

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:	School of Music
Subject(s):	<i>Music</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MA Applied Psychology of Music
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MA

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.

There seems to be a very strong, clear emphasis on research methodology.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

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?	<u>Y</u> / N
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	Y / <u>N</u>
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	Y / <u>N</u>

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

Standards

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	<u>Y</u> / N
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	<u>Y</u> / N
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	<u>Y</u> / N
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	<u>Y</u> / N
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	<u>Y</u> / 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>I was very impressed with the overall programme structure. Giving students a whole semester devoted to either qualitative or quantitative research is a good idea, as is the opportunity to spend a whole project critically analysing a single paper in depth. I wonder if, going forward, it might also be worth considering giving students the chance to contrast two papers, as it might help with discussion about what works and what doesn't.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	<u>Y</u> / 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>Yes. Several assignments were based specifically on prior research.</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	<u>Y</u> / <u>N</u>
<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?	<u>Y</u> / <u>N</u>
<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)?	<u>Y</u> / <u>N</u>
<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?	<u>Y</u> / 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>The assessment methods, marking and feedback were all appropriate to the ILOs.</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	<u>Y</u> / N
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	<u>Y</u> / N

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:

The work was generally excellent across all areas such as methods, statistics, referencing and literature reviews, demonstrating that the students had a good understanding of what they needed to do in the assignments, even if the quality of the work itself sometimes varied, as would be expected.

Perhaps going forward, students could also be encouraged to discuss the theoretical frameworks behind various topics, rather than sometimes diving straight in with a review of what has been done so far.

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

Feedback from staff was detailed and thorough, and there was a good range of marks.

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?	<u>Y</u> / N
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	<u>Y</u> / N
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	<u>Y</u> / N
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	<u>Y</u> / N
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	<u>Y</u> / N
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	<u>Y</u> / N
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	<u>Y</u> / N
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	<u>Y</u> / N
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	<u>Y</u> / N
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	<u>Y</u> / N
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	<u>Y</u> / N
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	<u>Y</u> / N
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	<u>Y</u> / N
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y / <u>N</u>
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
<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