

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	Performance and Cultural Industries
Subject(s):	Culture, Creativity and Entrepreneurship; Arts Management
Programme(s) / Module(s):	PECI 5105M Creative Work PECI 5204M Theoretical Perspectives (Culture, Creativity, Entrepreneurship) PECI 5209M Critical Debates in Culture PECI 5207M Arts Management and Cultural Leadership PECI 5208M Cultural Policy: Models and Debates PECI 5211M Audience Engagement and Impact PECI 5106M Performance and Collaborative Enterprise PECI 5210M Enterprise and Consultancy Practice PECI 5212M Research Perspectives (Culture, Creativity, Entrepreneurship) PECI 5102M Research Project
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MA Culture, Creativity and Entrepreneurship

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.

I'd like to highlight a particular model for providing feedback on the module Audience Engagement and Impact (PECI 5211M). The written feedback is clear and concise succinct with 3 or 4 points for the student to work on, individually tailored to each student. This is excellent practice, which I have adopted in my own insitution and which I would like to raise her as an example of best practice.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

Some of the practical work for the module Performance and Collaborative Enterprise (PECI 5106M) was made available for me to inspect, as well as audit trails for the assessment of the module, as per my feedback from last year. Many thanks to the module leader.

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

N/A

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

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

Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.

The aims, objectives and learning outcomes of the programme are appropriate for a Master's degree in this subject area. The programme provides an strong balance of theoretical perspectives, research training and practical, industry and vocational aspects. The course produces graduates who will occupy administrative, management and leadership roles in cultural and creative organisations, or work in roles which draw on their skills as creative entrepreneurs in both public and private sectors, in the fields of creative work, cultural policy, regeneration, arts marketing and arts and cultural management. It also offers the appropriate means of progression to PhD study. The programme is appropriate for an international cohort, with the content reflecting the creative and cultural sectors worldwide.

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

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)

The curriculum is both informed by and based around current research, which means that students gain access to cutting-edge scholarship, and get a sense of how research informs teaching. The reading lists are up-to-date and reflect current scholarship. Students are taught how to conduct research appropriate to the creative sectors and their final individual project tests their availability to conceptualise, undertake and write up their own research project.

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	Y / N ?
-----	--	---------

Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:

I'm not clear on what an 'integrated PhD is' but the programme prepares students for further study and whets their appetite for doctoral research. The feedback for the highest performing students often encourages them to pursue getting their work published and to explore doctoral study. It is great to see this progression being actively encouraged by staff members. As above, Students are taught how to conduct research appropriate to the creative sectors and their final individual project tests their availability to conceptualise, undertake and write up their own research project.

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y / N
<p><i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i></p> <p>The assessments are varied and include: pitch presentations, placements, academic essays, critical reflections and business plans, as well as practical work, and group work. The feedback is instructive, clear and encouraging.</p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i></p> <p>N/A</p>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<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>See 15 above. The marking shows a good range of grades, although the grading for the final project were lower overall this year compared to the previous cohort. The ratification process was carried out correctly.</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></p> <p>There are no issues on the programme with regards to quality of work. The only point worth a special mention here is that the more reflective work can result in superficiality. There may also be a cultural difference here due to the high number of Chinese students on the programme, whose educational background does not train them for critical thinking or for them to foreground their own voice in their academic work. Some additional reading on reflexivity may be helpful here.</p>		
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p> <p>There is some inconsistency in relation to feedback. This may be due to a teaching team that covers multiple programmes and external markers. Conversations about standardisation and benchmarking may be useful. I mentioned this point at the exam board meeting.</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></p> <p>N/A</p>		

Other comments

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

As last year, the programme is in good shape. There is a good range of modules and varied modes of assessment. It is well organised and delivered. Students also have the opportunity for students to shape research questions around their own interests by devising their own essay and/or research questions.

There have been some staffing changes, due to the bereavement of a member of staff and the resignation of another due to long-term sickness. I welcome the new appointments, and commend the existing staff for ensuring that standards were maintained in the period of instability.

I have some summaries and comments about individual modules:

PECI 5204M Theoretical Perspectives: Culture, Creativity and Entrepreneurship

This is a big and well organised module that is team taught. The split assignments ensure that the students engage with a broad base of theory. I looked over the longer essay and randomly selected from across the submissions. The grading appears to be fair and accurate, although sometimes the feedback can be overly general and often short, e.g. around 50 words is insufficient for a 5,000 word essay.

PECI 5209M Critical Debates in Culture and Place

This is an interesting, co-taught module with a split assignment. The assignment encourages students to devise their own focus, so it is good to see such a breadth of topics being tackled. I sampled the essays, as the presentation and associated materials were not available. It would be good to see the videos of the presentations next year. The marking is fair and accurate, with extensive critical feedback provided. Some assignments feature the student's names. Anonymity should be ensured and maintained.

PECI 5212M Research Perspectives (Culture, Creativity, Entrepreneurship)

This is a well-organised module. The student work shows variety and breadth, but could be more engaged with the research methods literature. The feedback is short but constructive and clear. It gives students a good sense of how to improve their work. Another split assessment. I

randomly selected a spread of samples from a range of grades, as I was having some difficulty with the online system. Whilst the presentations were not made available, the tutor's grading notes were accessible, which is very helpful and provides an important audit trail for ensuring quality and transparency.

