

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	English
Subject(s):	MA in Theatre and Development
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Dissertation Uses of Theatre
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	

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.

The placement and mentoring that underpins this programme are exemplary, as I have noted in previous years' examining. It is important to note that the relationships established with the Companies and organisations hosting these placements are built up over a number of years and represent irreplaceable professional, experiential and intellectual resources to the Academy.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

The quality of work is as high as ever.

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

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

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

My only comment is a concern that the cohort on this excellent programme is smaller. The host placement organisations play an

important role and I can see from their formative feedback that this has become increasingly reciprocal: a great asset.

Standards

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> / N
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> / N
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> / N
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> / N
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> / N
<p><i>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</i></p> <p>See above: nothing to add from previous years' comments. The structure and its pedagogical modalities are unique, with only in my experience offering a comparable programme.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> / 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>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> / N
<p><i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i></p> <p>As training for a PhD the programme is eminently suitable: I have already examined the practice of one candidate who has progressed through this MA (I was his mentor) and although he hasn't submitted the PhD yet I have been able to track and experience his practice-based research through a uniquely original project as it has become what promises to be a very valuable final piece of work.</p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y / <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> / N
<p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i></p>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> / 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>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> / N
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> / 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>		

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:

The formative feedback is detailed, appropriate and very well presented.

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

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:

The special circumstances preceded the Board and were most carefully and fairly conducted.

Other comments

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