

3.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Mentor? (informally contact dealing with any issue related to the course)	has been my	Y /
----	---	-------------	-----

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?	/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 /

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

The course is very similar (if not better) than our course in my university

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)

One sign of research influencing the course is presence of modules with higher level of mathematical content. Although this is a good thing, it appears that some students are struggling with mathematical subjects though I note that they are provided with a course in Foundation mathematics if required.

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

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

At this point I am not sure if the department has any future plan to pursue this option.

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 /
-----	--	-----

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 /
<p><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>		
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 /
<p><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></p> <p><i>From modules I have inspected and also from interviewing one person, I can confidently state that the course shows excellent level of standard</i></p>		
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p> <p>In my opinion is a good practise to put remarks on exam papers. I appreciate that these remarks will not go to students as feedback and usefulness is questionable. However, remarks can be useful especially if a second marker is assessing.</p>		

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?	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 /
<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

--

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Aviation Technology

Programme(s) / Module(s):

 AVIA1000
 AVIA1010
 AVIA1020
 AVIA1030
 AVIA1040
 AVIA2000
 AVIA2010
 AVIA2020
 AVIA2040
 AVIA2050
 AVIA3000
 AVIA3010
 AVIA3020
 AVIA3030

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

 BSc Aviation Technology with Pilot Studies
 BSc Aviation Technology and Management

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

School of Chemical and Process Engineering

Address for communication:

*School of Chemical and Process Engineering
 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. 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 thank the external examiner for positive comments. The issue raised of students having very little time between finishing courses, presenting project and actual exams is not something that can be addressed under the current Aviation Programmes, but will be considered as part of a major programme revision, which is intended to roll out in 2020.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We are pleased to hear that good practice has continued. As noted above, major changes are planned for 2020.

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 such matters 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:

No issues were raised by the external and we are pleased that things are running smoothly.

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 External Examiner raised the issue of some students struggling with mathematical subjects. There are two aspects to this:

1. the presence of maths in Aviation topics (especially aerodynamics in AVIA 3000 Aircraft 2), for which we have sought to enhance support for in 2018–19;
2. student performance on maths modules, which we hope to address as part of the 2020 major programme revision.

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 External Examiner suggested including remarks when exam papers are marked. Current School practice is not to include such remarks, not least because they are likely to cause confusion amongst students who believe incorrectly (despite annual reminders to the contrary) that they can ask for a remark based on issues of academic judgement.

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 were raised by the External Examiner.

Other comments

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

There were no other comments by the External Examiner.