

# The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 27/07/2018

### Part A: General Information

#### Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Food Science and Nutrition

Subject(s):

BSc Nutrition, BSc Food Science and Nutrition

Programme(s) / Module(s):

FOOD2201, FOOD2215, FOOD2260, FOOD3381, FOOD3391 (BSc Nutrition only)  
FOOD2135, FOOD2150, FOOD2160, FOOD2165, FOOD2175, FOOD3050, FOOD3071,  
FOOD3340, FOOD3371 (BSc Nutrition, BSc Food Science and Nutrition),

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

BSc

### 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.

Succession planning for DoSE role to ensure continuation of the high standard of service for students and staff has worked well.

Use of occasional guest lecturers to deliver specialised content from a clinical or industry perspective, and to emphasise the approach taken by professionals across several modules.

Use of good and poor examples of anonymised answers to generate class discussion on tackling examination questions (FOOD3391).

Great guidance and instructions for design of a social marketing campaign or intervention, with explicit guidance on what the examiners are looking for in a presentation and in a report of a good standard (FOOD3381)

Use of pre-seen compulsory exam question and additional questions based on papers presented by students in seminar discussion forums. Answers required thorough reading of recent papers, and demonstration of analytical skills (FOOD3071).

Examples of handbooks written in a student-friendly and encouraging tone, eg., FOOD2150.

Appetite for staff to work together, e.g., by module leaders and DoSE working together when opportunities arise to enhance the module and introduce challenging, contemporary assignments (FOOD2201).

Report to external examiners outlining the 'changes in teaching' during 17-18 provided a useful overview at start of the two day visit in June, especially as new staff had been appointed.

#### Enhancements made from the previous year

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

Examiner reports provided by module leaders in each box, with thoughtful analysis of students' strengths and weaknesses (e.g., FOOD2160, FOOD2165, FOOD2260).

Greater use of online submission and detailed individual student feedback on coursework, with a higher standard of feedback for students across a range (but not all) with praise, where due, and encouragement e.g. FOOD2260, and FOOD3391.

Use MCQ e.g. introduced in FOOD2150 and other modules, already used in FOOD2215, although the number of questions should be reviewed. Consider whether there is a need to standardise time limits against credit value for similar style papers, and to ensure the students are not limited by their reading speed, unless that is a declared outcome.

### 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 none.

### 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
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 BSc Nutrition and BSc Food Science and Nutrition programmes are very well designed. Much thought has been given to providing and delivering a coherent, contemporary and exciting experience for the students on these programmes. The students, as well as the staff, are very clear about the learning outcomes, and the programmes are highly regarded by students, and by the Association for Nutrition. The Assessment Map document, highlighting learning outcomes at each level, for each programme and detailing the assessments relevant to each LO, was very useful.

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)

It is very clear that all of the modules, and the overall student experience in the School are informed by research activity. There are plenty of examples of assessments on the programmes where, for example, students are required to read and interpret recent papers from peer reviewed journals, and to prepare scientific articles and academic conference style presentations. The final year research topics are based upon the expertise of the staff and this facilitates good teamwork and a taste of academic research for all 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>		
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)?	Y
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		
<p>The BSc Nutrition programme is accredited by the Association for Nutrition. The students are able to register as Registered Associate Nutritionists (ANutR) on graduation. This enhances their prospects for relevant employment and for continuing to gain experience in the sector so they may submit portfolios for full registration once they gain further relevant experience in nutrition areas. The AfN accreditation is increasingly required for graduate level positions in the UK and for enhancing the prospects of graduate nutritionists working abroad. Programme accreditation attracts prospective students and the majority of UK universities offering nutrition now offer accredited programmes at undergraduate and postgraduate level.</p>		

### 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>The module summary sheets were very useful, providing details of learning outcomes, content, assessments and feedback. The modules are well designed to build together and provide an effective degree programme.</p> <p>This year the administrative team worked with the programme managers to provide 'module boxes' with complete sets of documents needed by external examiners. The written report to External Examiners on 'Changes to teaching this year' was presented by the staff team, prior to scrutiny of the assessed work and was very useful in reviewing the modules and assessments. In addition, there was a sample of work available for each module showing the range of quality of work, and the complete set of scripts for each module was available, as and when requested. This arrangement was very much appreciated as it made the external examining process more streamlined. It allowed more time to focus on the content and assessment of each individual module. The module organiser detailing the assessment pieces and questions set (e.g. exam questions), with marks achieved for each element of modules, statistics, and comments prepared by the module leader were very helpful.</p> <p>The administration of the programmes is exemplary. The DoSE, Examinations Officer, programme leaders and administrators have obviously worked very hard, and with efficiency to prepare for the external examiners visits (February and June) and to run the Finalist Assessment Board and the Classification meeting following our scrutiny of the assessed work.</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>		
<p>This year the student cohorts for these two programmes performed to a very high standard indeed, most notably those students who had spent a year in industry prior to their final year of study. The very high marks were well deserved, with the best students achieving a standard that is the best I have seen in my experience as an external examiner of nutrition programmes. They are certainly among the best in the</p>		

country. I believe this excellent standard is due to the professional focus, the inspiring range of assessments, and the experience and passion of the staff for their subject that enhances the students' performance as a cohort. There is a good deal of evidence of creativity in assessments, and effective teamwork is often required for success. Demands made to reach professional standards are clearly met, with great support from passionate staff who very obviously care about their students' welfare and attainment, and are willing to spend time explaining the work and offering guidance. I met students during my visit to the University in February. The representatives indicated they are very happy with their programmes and their overall university experience.

