

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 06/11/2019

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

School of Chemical and Process Engineering

Subject(s):

Petroleum Engineering

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MSc Petroleum Production Engineering

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

MSc Petroleum Production Engineering

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

Points of innovation and/or good practice

There was evidence of a systematic moderation of marked scripts that was registered in a document. Projects were second marked. A detailed briefing was offered to students to work in their projects, setting milestones to offer feedback to students before final submission.

Enhancements made from the previous year

A rubric was added to the marking scheme of laboratory and project report, facilitating the process of marking and giving a comprehensive feedback to students.

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 / 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 / N
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y / N
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y / N
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y / N
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y / N
<p><i>The course benefit from combining teaching with another school for specialised modules (reservoir engineering and rock mechanics). A new module: Unconventional Reservoirs was added to the curriculum. This module addresses current challenges and opportunities in the industry.</i></p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y / N
<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><i>Research project teams are linked with supervisors research interest and expertise.</i></p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	Y / 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?	Y / 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 / N
<p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i> <i>I understand the teaching team is seeking accreditation from the Energy Institute. Given the structure, ILOS, industry orientation, standards, and graduates from the course, I support this accreditation process, and wish the teaching team a clean success.</i></p>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y / N
<p><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> <p><i>There is a blended assessment strategy including exams, coursework, laboratory and research project that offer students opportunities to reach the ILOs. The samples of assessment show evidence of alignment with level and ILOs of the modules. The laboratory of Well Control offers an excellent teaching and learning experience to students.</i></p>		

18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y / N
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y / N
<p><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> <p><i>This year cohort displayed a good performance with average in modules above 65%. There were only two students that did not perform well.</i></p>		
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p>		

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 / N
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y / N
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y / N
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y / N
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y / N
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y / N
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y / N
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y / N
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y / N
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y / N
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i> 35 N/A</p>		

Other comments

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

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Petroleum Production Engineering

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MSc Petroleum Production Engineering

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

MSc

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Head of School

Faculty / 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

The positive feedback with respect to the research projects with respect to both the detailed briefing provided to the students and the setting of milestones to provide feedback to the students alongside the clarity of the marking of the projects is acknowledged. The School will continue to identify opportunities to enhance its processes and ensure that there is real clarity provided to students in terms of expectations for the research project and related modules.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

The School is introducing rubrics for all modules in terms of assessment structure thereby ensuring there is greater clarity to both staff and students in terms of expectations around feedback of coursework/assignments. Further progress on this will be made in the next 12 months.

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 issues raised.

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

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 acknowledges the examiner's positive feedback with respect to the programme spanning the schools' of Chemical and Process Engineering and Earth and Environment. The School continues to strive to ensure the content of its programmes is up to date and reflective of current practice within industry. This was the rationale for the introduction of the module on Unconventional Reservoirs. The School places a strong emphasis on research informed teaching and this is very much the ethos for research projects which are aligned with the research strengths of academics working in the area of petroleum production engineering. The School thanks the external for highlighting this strength.

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 strives to ensure there is a diversity of assessment including exams, coursework, laboratory and research reports to ensure the ILOs are satisfied and are pleased to note that this has been recognised by the external examiner. By providing this level of diversity in terms of assessing the ILOs, the students have the ability to continually monitor their progress throughout the program. The feedback is structured to ensure students maximize their potential across the program.

The strength of the cohort was recognized by academic staff and this was reflected in the overall classifications for the majority of students. Through the inclusion of more student led activities and increased engagement from teaching staff, the students' positive opinions of the program were increased compared to previous years.

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 comments provided

Other comments

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

N/A