

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

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 26/07/2019

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

Food Science and Nutrition

*Subject(s):*

Food Science and Nutrition

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

FOOD2201, FOOD2215, FOOD2260, FOOD3381, FOOD3391,  
FOOD2135, FOOD2150, FOOD2160, FOOD2165, FOOD2175, FOOD2260, FOOD3050,  
FOOD3071, FOOD3340, FOOD3371, FOOD3381, FOOD3391.

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

BSc Nutrition, BSc Food Science and Nutrition

**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.*

The attention to succession planning for the DoSE role during AY2017-18 has resulted in the smooth operation of teaching and assessment this academic year. There was a seem-less handover and continuation of the high standard of service from the teaching team and the administrative staff in the School. I was able to see the team functioning very well together and ensuring the processes were completed with minimum fuss and with accuracy.

The module handbooks are an excellent resource for students and examiners. There were many good examples, including the Food Product Development Team Project (FOOD3371). The Dragon's Den competition for the FOOD3371 module is innovative and exciting, with students having to learn how to best negotiate the considerable challenges and sensitivities of team work. The competition clearly generates momentum and builds excitement among the teams as they develop their products; the teams are required to create clean label innovative foods to improve health with a focus on sustainably sourced ingredients. Their successful, innovative products (judged by a panel of food industry professional 'dragons') are testament to the endeavours of all the final year students and the enthusiastic support of the staff.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

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

There have been several new teaching appointments this year and this has resulted in some changes to assessments. The assessments were more varied this year; the newly introduced ones have been well thought out to maximise student engagement and input, producing excellent work in many cases. It is pleasing to see there are plans to continue to consider changes to assessment types, away from extensive use of traditional, unseen written exams.

**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*

None

**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
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*

There is ample evidence that the School is committed to its students and to their development during their programmes of study. The staff in the Head of School and DoSE roles during my four-year term as External Examiner have provided strong leadership. This has facilitated the supportive environment that has resulted in the opportunities for an excellent learning experience for their undergraduates. The staff continue to actively support a culture where students are very much part of the team. Students work hard to rise to the academic challenges set, with an awareness of the need for professional approaches, and responsibilities, to themselves and other team members.

Staff have paid some attention to the need to consider whether there is over-assessment on each programme, and whether the types of assessment help students achieve their best academically, and secure good positions on graduation. This is an on-going process: results so far indicate the action planning and developments, such as more use of peer assessment in modules including FOOD3371 are bearing fruit.

This year I saw some well-considered module and assessment reviews in the module boxes (e.g. FOOD3071, FOOD3340, FOOD3391 FOOD2140, FOOD2150, FOOD2201 and FOOD2215). Some of the reviews of progress and year-on-year changes by module leaders were not available to me during my visit for the Exam Board. I am keen to hear that all modules have now been reviewed, using the MEQ responses from the cohort, especially those where the performance in assessments was relatively poor (e.g., FOOD2160, FOOD2165).

**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.*

Both programmes are in good shape. There is continuous attention to the design and delivery, with serious consideration of the aims and learning outcomes at both the module and programme level. There is a good level of depth in each module, and appropriate content, as indicated in the module handbooks

and the marked assignments. The structure and balance of practical with theory, and the use of team work is good, but there are still issues of over-assessment, compared with other students on similar courses elsewhere, and an over-emphasis on traditional (hand) written examinations.

The programmes are contemporary in their content and focus; they provide students with a very good professional experience to support their academic work. In talking to students from the programmes, it is clear to me that they have developed many strengths and professional outlooks that make them confident, well-rounded graduates. The Leeds graduates are attractive to employers in the food industry, health settings and elsewhere.

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)*

The staff are innovative in their use of current research, both in their teaching and in the assessments they set.

There is evidence of a good range of activities across the modules requiring students to undertake primary research, analyse results, and to interpret and critique a range of academic articles. The students must also be able to write reports for assessment, sometimes adopting the styles of academic publications. The final year projects provide opportunity to work alongside staff and postgraduates, to develop research skills required for securing postgraduate opportunities, and to succeed in work on new developments in professional environments.

In summer 2018 the Annual Summer Meeting of the Nutrition Society was held at the University. At the conference the School was able to showcase its excellent research base, innovation, and its role in national and international Nutrition developments. The event provided a good opportunity for the students to recognise, with pride, the value of the contributions by postgraduate students and staff in the School, and to see how much this work is valued in the Nutrition world.

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
-----	--	---

*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:*

The BSc Nutrition programme is accredited by the Association for Nutrition (AfN).

The graduates of the BSc Nutrition programme are immediately able to register with AfN as Associate Registered Nutritionists. This qualification is increasingly being recognised as important for newly qualified graduates in the professional world of nutrition: it provides both an acknowledgement of success on an accredited degree programme that includes ethics and professional standards in the curriculum, and a clear route to full registration as a Registered Nutritionist (RNutr) with further experience.