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

The assessment and feedback comments to students were fair. The award of marks was consistent across modules and individual pieces of work. On exam scripts it would be helpful if the first marker could add a very brief comment to justify the mark for the moderator and external examiners, in addition to the model answers they already provide. There could be more evidence of the moderation process for each module. The staff commitment to written feedback did vary, with some eloquent and forward looking comments offered by some markers, but not others. There was a range of feedback, in terms of volume and quality. It would be an improvement if there was more evidence of written/oral feedback to students across all modules, although I should say that when meeting the students in February none raised the timing or quality of feedback on assessments as an issue of concern. I believe the gradual migration to more online submission and marking of coursework will improve the visibility of feedback to students and examiners.

As I have commented previously, the volume of work at level 2 seems quite onerous and indeed the students I met have commented on this; one student commented that Level 2 'intense'. Could the workload be reviewed to ensure that students are not disadvantaged against others on similar programmes? Of course I appreciate those industrious students rising to the challenge may well benefit from their hard work in the final year, and this may account for their exceptional academic performance.

### 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

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

All of appropriate documents and samples of assessed work were provided within individual module boxes, along with comments from module leaders and marks lists, statistics etc. Staff made themselves available prior to the exam meetings. The programme managers and the Director of Student Education gave their time generously, explaining the details of the programmes and updating the examiners on new developments during the visit.

The meetings were conducted in a professional manner, with consideration of each case and it was pleasing to see the care and dedication in presenting accurate documentation in an efficient and exemplary manner. The chairs and the administrative staff are to be commended on their excellent work.

#### Other comments

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

The successful development of the BSc Food Science and Nutrition, and BSc Nutrition programmes has continued in the three years since I was appointed as a new external examiner. The programmes benefit from the skills of the dedicated and enthusiastic team of staff supporting them. The students on the programmes achieve high standards and clearly value their undergraduate experience. They will become great ambassadors for the School and the University of Leeds on their graduation.

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

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

BSc Nutrition, BSc Food Science and Nutrition

Programme(s) / Module(s):

FOOD2201, FOOD2215, FOOD2260, FOOD3381, FOOD3391 (BSc Nutrition only)  
FOOD2135, FOOD2150, FOOD2160, FOOD2165, FOOD2175, FOOD3050, FOOD3071,  
FOOD3340, FOOD3371 (BSc Nutrition, BSc Food Science and Nutrition),

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

BSc

Title and Name of Responder:

Position\*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

*MAPS/School of Food Science and Nutrition*

Address for communication:

School of Food Science and Nutrition  
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**

It was important to ensure a seamless transition with the appointment of a new DSE and your comments show that this has been successful. The decision to give a full report of changes in teaching was new this year due to the number of new staff teaching, however as it was useful to you a report of changes will be presented each year. Thank you for highlighting a number of pieces of good practice which will be disseminated to other module leaders to use where appropriate.

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

Internal examiners reports on examination answers and coursework are to be made standard for all modules. The use of online submission and marking will continue to increase and all staff will be instructed to give full feedback on-line and to include positive comment where due and to give some encouragement. With respect to the use of MCQs and the number of questions, the School has started to standardise the style of MCQ dependent on level and will also consider the number of questions with respect to the credit weighting and examination length.

**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 – External Examiner is not in first year of appointment.

## 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 Nutrition programme has just been re-validated with the AfN and there has been some focus group meetings with Nutrition students to ensure that students are aware of learning outcomes and requirements for AfN accreditation and can have input into programme improvements. The students are made aware of the importance of research and how the research of the School influences modules in the programme.

## 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:*

Module boxes to include all module information along with coursework, examination paper examples and module leader comments are a new innovation and will be continued as you have found them helpful. The School will continue to look for ways to improve administrative arrangements for the External Examiners and will be pleased to act on any suggestions. The internal examiners agree with your observation that the student performance this year was of a deservedly high standard. The A level requirement for entry onto the programmes has ensured that many of the best students come to Leeds to study, and staff have responded in making the programmes interesting and challenging – and offering any support required from our students.

It was disappointing to note that there were some scripts without sufficient comments from the first marker – all staff will be informed of the minimum requirement for comments on scripts in addition to the provided guide answers. Examples of best practice assessment feedback will be presented at an away day to standardise the feedback. Module leaders will be asked, as part of the exam question feedback document, to indicate what moderation has been carried out for exam answers and coursework. There is a TES (Teaching Enhancement Scheme) group that is reviewing all aspects of level 2 assessment, and there has been a reduced volume of coursework set for the next academic session. The group is expected to continue the review for another academic session.

## 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:*

It is pleasing to note that you found the arrangements and conduct of the meetings was done so in a professional manner. It is intended that the DSE and Assessment Lead will update the External Examiners on all new developments at the start of the visit.

## Other comments

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

The internal examiners agree with your sentiments concerning the high standard of our students and we look forward to them being great ambassadors for both School and University in the future.