

# The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18      QAT Received 26/10/2018

### Part A: General Information

#### Subject area and awards being examined

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

Engineering/School of Chemical and Process Engineering

*Subject(s):*

Fire and explosion Engineering

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

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

BA/Bsc/Msc

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

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

The program was more closely connected to research this year

#### Enhancements made from the previous year

New computer models were used for the evaluation of fire safety.

#### Matters for Urgent Attention

It is sad to see such a strong and vibrant course, well respected internationally closing down at a time when in the UK and internationally there is great push for more education and training at high level of fire safety professional engineers (system designers and regulators alike). Disasters like Grenfell have demonstrated the urgent need for more professionals competent in this field.

#### 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
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	N
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	N

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*

## 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.*

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)*

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

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

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y
-----	--	---

*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
-----	---	---

*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.*

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?	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
<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**

It is sad to see such a strong and vibrant course, well respected internationally closing down at a time when in the UK and internationally there is great push for more education and training at high level of

fire safety professional engineers (system designers and regulators alike). Disasters like Grenfell have demonstrated the urgent need for more professionals competent in this field.

**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)***Title and Name of Examiner:*

Subject(s):

*Fire & Explosion*

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MSc Fire &amp; Explosion Engineering

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

MSc

*Title and Name of Responder:*

Position\*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

*Engineering/Chemical & Process 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 [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**

We welcome the EE comment on the connection of the programme to research and confirm that as well as covering the fundamentals it is one of the objectives of the programme to present new findings, understanding, developments and application within the subject area.

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

A couple of the students used new software in the research and design projects and this was encouraged and supported by the delivery team.

**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:*

We note and appreciate the EE comments but the School, in setting our future priorities and direction, has taken the decision to close the programme.

**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 are not sure what the EE negative response to Q. 5 & 6 specifically relates to. If it is in relation to the closure of the programme this has been replied to.

## 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:*

No issues raised.

## 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:*

No issues raised

## 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:*

No issues raised.

## Other comments

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

See earlier response under the Matter for Urgent Attention section.

We would like to thank the External Examiner for his knowledgeable input and helpful comments and contribution over    years of service in this role in maintaining the quality and standards of the programme and wish    well for the future.