

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 18/02/2020

Part A: General Information**Subject area and awards being examined***Title and Name of Examiner:**Faculty / School of:*

Chemistry

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

Chemical Biology & Drug Design

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

MSc

Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards**Points of innovation and/or good practice**

Chemical biology/medicinal chemistry is a major research strength at the University of Leeds and this is reflected in the high quality of teaching and training delivered in this course. The research reports and presentations, from the students, which I was able to view remotely online were all of a good standard. Most of the research projects seemed to have a good balance of chemistry and biology. Whilst most projects are laboratory based (wet lab) there was at least one project that was mainly based on modelling (dry lab) work. It can be easier to generate a larger body of results from a modelling project, in a short space of time, compared with experimental projects. This can lead to report from a dry lab project that could appear to be more substantial than reports from typical experimental projects. It is particularly important that due consideration is given to this during project marking. In particular, modelling projects, should be carefully scrutinized, by theoretical experts who can fully evaluate the quality.

Enhancements made from the previous year

The high standards have been maintained

Matters for Urgent Attention

NA

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	Y
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	Y
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	Y

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

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?	Y

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 programme structure, design and aims are very good.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
-----	---	---

The course builds on strong research in Chemical Biology and Medicinal Chemistry at Leeds.

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 / 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
-----	---	---

The design and structure of the assessment methods was good. The marking of modules and the classification of awards was also appropriate. Overall the quality of teaching, training and supervision was very good.

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
The standards of the research reports and the quality of the research presentations is comparable with the output from MChem students at the		
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</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
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?	N
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

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Chemical Biology and Drug Design

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

MSc

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

School of Chemistry, Faculty of Engineering and Physical Sciences

Address for communication:

School of Chemistry, University of Leeds LS7 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) should be attached to an e-mail and sent to the Pro-Dean for Student Education in the relevant Faculty. Following approval by the Pro-Dean for Student Education, the School must send the response (including the full original report) 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

We thank _____ for his supportive comments. We recognise that different types of research projects can generate results more or less easily and we fully agree that computational projects should be assessed by experts in that field. As the project module is now shared with two other MSc courses, the availability of potential examiners with a very broad range of experience, including computational chemistry, is assured.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We are very happy that _____ recognises that our high standards have been maintained year on year.

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:

N/A

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:

We are very pleased that _____ recognises that the programme structure, design and aims are very good, and that the course builds on strong research in Chemical Biology and Medicinal Chemistry at Leeds.

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 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 that _____ recognises the quality of teaching and assessment.

Other comments

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

N/A