

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

<i>Faculty / School of:</i>	Performance and Cultural Industries
<i>Subject(s):</i>	Theatre and Performance
<i>Programme(s) / Module(s):</i>	PECI 3700 Independent Research Project PECI 3106 Performance project PECI 2706 Cultural Flashpoints PECI 12705 Theatre Directing PECI 12102 Collaborative Performance Project PECI 2710 Industry Study PECI 2101 Researching Theatre and Performance
<i>Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):</i>	BA Hons

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.

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 modules I examined didn't involve changes but it was evident that Directing had addressed the concerns identified in last year's report and that there was more continuity between Level two taught modules and Level 3 research options. There were several Individual Research Projects this year that clearly built on second year foundations, enabling students to write in more depth, building on the contextual research undertaken in year 2.

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

No areas for urgent attention

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiners Handbook?	Y / N
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School 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 a 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 Leeds Theatre and Performance programme is ambitious and distinctive, offering students breadth and depth through a very well balanced curriculum that combines skills based core modules, research led specialist options and an abundance of opportunities for working in educational, social, community and professional contexts. The aims and learning outcomes have been recently reviewed in conjunction with the ongoing curriculum development exercise. In the modules I examined at levels two and three, there is evidence of students being engaged critically, creatively, conceptually and politically (as artists, cultural activists/ historians and as cultural entrepreneurs). The Level Two modules offer a strong intellectual and practical foundation and also require students to apply their skills in real world contexts through modules such as the collaborative project and the Industry Study. This also develops transferable skills and often results in maturity of expression and professional approaches towards creative practice that are unusual for this formative stage of the degree. Students demonstrate agency and independence as learners, producing work that is often politically engaged and original in modules such as Cultural Flashpoints. The Level 3 work is impressive with the Independent Research Project producing several First Class dissertations, while the Public Performance Project achieved consistently excellent results. It was pleasing to see students developing work from Level Two to Level Three this year and to see this encouraged in feedback on Level Two work. At its best, the academic and practical work achieves standards beyond those expected of Honours Level UG programmes.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear? This is very clearly a research led programme with specialist options reflecting staff research interests and students engaging with current research materials. There are considerable strengths in contemporary performance, scenography, applied theatre, popular culture, gender and sexuality in performance and activism.	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)

This is achieved through curriculum design informed by research and by students undertaking research projects that are consistent with staff specialisms.

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

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

n/a

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
-----	--	---

Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:

n/a		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		
n/a		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<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>The assessments are generally well designed, testing the learning outcomes effectively. Students integrate theory and practice, communicating to a range of audiences using different modes of delivery, including presentations, performances, essays and report writing. Although I am impressed by the quality of written work achieved by the majority of students, the practical modes of assessment produce higher marks than other methods. This was particularly noticeable when comparing marks between the group presentations and essay marks for the Level Two Researching Theatre and Performance module and also comparing student achievement on the Individual Research Project and Public Performance modules at Level Three. Although student group marks are differentiated, there maybe ways in which the assessment tasks could be developed or varied to ensure that students are not carried through group work, particularly at level 3 where the practical element carries a 60% weighting. A viva voce examination, for example might take the form of an after show discussion in which students can demonstrate their conceptual understanding of the work and contribution to process. I also noted that students who produced weaker written work, particularly in the IRP were working with flawed questions. The team have structures in place for supporting students in developing questions, but a mechanism for approving the question might at least ensure that students have a sound basis from which to develop their study. The quality of teaching is consistently excellent and this is evident in student performance. The work produced on Directing this year had improved in content and quality, based on the sample I saw with more attention to production histories and contexts. This was a new module last year.</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
<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>The academic standards are high, comparing favourably to students on comparable courses. However, it was evident at the Exam Board that the Level 2 cohort included a significant number of students with problematic profiles. Some of these had withdrawn or transferred, while others had failed modules due to non submission of work or plagiarism. Poor attendance was a prevalent concern for struggling students with several cases where the student had ceased to correspond and was presumed withdrawn. Lack of engagement with teaching was mentioned when retakes were discussed. The staff had discussed their concerns with student representatives and were consulting with the cohort on strategies to address attendance issues. However, it was also evident that a change to attendance monitoring had caused problems for this cohort so that some students were not picked up until semester 2. As a practice based subject area Theatre and Performance depends upon very high levels of attendance and engagement so it is imperative that this is addressed for the future so that staff can implement early intervention to identify and support students who are struggling to engage. I was also struck by the numbers of plagiarism cases which may also be symptomatic of students who need more support, particularly in modules requiring high levels of independence. There are some minor inconsistencies in marking with some tutors identifying grammatical and typographical errors and others not correcting this.</p>		
<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 Examiners 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>On the whole, the documentation provided to external examiners is excellent. However. It is extremely important for External Examiners to have access to practice.either through invitations to performances or through documentation that is sent through in good time.</p>		

