, but not in the continuous assessment. From this my understanding is that **adaptation to the Leeds examination process needs to be addressed.**

I support the proposal by the head of studies in regards the worries on writing exam answers and the expectation use of writing exam answer support, seminars that can help to get more familiar with the examination practice. **This is not addressed in the improvement report.** Suggestion: e-help with example questions and answers and with typical mistakes that have to be avoided by a MSc student, Mock exams (conducted by all the MSc team rather than this module only),

Marking Scheme is provided and very detailed, Thanks!

Marking is fair and there is a clear difference between high and lower achievement. The exams that were revised and had a failed mark were clearly not achieving the learning outcomes of the module.

### **Response**

**Additional support is to be offered to the students in the form of 4 hours of tutorials on exam questions and answer techniques which we envisage should improve exam performance.**

FOOD5016M Physical Properties

No Marking scheme

Section A marking of questions are not presented. I can't comment on this section any further, although the average results of this is a failure (14.1/30)

In this module there is a correlation between the exam mark and the continuous assessment. A student with a weak exam (26%) managed to obtain a 10/10 in the lab and 6.5/10 in the examples, but all the other students are clearly performing bad in exam and labs.

Question 2 and 6 on maillard are overlapping with question 6 section C 5421 (both questions asking the student an open question on Maillard and aroma or flavour and Strecker. Students seem to have used the SAME type of answer in question 6 (a) with the same type of material and got the advantage of scoring in two exams.

The programme committee need to revise the **overlapping of both these areas** to spread the resources more effectively.

In previous years evidence of double marking or moderation was clear, however this year I can't see any evidence of this marking.

There is one student in this. Module that has simply written down the questions in the exam in a behaviour very difficult to explain. The student should be referred to student services.

**Feedback in exam is very good.**

4/15 failed

**Response and action. Programme and module leaders will be assessing module content and duplication of content and will be rectifying any content repetition issues.**

## **FOOD5055M FOOD PROCESSING**

**Response - Thank you for your comments on this module.**

**MCQ continuous assessment will be reviewed and updated to introduce more discriminatory assessment.**

**Repeated content will be removed.**

## **FOOD5115 Colloids and Dairy Science**

4/13 failed similar to last year

marking scheme available for mcq ,thank you.

Assessment is varied (MCQ and open) with no choice

The performance on the MCQ part is much higher (8.8/10) than on the open questions (9.3/20 and 7.2/20 which is within the failure). Maybe the module team should discuss this

Q5b in 5472 Sensory Science and Q11c in this exam both deal with the dynamic nature of oral processing. The two questions seems to requiring independent answers, and students, although they introduced information on sensory perception in the answer of this module don't seem to have been marked for it (Creamy perception, astringency perception mentioned)

#### **Response**

**Examinations will be quality checked for consistency by independent assessors as part of a continual improvement process.**

#### **FOOD5125 Food Biotechnology**

Model answers available, thank you

No failure and no evident issue (a small number of students that is manageable).

Marks in CA and Exam are similar in average and seem reasonably correlated.

**Response Thank you for the observations.**

#### **FOOD5472 SENSORY SCIENCE**

Marking Scheme provided, thank you

No failure in the module

This year the continuous assessment level of achievement is comparable to the exam performance

Q1 and Q2 have an average below the fail threshold. This seems to be the result of a number of students (7-8) leaving Q1-3 and focusing on questions 4 and 5 and scoring enough marks on those to pass. As the lecturers in the module indicate there is a certain unbalance in the questions answered and the material delivered maybe a suggestion to require from the student to answer a number of questions from semester one might give a more balance assessment of the whole module learning outcomes.

Q4 on fluids and rheology **might be overlapped within the learning outcomes of other modules** and while it has not been a similar question in exams in other modules this year it is likely that it will be in the future. The programme team might need to monitor this area.

**Response and action. Programme and module leaders will be assessing module content and duplication of content and will rectify any content repetition issues.**

#### **FOOD5206 ANTIBODIES, GMOS AND PCR**

No failures in the year. Marks in exam and CA are within the same range and reasonably correlated.

Exam is based on MCQ which this cohort seems to be reasonably familiar with.

Not using negative marking on a MCQ at MSc level might be giving away a lot of marks and from the programmes I am familiar with at MSc level they all apply corrections for chance.

Marking solution provided, thank you.

I would suggest that the future use of MCQ with bigger groups as a tool to facilitate assessment (combined, possibly at the choice of the programme team, with other types of assessment) could be easily examined and reflected with the evidence provided in this module.

**Response and action. Examination format has been considered and various marking schemes have been assessed. On the basis of the results a suitable strategy has been decided which appears to provide a discriminatory assessment.**

#### **Food5235 Food and the allergic reaction**

**Please see module leader commentary below;**

The EE commented that the average mark for the Directed Reading question was a fail. This is true (average = 9.1/20, SD = 2.1).

**One student failed the Module – this student failed both components, the only one to do so, obviously.**

**This was the 1<sup>st</sup> year of a completely revised Exam, and I was very pleased with the results overall. I think it is significant that all bar one of the students passed the MCQ section. Given that the overwhelming majority of the students are international and are not native English speakers, it might have been expected that the MCQs would be a problem area. Clearly next year I will need to work harder on the Directed Reading with the MSc students, realising that this is a really difficult question for this cohort. I am also happy with the MCQ marks because the students have to demonstrate some understanding of the WHOLE course, and they can't question spot, of course.**

**(Note: the BSc cohort did better on the Directed Reading question than ever before...)**

**Food5270m food analysis**

**Note there is a 2009 examination attached.**

28/75 has duplicated fails since last year with many students from FS&N (note last year this was similar but with FQ&I, which now don't feature so heavily). This might require consideration by the team.

Questions 1 and 4 have an average <10, specially Q4.

Questions 2 was not a favourite, and the failure of students to attempt a question that contained Beer Lambert's law is worrying. It seems some students were busy preparing answers on fiber analysis.

Have a marking scheme, thank you.

Some of the student achievement is of very good level

**Response and action. Programme and module leaders will be assessing module content and delivery to enhance learner understanding.**

**FOOD5481 Food Quality Assurance and Quality Control**

1/42 Failed, this change in respect to last year is significant.

Examination has been changed to MCQ and this might have a significant role in this change of performance.

Content delivery in quality systems and management seems to have contributed to a coherent delivery as well

Average of the two elements of assessment (ex and ca) are in a similar range and reasonably correlated.

Marking Scheme Provided, thank you

Group thinking and topic picking has been addressed to the satisfaction of the lecturers.

**No student feedback received this year.**