



COVENANT UNIVERSITY, OTA EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT FORM

(A) GENERAL INFORMATION

	Preliminary Information	Academic Session 2020 / 2021
1.	College: ENGINEERING	
2.	Department: CHEMICAL ENGINEERING	
3.	Programme: B. ENG. CHEMICAL ENGINEERING	
4.	Name of External Examiner (with full title): ENGR. PROF. O. A. OLAFADEHAN	
5.	External Examiner's Home Institution: UNIVERSITY OF LAGOS, LAGOS, NIGERIA	
6.	External Examiner's Department: CHEMICAL AND PETROLEUM ENGINEERING	
7.	Rank of External Examiner: PROFESSOR	
8.	Telephone Number: +234802-912-9559	
9.	Email address: oolafadehan@unilag.edu.ng	
10.	Course Code: CHE 52 Title of course examined: Patent and Invention, Industrial Chemicals	

Note: All preliminary information are to be provided by Head of Department before this form is sent to the External Examiner

(B) EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S OBE COMPLIANCE

- (i) Professional Qualification: FIOGR, NSChE, NSE
- (ii) Are you COREN Registered? ☒ yes If yes, COREN Registration R15180
- (iii) Have you undergone any training on OBE? ☒ no If yes, when?
- (iv) Are you OBE Certified? ☒ no If yes, when?

(C) KEY ASPECTS WHERE YOUR COMMENTS ARE SOUGHT AS AN EXAMINER

Guiding instructions on completion of External Examiner's report form

A checklist, containing prerequisite conditions for external examining, has been included for your use. Please specify if there are issues or comments made in your previous report that have not been addressed. Your report need not be limited to the areas we have highlighted, and you are requested in Section 10 to make free comments on any other matter that you consider important.

Guiding instructions on completion of External Examiner's report form

A checklist, containing prerequisite conditions for external examining, has been included for your use. Please specify if there are issues or comments made in your previous report that have not been addressed. Your report need not be limited to the areas we have highlighted, and you are requested in Section 10 to make free comments on any other matter that you consider important.

Please clearly differentiate between suggestions or advice for consideration and recommendations that require action of the relevant authorities.

You have our assurance that your report will be considered at the most appropriate levels, first in the Department concerned and then subsequently at the College level in order to ensure that substantial issues that you raise are given the necessary and commensurate attention. In addition, your report will be considered subsequently as part of the Annual Appraisal and Quality Improvement processes. You are asked not to identify individual students or staff members by name.

You are asked to type in your report into the soft copy of this form addressed to the Vice Chancellor of Covenant University promptly. The report is expected within 2 weeks of vetting of the examination questions and marked scripts.

1. Programme's OBE Compliance

You are requested to make clear and specific comments on the following vital areas related to OBE curriculum:

1a. Assessment of programme curriculum

The programme curriculum was assessed and found to be compliant with OBE curriculum.

1b. Assessment of OBE implementation and achievement of the POs by the students.

The programme objectives (OPs) were achieved based on the assessment of OBE implementation.

1c. Assessment of staff quality including qualifications and industry exposure. This should include an assessment of work load of each staff in teaching, research, consultancy and supervision of student projects.

It was discovered that 15 Faculty out of 18 possessed PhD and all the Departmental Faculty did have succinct exposure in chemical and allied industries. The work load of each staff was moderate with a staff taking almost 2 courses per semester and supervising 4 students in 2020/2021 academic session. The research prowess of each staff was outstanding with many research outputs in Scopus and Web of Science and their research works are visible to the national and international academic communities via Google scholar, researchGate, academia, amongst others.

1d. Assessment of staff-student ratio and student workload. If found to be insufficient, please recommend corrective action to be taken by the institution.

The staff-student ratio was adequate with ratio 1 to 4 for the 2020/2021 academic session and the student workload per semester was sufficient, which did not pose much curriculum stress on the students.

1e. Assessment of preparation process of examination papers i.e. procedures for setting and vetting, quality assurance, confidentiality and security.

The preparation processes of examination papers were duly followed by setting the questions well before the Omega examinations were taken and vetted by the External Examiner who made some comments/suggestions/corrections/objective criticisms. All these were factored into the Omega examinations written by the students having protected the integrity of the examination questions.

