

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

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19    QAT Received 15/02/2020

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

*Environment / Food Science and Nutrition*

*Subject(s):*

*Food Science, Nutrition*

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

Programmes: Food Science and Nutrition; Nutrition  
Modules: FOOD5174M Diet and CV Health; FOOD5045M01 Microbiological and Chemical Food Safety; FOOD5280M Functional Foods; FOOD5405M Professional Development for Employment and Research; FOOD5196M Impacts of Food Processing on Nutritional Quality; FOOD5340M Food and Cancer; FOOD5410M Nutrition Policy and Practice; FOOD5425M Personalised Nutrition; FOOD5510M Applied Nutritional Epidemiology; FOOD5515M Nutrition through the life cycle/life course; FOOD5071 Research Project

*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**

*Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.*

As in previous years, the MSc project provide excellent insight into the skills of the students. I reviewed 4 FS&N and 3 Nut. The range of projects in this small number was exceptional and reflects the expertise of staff within the school.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

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

Last year I was provided with a module summary from the ML. This was helpful however this year this has been inconsistent.

**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*

At my visit in November I was not always provided with highest and lowest piece of work to look over. This is helpful to see the range of performance. Some module handbooks do not make it explicit how the LOs will be assessed and some of the wording of said LOs is not necessarily consistent with L7. I did also observe some half-marks that were given in some exams (Diet and Cardiovascular Health). The school should standardise this as not everyone sees half marks

There are still components of assessment that have been failed but students pass overall. The specific modules include Food 5515M Nutrition through the life course and Food 5410m Nutrition policy and practice. In 5515M there were 6 fails in the poster. Is this module linked to core competencies? In 5140M there were 2 fails in the CSWK but both students still passed the module?

From the AfN:

“AfN Core competency S3c - compensation, trailing and extended re-sit opportunities within and between modules where core competences are assessed (all modules within this programme) are not permitted.”

I realise I have mentioned this before but this still seems to be persisting.

For the MSc projects I did notice some inconsistencies in the abstracts that were produced. Do students receive guidance on this.

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

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 only**

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.*

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?	N
-----	--	---

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

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 / N
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		

### 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>		
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?	N
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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>Not always provided with highest and lowest example of work; therefore not always able to determine the range of student performance and assessment. Highest, lowest and sample from between would be helpful.</p>		

#### Other comments

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

## Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report

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

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

<i>Subject(s):</i>	School of Food Science and Nutrition
<i>Programme(s) / Module(s):</i>	Programmes: Food Science and Nutrition; Nutrition Modules: FOOD5174M Diet and CV Health; FOOD5045M01 Microbiological and Chemical Food Safety; FOOD5280M Functional Foods; FOOD5405M Professional Development for Employment and Research; FOOD5196M Impacts of Food Processing on Nutritional Quality; FOOD5340M Food and Cancer; FOOD5410M Nutrition Policy and Practice; FOOD5425M Personalised Nutrition; FOOD5510M Applied Nutritional Epidemiology; FOOD5515M Nutrition through the life cycle/life course; FOOD5071 Research Project
<i>Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):</i>	MSc programmes
<i>Title and Name of Responder:</i>	
<i>Position*:</i>	Head of School
<i>Faculty / School of:</i>	<i>Environment/ School of Food Science and Nutrition</i>
<i>Address for communication:</i>	Stead House, School of Food Science and nutrition, Woodhouse Lane Leeds, LS2 9JT
<i>Email:</i>	
<i>Telephone:</i>	

*\*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) must be sent directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at [gat@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:gat@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 appreciate the comments provided recognising our efforts to promote research-led teaching. Our Research Project module aims to promote creative and independent research in our learners and to cultivate objective and critical enquiry. Over the last year we have integrated the Research Project module with Key Skills to better align the required skills to the actual project undertaken e.g. specific literature review and catered statistics (in addition to an overall increased statistical training). Students have been further encouraged to select academic staff members as project supervisors who can offer project topics in specific areas of interest.

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

Apologies that module summaries were not supplied in all cases. We pride ourselves on our continual improvement in terms of providing high-quality and verifiable assessment and so we will endeavour to ensure complete and transparent resources are supplied. We have introduced a checklist system and are intending to provide resources via web access increasing our flexibility and efficiency.

#### **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:*

Thank you for bringing lack of evidence to our attention and apologies for the inconvenience. We routinely provide low-mean-high examples of exams and assessments so we will investigate which specific case you refer to and ascertain if there was a particular reason that this occurred and to ensure it does not happen again. As in the previous comment, we will ensure the full range of assessment data and examples are provided using a module checklist approach. In addition, in conjunction with the University Leeds Expectations for Assessment and

Feedback (LEAF) initiative, the Director of Student Education (DSE), Academic Lead, Programme/Module Leaders are in the process of mapping and ensuring that module learning outcomes are coherent across the programmes, appropriately assessed and monitored. Where appropriate, careful consideration and modification of Pass for Progression (PFP) modules is being implemented in relation to core-competencies and ensuring AfN criteria are satisfied so that students are appropriately assessed and classified. As a result, the individual assessment (FOOD5515M poster) will be removed next year, as it does not link to the competencies. The module leader for FOOD5140M is currently on six-month study leave but we will ensure the CSWK element is evaluated in terms of its association, if any, to the core competencies. Thank you for identifying these aspects.

In terms of our assessment practices, the school has specific (Teaching Away Day) sessions where we discuss issues such as consistency in grading and we are endeavouring to improve our approaches by introducing improved, more specific marking rubrics to assist assessors. Where discrepancies occur a formal process is undertaken to review and discuss, allowing consensus to be reached. Thank you for your comment relating to inconsistencies relating to the Abstracts you viewed. In the new research project module and in our previous research project and Key Skills module, students receive library services sessions to identify consistent approaches in academic writing so we will review aspects relating to abstract writing.

**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:*

NA

**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:*

Within our programmes we endeavour to implement the highest quality in terms of delivery, assessment and in terms of external objective review. All content, rationale, assessment and review processes are recorded and available for external review and audit. In our programmes we include research modules at both group and individual level and aim to deliver current research material and offer the opportunity for students to participate in the development process to promote mutually acceptable standards for both academic and learners. We also aim to integrate current research into our programmes and through our Industrial Advisory Board we identify and implement appropriate strategies to ensure our students are equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills required by industry and maintain the high regard in which our students are perceived.

**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:*

We appreciate the recognition of the External Examiner and will ensure that we continue to deliver information in a clear and effective fashion. Through continual review, we reflect and modify our teaching practices to ensure blended and engaging modes of delivery are provided and which are appropriately assessed. This is enhanced through regular staff student forums to gain current student perspectives. We also implement equitable and inclusive practices to establish a high baseline standard whilst providing the opportunity for students to demonstrate excellence.

**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:*

Thank you for your recognition that the progression and awards processes, assessment, feedback and related guidance information are appropriate.

Apologies for the omission of providing all high/low examples and bringing this point to our attention. As stated above we are improving our practices to evidence sufficient and consistent marking and feedback are being applied and so we will ensure that high, mean and low examples are provided. This should have been provided so we will ensure the checklist for reach module is complete. The University and School are aiming to deliver all

marking and feedback online and so all data will be accessible by the External Examiner. We are also still maintaining the 'Module boxes' containing data for the review process. Student Education Services provide a consistent and comprehensive range of data and information relating to the module content, results and assessment required for classification and progression. We are fully committed to maintaining our high standards and in adopting new processes to enhance our practices. Your valued comments are greatly appreciated.

#### Other comments

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