PECI 5102M Research Project

A great range and breadth of students' work here and a good mix of grades, covering the whole spectrum and no fails, which is a testament to the teaching on the programme and the level of support provided by the department. This continues to build on work of a good standard over the last few years. It was especially impressive due to the changes in the teaching team, with new appointments brought in and issues with staffing over illness and the sad and sudden death of a key member of the teaching team.

To cross check consistency due to the larger marking team with some new appointments, some assignments were referred to a third marker for spot checking and moderation. This is a fair amount of extra work for a teaching team already stretched, but commendable and worth a mention in the report as it demonstrates the commitment to ensuring and maintaining quality and standards. A special thanks to _____ and _____.

PECI5106M Performance and Collaborative Enterprise

Many thanks to _____ for making the practical materials available. I inspected an extensive collection of students' work, marksheets and marking notes. The marking looks fair and accurate, and the written feedback is thorough and detailed, although the grades are rather bunched. The student's work is not particularly strong, which is reflected in the grades and as such, it would be helpful to see more critical feedback, with students given clear instructions for how they could improve their work. The work in general seems very under-theorised. The module information is dispersed and fragmented across several different documents, which is confusing to me and inconsistent with the other modules in the department.

PECI5207M Arts Management and Cultural Leadership

This is a well prepared and organised module. The assessment is a mixture of presentation and essay. It would be good to see the videos of the presentations next year. The essays show a good range of marks and are fairly and accurately graded, with helpful and constructive comments. One note of consideration: there is some variation in the markers in terms of format. This is to be expected when there is more than one tutor on the programme. However, it might be worth considering whether the feedback can be made more uniform. i.e. if one tutor uses the 2/3/4 things to improve model, maybe both could or neither use this. Students inevitably compare notes and so it might be worth considering this?

Some essays have the student's names included on the assignment. These should be anonymised to ensure fair and impartial marking procedures. Perhaps it's worth re-reminding the students about this important aspect of submission protocol?

PECI5211M Audience Engagement and Impact

This is a large well organised and delivered option module. The module material is up-to-date, extensive and relevant to the needs of those working in the arts. The assessment is vocationally relevant and useful. There is a great range shown in the work of the students, with lots of variety in the essays in terms of case studies, demonstrating the broad appeal and relevance of the module. The grading is fair and accurate and the feedback precise - detailed, digestible and direct. One minor point: the students didn't seem to understand that the written assignment was a report and needed to be in a particular format. Even some of the students with the highest grades seemed to overlook this. I can see from the module handbook that there is a long and fulsome section on how to write a report, with a detailed Q&A and links to the library for study

skills info on report writing, so this is not a criticism of the tutor. Invitation to the tutor to consider whether there is anything that can be done to make this clearer next year?

PECI5210M Enterprise and Consultancy Practice

Whilst I welcome this vocationally useful module, I have some concerns. It is organised in a different way and deviates from the standard weekly lecture and seminar format. Students have contact time with the tutor but there is less structure. The assignment is a combination of group work report, individual or group presentation, and essay. The module handbook is rather scant and the reading list could have more of an emphasis on enterprise and consultancy. At present the list is mostly generic management texts or specific to arts marketing.

I looked at the reflective essay only as the presentation materials were not made available. The marking feedback was very positive and encouraging, and the essay marks appeared quite high overall. However, there were no anomalies to speak of when we looked further at the grades during the exam board.

As this module is not running next year, there are no actions to take forward.

PECI5105M Creative Work

This module has a split assessment, comprising of a presentation and research project based on a placement. The extensive reading list is great and all of the key texts are listed there. The presentation was not made available so only looked at the project work. The marking is far and accurate, and the feedback detailed and constructive. It would be good to see the videos of the presentations next year.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

Programme Leader

Performance and Cultural Industries

*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 qat@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 the reviewer for the commendation for the format of feedback for the module audiences engagement and plan to recommend tutors roll this out across all modules in the coming year

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We are pleased you were happy with access to the missing module from last year but recognise your concern about not seeing presentations. We will endeavour to record all these for the coming year and make them available via Minerva

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:

The external examiner has not responded to these questions

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 thank the examiner for their positive comments on the programme, in terms of content, as well as the balance between being academically robust while also improving students employability.

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:

We thank the examiner for their positive comments on the marking and feedback, and in particular the suggestion that we consider ways of improving students approach to reflective writing. The relevant staff will consider how to address this in module reviews.

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:

The examiner was happy with all aspects but made no additional comments.

Other comments

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

We thank the examiner for their positive comments about the commitment demonstrated by the staff team in what has indeed been a very difficult year, with the death of one colleague and retirement of a second, at the same time as significant uplift in student numbers.

We have already referred above to our plans to take on board the examiners request to see videos of presentations next year and these have been recorded for semester 1. In addition we have rolled out a standard feedback format based on the exemplar noted this year.

While the third marking approach to Research project worked this year we hope to minimise the extra workload this entails next year by adding a standardisation meeting for all staff at the start of the marking process.

The comments given on each module are extremely used and will be considered in module review meetings. In particular we will consider how to increase engagement with theory in performance and collaborative enterprise; how to improve reflective writing in creative work and report writing in audience engagement.