If. Assessment of examination papers and marking schemes set for the questions, coverage of syllabus, adequate balance between theory and application, setting of questions of equal level, adequate choice of questions, and appropriateness of marking scheme.

Eight examination papers (CHE 520, CHE 521, CHE 522, CHE 524, CHE 526, CHE 527, CHE 528 and PET 525) were assessed for the Omega Semester 2020/2021 and their respective marking schemes were in conformity with the Questions set. All the questions did reflect exhaustive coverage of the syllabuses.

Ig. Assessment of the marked answer scripts based on a sample of good, average and weak candidates. Fairness/disparity of marking, follow-through method adopted if answer to one section is wrong, response of candidates to the question, and distribution of marks

Assessment of the marked answer scripts based on a sample of good, average and weak candidates. Fairness/disparity of marking, follow-through method adopted if answer to one section is wrong, response of candidates to the question, and distribution of mark

The marked answer scripts of CHE 520, CHE 521, CHE 522, CHE 524, CHE 526, CHE 527 and CHE 528 were duly vetted and found to be void of any human and computational error/mistake, based on a random sample of excellent, very good, good, fairly good, average and weak students. Marks were equally distributed according to the depth of questions set

Ih. Assessment of coursework, laboratory work, assignments, design projects, final year projects.

Course works and assignments were assessed, laboratory work was not applicable to the final year students so it could not be assessed. The final year design and research projects were assessed at the end of the 2020/2021 academic session. The theme of the design project addressed environmental issues and health concerns by utilising waste polyethylene bottles to produce bis(2-hydroxyethyl) terephthalate (BHET) using diethylene glycol as solvent and potassium sulphate as catalyst. The design simulation softwares of ASPEN PLUS, HAZOP, HAZID and risk management were employed in achieving this aim. The final year research projects

Ij. Assessment of examination procedures and regulations

The examination procedures and regulations were carried out and assessed by the U

1k. Assessment process of the programme.

The programme was assessed and found to compete with the best national, continent and global practices of Chemical Engineering.

2. Your Participation in the Moderation process

Please include comments on the following: adequacy of orientation information given to you as regards your role as External Examiner; the value of relevant documentation received (including University regulations and assessment criteria); the sufficiency of time given to you to approve examination papers; opportunities for inspection of sufficient samples of examination scripts.

Sufficient orientation information was given to me by the HoD, Chemical Engineering and the Departmental Examination Officer as regards my role as External Examiner. The assessment criteria were made available as a guide. I had access to all the relevant documents well before the Omega Semester Examinations were conducted and had ample opportunities for inspection of quite a number of examination scripts.

3. Suitability of the Course Structure, Learning Content and Modules

Please comment on whether the structure and content of the taught course(s) and its constituent modules are coherent and appropriate for the specific undergraduate/postgraduate level concerned, the course outline, course objectives and intended learning outcomes of course concerned. Have you found evidence of research-led teaching/ scholarship informing the curriculum and its pedagogy?

The structure and contents of CHE 520, CHE 521, CHE 522, CHE 524, CHE 526, CHE 527 and CHE 528 and their constituent modules were coherent and appropriate for the Bachelor Degree in Chemical Engineering, the course outline and understanding and application of each course in the process and chemical industries. There was a strong evidence of research-led teaching and scholarship informing the curriculum and its pedagogy.

4. Quality of Assessment

Please comment on whether the methods of assessment, marking, and grading (if applicable) are appropriate to the objectives, intended learning outcomes, structure, and content of the course. In addition, whether the examination questions assess a variety of cognitive dimensions (such as testing for knowledge, understanding, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation); whether marking schemes and grading are set at the appropriate level; whether the method of final assessment allows for appropriate discrimination between candidates.

The methods of assessment of the students pertaining to the questions set, marking of examination scripts and grading of students were found to be eminently appropriate to the objectives, intended learning outcomes, structure and contents of CHE 520, CHE 521, CHE 522, CHE 524, CHE 526, CHE 527 and CHE 528. The examination questions did assess sound knowledge, deep understanding, industrial application, rigorous analysis, detailed synthesis and evaluation in all. The marking schemes and grading were at the appropriate level and the final assessment of the students by each of the Examiners was done without any bias or favour.

