

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 12/07/2019

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Aviation

Subject(s):

All Aviation Modules

Programme(s) / Module(s):

BSc Aviation Technology with Pilot Studies
BSc Aviation Technology and Management

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.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

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 |
| The uniqueness of the course is its focus on aviation rather than aeronautical or aerospace engineering. The course content is a good preparation for a career in aviation, either as a pilot or in one of many associated aviation roles. | | |
| 13. | Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear? | Y |
| I would say that rather than direct research the programme benefits by keeping up to date with advances in the aviation industry as exemplified by the Aviation Futures module and the final year projects. | | |
| 14. | Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD? | N |
| Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD Not in its current form. Only if project oriented elements are further enhanced. However I strongly support this idea. | | |
| 15. | Does the programme include clinical practice components? | N |
| Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here: Practice components are in line with learning outcomes | | |
| 16. | Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)? | 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 |
| There is a good mix of modules assessed solely by coursework or exam and were modules are assessed by both the mix is appropriate | | |
| 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 student cohort of 16 is quite small, the majority of which have achieved a good academic standard at least as good if not better than comparable courses in other universities

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> <p>None</p> | | |

Other comments

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

A very well run and well managed course and looked after by a very efficient administrator. I am grateful for making my job very easy and enjoyable

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
 AVIA3050

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:

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. 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

There were no comments by the External Examiner to respond to.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

There were no comments by the External Examiner to respond to.

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:

There were no comments by the External Examiner to respond to.

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 Examiner.

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 were pleased to note that the External Examiner recognises the uniqueness of the programme and that the programme keeps abreast of advances in the aviation industry. The new Aviation B.Eng. programme, launching in 2020 will be much more strongly research-led, in the School's areas of strength in materials, energy and whole systems, than the current B.Sc. programmes.

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 that the External Examiner commented on the variety of assessment methods. The current final year is indeed small, although of high quality as the External comments, but efforts to enhance student recruitment have paid off and there are 28 students due to enter level 3 for 2019/20. Our recruitment target for September 2019 is 30 home/EU students entering level 1, plus international student recruitment.

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

We are most pleased that the External Examiner found the programme well run, with effective administrative support by the Student Support Office and are grateful for his positive comments about the external examination process.