The BSc Nutrition programme meets fully the AfN Standards and Core Competencies for accreditation.

## 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.*

As I have commented in previous years, I believe there is a tendency to over-assess, using multiple points of assessment in some modules and this needs further attention.

Lengthy written examinations disadvantage those students who find this a greater test of hand-writing clarity. The number of unseen papers should be considered in the forthcoming mapping exercise. I was pleased to see that this year there were fewer traditional style written examinations and more use of MCQ when appropriate (e.g., FOOD3071).

The modules are designed to ensure the ILOs are met and tested during the current range of assessments and even greater use of innovative coursework could be considered for the programmes to test the ILOs and really challenge the high-performing students. Innovation and the introduction of alternative types of assessment may lead to improved use of staff time on assessment, allowing the generation of higher quality feedback and feed-forward to students (this is presently limited by the number of modules assessed by traditional examination methods).

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

*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:*

The academic standards achieved by the students at Levels 2 and 3 are exceptional when compared with other HEIs offering similar programmes. The assessments and module comments provide evidence that the experience gained by these students during their undergraduate courses at Leeds more than meets needs and expectations. As I witnessed last year, the students on the two BSc programmes have responded very well to the challenges set in their assessments; they have mostly performed very well again this year. However, I believe the overall number of items of assessment, especially at Level 2, limits the potential to stretch the most able students; they seem to be over-assessed when compared with second year students at other institutions that I am familiar with.

The students who undertook a placement year were able to demonstrate their considerable skills and expertise in the assessment, especially in the practical work and team projects. The placement year in industry is a considerable strength of the degree programme. The students undertaking these have told me they have really appreciated the opportunities offered during the year in industry, and have explained that their experiences were invaluable, helping them to use their expertise to achieve success in modules in their final year of study.

*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.

One area for improvement is to ensure there is evidence of moderation as it was available for only some of the assessments. On exam scripts it would be helpful if each of the first markers could add a very brief comment to justify the mark, for the benefit of the moderator and external examiners, in addition to the very helpful model answers they already provide. One example of good practice was FOOD2201 where the first marker provided detailed answers on what was expected from the student to generate a high score.

It would be an improvement if there was more evidence of written and oral feedback to students across all modules. The staff commitment to provision of written feedback did vary somewhat this year, with some pertinent, constructive comments offered to the student by some of the assessors, but not others. It may be the case that staff have used feedback sessions in class or in tutorials, oral feedback online, or other methods I was not aware of during my visit. The assessed work I saw on my visit indicated that a range of written feedback, in terms of both volume and quality; this is an area that could be given more attention to enhance student learning and provide some consistent, high quality across all modules.

I believe the gradual migration to more online submission and marking of coursework (e.g., using GradeMark, already employed for some modules, e.g., FOOD3381 and FOOD2260) will improve the visibility of feedback to students and examiners. The use of online marking should improve student access to feedback. It could provide more opportunity for the application of feed-forward by all students, rather than just those who are more confident and pro-active when seeking this support for improvement in their future assessments.

### 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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p>		

### Other comments

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

The only issue of concern I experienced in undertaking my task this year was in gaining access to Minerva. I registered for this in advance of my visit, but I was unable to gain access. IT Support were unable to help during my two day visit to the University to review work and attend the Assessment and Classification Board. This problem was frustrating for everyone and unfortunately it meant a good deal of additional work for the administrative team at a very busy time.

This is my final year in the role as external Examiner. I would like to thank the DoSE, the academic staff and the administrative staff for their work in making this task so pleasant and straight forward. The staff were always responsive to my questions, and timely in providing information and materials. I wish the School well in its development over the coming years. Students clearly benefit from the excellent programmes and the considerable enthusiasm, care and expertise of the staff.

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

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

*Food Science and Nutrition*

Programme(s) / Module(s):

FOOD2201, FOOD2215, FOOD2260, FOOD3381, FOOD3391,  
FOOD2135, FOOD2150, FOOD2160, FOOD2165, FOOD2175, FOOD2260, FOOD3050,  
FOOD3071, FOOD3340, FOOD3371, FOOD3381, FOOD3391.

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

BSc Nutrition, BSc Food Science and Nutrition

Title and Name of Responder:

Position\*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

*Environment / Food Science & 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) 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 are pleased that both courses have been recognised for good/innovative teaching practices. Ongoing programme review will ensure that this practice is maintained and enhanced where possible

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

We agree that changes to assessment have improved the programme. We will continue to reflect on the appropriateness of assessments and assessment mapping by engaging in LEAF.

**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:

Not applicable

**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 specific points raised. We will ensure that programmes continue to provide the necessary support and resources to external examiners.

**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 specifics points raised. We will ensure that programmes continue to provide the necessary support and resources to external examiners.

## 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 are pleased by positive comments of the external examiner and will ensure that our assessment and feedback remains high quality. We are undertaking programme reviews to establish areas of over-assessment and identify opportunities for varying assessment.