5. Evaluation of Marking Standards

Please comment on whether the marking of examination scripts was conducted rigorously and objectively, with the marking schemes and grading applied in a consistent way; whether the final assessment of the candidates was fair and in accordance with the criteria for marking and grading; and whether evidence of this consistency of standards can be seen across modules of the course.

The marking of examination scripts in CHE 520, CHE 521, CHE 522, CHE 524, CHE 526, CHE 527 and CHE 528 was conducted rigorously and objectively, with the marking schemes and grading applied in a consistent manner. The final assessment of the candidates was fair and in consonance with criteria for marking and grading and the consistency of standards was evidenced across the modules of each of the courses.

6. Quality of Students' Performance / Learning Outcome

Please comment on your overall impression of the quality of the students and their performance and whether the general performance depict the attainment of learning objectives and intended learning outcomes of the course. Does the range of assessment methods and performance provide evidence of effective student learning?

I found the quality of the students and their performances very impressive, which depicted the attainment of learning objectives and intended learning outcomes of each of the courses. The methods of the range of assessment and performance provided strong evidence of effective student learning.

7. Comparison with Similar Programmes of Study at Other Institutions

Based on your experience, please indicate whether you consider that the standards of the course, its mode of assessment, and performance of students are comparable with those at other top institutions (National and International)

8. Administration of the Assessment Process

Please comment on the procedures followed for the external assessment, the administrative arrangements and their appropriateness and effectiveness, and the adequacy of the support provided to you.

The procedures for the external assessment were strictly adhered to; the administrative arrangements were superlative, eminently appropriate and highly effective; and the support was humane and sufficient to get the assignment done in time.

9. External examiners' report checklist

Click on the box to indicate your choice

Programme Material (Did you Receive the following)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Course / programme handbook(s)/Curriculum?	
Programme/Course regulations (these will most likely be in the programme handbook)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
A copy of the Course Curriculum (these will be in the programme handbook)?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Assessment briefs/marketing criteria?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Draft examination Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Did you receive all the draft papers?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
If not, was this at your request?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Were the nature and level of the questions appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Marking examination scripts	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Did you receive all the scripts?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Were the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Were the scripts marked in such a way that the correlation between allotted marks on the marking scheme and what is awarded on the scripts?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Project reports	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Was the layout and organization of dissertations/final year reports appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Were the method and standard of assessment appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Continuous Assessment (CA)	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Was the allocation of scores between CA and Examination satisfactory?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Was the performance in CA satisfactory relative to examination performance?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Was the course file presented? (containing: CLO, Lecture notes, CV of the lecturer, questions for tests, examination with marking guides and results)	<input type="checkbox"/> YES

12345

10. Other Comments/Recommendations

For a 3-unit course, NUC stipulates that the Examiner should set 7 questions and students are required to answer only five questions in 3 hours. Hence, examination questions are to be set in such a way that the student will have the opportunity of having an option of choice instead of being asked to answer all the questions set, as was conducted in the Omega Semester 2020/2021 in particular and in general the academic session

Name of External Examiner

OLAOSEBIKAN ABIDOYE OLAFADEHAN

Rank

PROFESSOR

Digital Signature

Olaosebikan A. Olafadehan

Digitally signed by Olaosebikan A. Olafadehan
DN: cn=Olaosebikan A. Olafadehan, o=UNIVERSITY OF LAGOS, Lagos,
NIGERIA, ou=Chemical and Petroleum Engineering,
email=olaosebikan@unilag.edu.ng, c=NGA
Date: 2021.09.13 09:28:39 +01'00'

Date

September 27, 2021

11. HOD's Comments on observations of External Examiner and actions to be taken

The comments of the External Examiner are well noted. He did an excellent job. However, in response to his comments in section 10, the Department follows the OBE examination questions setting format that requires students to answer all questions during an examination.

Name

Engr. Prof. Vincent Efeovbokhan

Digital Signature



Date

Sept. 29, 2021