

# The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19      QAT Received 12/08/2019

### Part A: General Information

#### Subject area and awards being examined

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

Chemical and Process Engineering

*Subject(s):*

*Petroleum Engineering*

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

CAPE5600M	Advanced Drilling and Production Technology
CAPE5601M	Drilling and Production Technology
CAPE5620M	Unconventional Oil and Gas Reservoirs
CAPE3601	Drilling and Production Technology
CAPE5630M	Flow Assurance and Oilfield Chemistry
CAPE1030	Introduction to Petroleum Engineering
CAPE1060	Fundamentals of Process Chemistry
CAPE2000	Mathematical Techniques 2

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

**MEBE Petroleum Engineering**  
**MSc Petroleum Production Engineering**

### Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards

#### Points of innovation and/or good practice

*Combination of new and existing modules from other courses to put together the courses in petroleum engineering.*  
*Final year programme gathers relevant topics from the oil industry, and expose the students to independent learning experience while they receive feedback to make further progress.*

#### Enhancements made from the previous year

*N/A. First year in the role.*

#### Matters for Urgent Attention

*N/A*

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

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	Y / <del>N</del>
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 / <del>N</del>
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y / <del>N</del>
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y / <del>N</del>
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y / <del>N</del>
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y / <del>N</del>

*The courses have been designed to cover relevant aspect for a petroleum-engineering professional. They have creatively put together modules from different disciplines with new modules. This reflects the multidisciplinary nature of the oil industry and knowledge of the opportunity.*

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y / <del>N</del>
-----	---	------------------

*It was noticed that students have opportunity to get exposed to research and design in the final year project. They were also offered the opportunity to get involved in practical research in the well control laboratory.*

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?	Y / 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 / N
-----	--	-------

*I have not knowledge if this is the case. However the courses could be accredited (e.g.) by the Energy Institute as they comply with the associated requirements.*

## Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y / <del>N</del>
-----	---	------------------

*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.*

18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y / <del>N</del>
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y / <del>N</del>
<i>The structure of the project allows to identify individual performance in the development of the group project. Students get feedback to apply in second phase of the project.</i>		
<i>It would be useful to see statistics of the students performance per module. This would help to identify opportunities for improvement.</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 / <del>N</del>
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y / <del>N</del>
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / <del>N</del>
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / <del>N</del>
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / <del>N</del>
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y / <del>N</del>
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y / <del>N</del>
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y / <del>N</del>
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	<del>Y</del> / N
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y / <del>N</del>
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y / <del>N</del>
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y / <del>N</del>
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / <del>N</del>
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y / <del>N</del>
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / <del>N</del>
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / <del>N</del>
<i>Samples of important pieces of coursework were produced (i.e. final year projects, dissertations). It would be good to have access to other samples of coursework (e.g. presentations, reports, in-class tests). Ideally, it would be interesting to have a chat with students about their learning experience.</i>		

### 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:**Subject(s):*

Petroleum Engineering

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

MEng/BEngPetroleum Engineering

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

BEng/MEng

*Title and Name of Responder:**Position\*:*

Head of School

*Faculty / School of:*

Chemical and Process Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Physical Sciences

*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***

The School appreciates the positive feedback regarding the ongoing improvements to the course content. New modules were introduced in Level 4 to ensure advanced topics remain relevant to current activities in petroleum engineering. The capstone module, Petroleum Engineering Project (CAPE3010), is reviewed on an annual basis with entirely new field locations provided to each design group to ensure it remains relevant. Furthermore a key criteria is to ensure that the students are exposed to opportunities whereby they can develop and demonstrate independent learning whilst providing feedback to ensure they continually develop their skills.

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

N/A

***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 areas 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:*

The School apologises for failing to provide copies of the previous External Examiner's reports and the School's responses. These will be made available at your next visit. An External Examiner Mentor will be appointed as soon as is feasible. Time will be allocated during the next visit to discuss the examination processes. In the interim, the School will introduce you to your mentor so that you can discuss with them any issues that you have prior to next visit.

## 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 School appreciates the positive responses regarding the program standards. Of particular note is the feedback on the fact that the course has been designed to cover relevant aspects for a petroleum-engineering professional and that through the creative bringing together of modules, the course reflects the multi-disciplinary nature of the oil industry. Furthermore the reference to the exposure of the students to both design and research and practical research in a well-controlled laboratory environment is extremely positive and we would like to thank \_\_\_\_\_ for highlighting these aspects of 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:*

The School notes the request by \_\_\_\_\_ for the specific module statistics for all Chemical and Process Engineering (CAPE) and Earth and Environment (SOEE) modules on the petroleum engineering degree. The issue is that some modules are co-taught with other degree programmes and thus the current statistics do not always reflect the performance of the petroleum engineering students. However, the School will ensure that in the future for co-taught modules, evidence of performance for the petroleum engineering students will be provided to allow areas for improvement to be identified.

## 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:*

The School acknowledges that a sufficient range of coursework was not made available to allow the effective evaluation of course content and quality. To address this issue we will ensure that assessed work submitted to co-taught modules will be made available to you to assess the performance of petroleum engineering students. Furthermore assessed work on Earth and Environment modules will be available for review. The School will endeavour to have students studying on the programme available to allow \_\_\_\_\_ to talk with them about their experiences. This proved difficult due to the students having completed their studies and being away from the University at the time of the examination meeting.

## Other comments

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

No comments provided.