

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 01/07/2019

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Mechanical Engineering

Subject(s):

Automotive Engineering

Programme(s) / Module(s):

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

BEng, MEng

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.

Good feedback system for projects, both individual and group. Good robust moderation process in exam marking.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

Improvements made on automotive chassis engineering module (MECH5185M) by introducing more lectures on difficult topics within and allocated more marks to coursework, which have reflected in better student performance. Improved minutes for each module.

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

Vehicle and product system design (MECH5760M) has particularly high marks, approx. 2/3 with 1st class. Exam and coursework should be more challenging and perhaps more automotive specific. 4 modules on 2nd year with more than 50% of cohort achieving a 1st class. This has been noted in the minutes along with proposals to make the modules more challenging or adding new material, which is recommended.

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>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</p> <p>The structure of automotive engineering course is good with appropriate aims and LO's</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<p>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)</p> <p>Good range of student projects on offer from the various disciplines</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<p>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</p> <p>N/A</p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<p>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</p> <p>N/A</p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y
<p>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</p> <p>I cannot see a reason why the IMechE would not accredit the course. In my opinion the course meets all of the requirements and makes good use of group work.</p>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p>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.</p> <p>All modules seen do give the students opportunities to meet learning outcomes. Good range of coursework.</p>		
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
<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> The standards are particularly good at level 2. Level 3 and 4 demonstrate a better mix of achievements</p>		
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i> Assessment was appropriate and fair, feedback was also good in general.</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
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> Exam board and processes were very efficient and fair. Due consideration was given to all students with some post board actions that needed more time to resolve.</p>		

Other comments

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

Clear to see from exam board that students who had taken an industrial placement had out performed others on the whole. Module summary sheets with minutes are very helpful, please continue. If possible, it would be nice to have split between Coursework and Exam for each module. Unfortunately, it was not possible to meet with some automotive students this year, but understandable due to relative small number of students and timing. Overall, very pleased with course, well-structured and run with robust processes in place.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Automotive Engineering

Programme(s) / Module(s):

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

BEng, MEng

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Associate Professor (Automotive Programme Manager)

Faculty / School of:

Engineering

Address for communication:

School of Mechanical Engineering
University of Leeds
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. 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

Positive comments received, we will maintain the current moderation processes.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Positive comments received about changes to MECH5185 Automotive Chassis Engineering module, we will monitor student performance to assess effectiveness of those changes.

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:

The module MECH5760 Vehicle and system design will be reviewed to make it more challenging and more subject specific. 2nd year modules will also be evaluated to make it more challenging.

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:

Positive response received for all questions. Further response not required.

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:

Positive comments received for all questions. Further response not required.

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:

Positive comments received for all questions. Further response not required.

Other comments

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

The module summary sheets has been recognised as a good practice and we will continued trying to split coursework and exams. Also if possible, we will try to organise meeting with automotive students.