## 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:*

We are pleased by positive comments of the external examiner in that our progression and awards process is rigours, robust, and fair.

## Other comments

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

We agree that uninterrupted access to Minerva is important. We will ensure that our technical team are aware of the issues experienced.



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

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 14/08/2019

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

<i>Faculty / School of:</i>	School of Food Science and Nutrition
<i>Subject(s):</i>	Food Science
<i>Programme(s) / Module(s):</i>	B.Sc. Food Science B.Sc. Food Science and Nutrition
<i>Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):</i>	B.Sc.

**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.*

The use of specialised software such as CrystalMaker and Comsol Multiphysics is innovative in teaching food Processing plus the wide range of projects undertaken from literature reviews to development of novel food ingredients and new products which enhance nutritional and functional properties are examples of good practice.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

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

The Functional Foods module (Food 3300) new exam format is an improvement on past exams and tests students understanding of the subject.

**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*

None

**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
<p><i>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</i></p> <p>The B.Sc. Food and Nutrition and B.Sc. Food Science and Nutrition programmes are well structured, the module designs are very suited to achieving the intended learning outcomes. The course aims are envisioned to stretch student's knowledge and the intended learning outcomes are comprehensive.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<p><i>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)</i></p> <p>Both programmes are enhanced by research in the subject of staff delivering the modules and the student research projects are based on the research interests of the staff.</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i></p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i></p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i></p> <p><b>The PSRB requirements ensure all accredited programmes have a high content of Food Science and Food Technology, and that the graduates have the knowledge, skills and studied sufficient breadth of topics to enable them to competently evaluate the safety and quality of food and sufficient depth to enable them to identify appropriate strategies for its implementation, maintenance and improvement.</b></p>		

## 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.*

The design and structure of the assessment methods is varied and suited to test the achievement of the learning outcomes. A range of assessment tools are used including in-course tests, individual and group reports, presentations, portfolios, tutorial performance, poster presentations, laboratory practical reports and written exams.

The arrangements for marking of modules were good. All assessments were marked consistently and there were clear graduations between marks awarded. The exams were annotated and there was evidence that coursework was moderated internally.

The move to the classification system to 0 to 100 from 20 -90 will make the classification of awards more transparent to the external examiner and students.

The quality of teaching was high, learning and assessment methods were effective as indicated by the performance of students and number of first class degrees awarded.

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

*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:*

The academic standards demonstrated by the students are high, and their performance is comparable to students on equivalent courses. The strength of the programme is the high content of Food Science.

An area where there is scope for improvement is business management as graduates' need an awareness of business practice since most will be employed in the food industry.

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

### 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**

It is hoped that the technical issues affecting Minerva which impeded continuous online access to the modules will be resolved.

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

Subject(s):

Food Science

Programme(s) / Module(s):

B.Sc. Food Science  
B.Sc. Food Science and Nutrition

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

BSc

*Title and Name of Responder:*

Position\*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

School of Food Science and Nutrition

Address for communication:

School of Food Science and Nutrition  
University of 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) 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 are pleased that both courses have been recognised for good/innovative teaching practices. Ongoing programme review will ensure that this practice is maintained and enhanced where possible. We highly value the External Examiners expertise and objective assessment of programmes and modules and have accordingly introduced new software solutions to engage students and to enhance our learning practices.

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

We agree that changes to the FOOD3330 assessment have improved this module. We will continue to reflect on the appropriateness of assessments and assessment mapping by engaging in LEAF. The DSE, Programme and module leaders are currently assessing learning outcomes and ensuring appropriate and efficient assessments are applied. The University and the School are committed to establishing effective, coherent and transparent teaching and assessment practices.

**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:*

Not applicable.

**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 specific points were raised. We will ensure that programmes continue to provide the necessary support and resources to external examiners and will aim to provide module resources to assist in the effective assessment of our practices.

## 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:*

We continually monitor our performance through reflective practices and in the context of participatory student feedback. We recognise the importance of PSRB requirements and ensure all accredited programmes have appropriate content of Food Science and Food Technology. Through our Industrial Advisory Board we identify and implement appropriate strategies to equip our students with the necessary knowledge and skills required by industry.

## 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 are pleased by positive comments of the external examiner, and will ensure that our assessment and feedback remains high quality through programme review and LEAF. We continually review, reflect and modify our teaching practices to ensure blended and engaging modes of delivery are provided and which are appropriately assessed. This important latter aspect requires equitable and inclusive practices to ensure 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:*

We are pleased by positive comments of the external examiner in that our progression and awards process is rigours, robust, and fair. With our Student Education Services, we now provide a consistent and comprehensive range of data and information relating to the module content, results and assessment which we will endeavour to maintain and modify where necessary to ensure the effective practices which have been recognised.

## Other comments

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

We agree that uninterrupted access to Minerva is important. We will ensure that our technical team are aware of the issues experienced and will aim to provide the External Examiners with remote and flexible access to our modules and their associated resources.