Other comments

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

There are some variables in the material provided to examiners in terms of module handbooks, assessment details and criteria, run of marks etc. It would be helpful to have a standard template for examiner packs, perhaps sharing good practice

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

	Head of School

**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

--

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

For Level 1 or 2 modules: We welcome the recognition that comments about 1708 Theatre Directing in the previous report were taken on board by the new programme team and the concerns had been addressed. This module continues to be actively developed in terms of both content and delivery as a core component of the Level 2 experience.

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:

--

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:

--

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:

For Level 1 or 2 modules: We are reassured by the observation that the Level Two modules on the new BA T&P programme are regarded as being consistent with the ambition and distinctiveness of the PCI offering, and particularly that the "strong intellectual and practical foundation" of these modules foster independence of learning and professionalism in "real world contexts" as the basis for continuing work at Level Three and beyond. We very much hope that we will be able to preserve the continuity of this creative and intellectual development through the new Level Three modules to be offered next year – including Contemporary Theatre Makers and Performance Design & Space – and look forward to the External Examiner being able to sample the outcomes of these modules for the first time in the 2017/18 session.

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:

For Level 1 or 2 modules: The general comment about the different levels of achievement between written and practical assessments, mentioning the Level Two module Researching Theatre & Performance, will need to be pursued in our next round of discussions about modes of assessment across the whole programme, and we will no doubt wish to continue this discussion with the External Examiner once [redacted] has been able to sample the new Level Three practical modules in the 2017/18 session within the revised BA T&P programme. The somewhat weaker profile of results for Level Two students, and the difficulties with attendance and engagement with a minority of the cohort are acknowledge, and steps are being taken for improving the situation in the 2017/18 session, including the development of a new Attendance Monitoring Policy in collaboration with the Student Representatives. Processes for improving consistency of tutor feedback on written work especially are under review by the PCI Assessment Lead for the 2017/18 session.

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:

Other comments

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

For Level 1 or 2 modules: In response to the request for further materials to be presented to the External Examiner in advance, we will be working with the PCI Assessment Lead to provide better quality materials at an earlier stage.

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

QAT Received 21/06/2017

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	School of Performance and Cultural Industries
Subject(s):	<i>Theatre and Performance</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	PECI 2701, 2704, 2707, 2708, 2709, 3107, 3501, 3701, 9001.
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BA

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 was given several new modules to EE this year. These industry facing modules, whilst having a practical element, are clearly tied into the usual high academic expectations of the course. This makes for challenging study as students are directed to a range of new reading resources in arts management and production and styles of research. However, those who take these courses and others similar, if they work hard, are well prepared for future work.

This attention to bridging between the degree and employability is evident elsewhere on the programme, as I've noted in previous years, with course strengths in community engagement and working in quite challenging situations through applied practice. I have been impressed over the years, and reinforced this year, with the attention placed on ethical practice both in working on applied or business projects and within research projects. This is evidenced in the use of contracts with students devising substantial independent study or group work projects and within the Enterprise Project module.

Another strength of the course is the clear link between staff research and teaching. A spate of books, articles and practical involvement in theatre companies/design initiatives were evident throughout the reviewing process of the modules. This current engagement in research feeds directly and obviously into the kinds of very appreciative comments that came in the course evaluations for PECI2701 Creative Practice and Performance Contexts.

It was notable that course module guides included a section detailing changes on that module for the incoming year group. This was an example of excellent practice whereby the staff responses to feedback (student evaluations, peer observation or EE comments) were made clearly visible to the new student group thus completing the feedback loop satisfactorily.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

This year I saw no examples of inconsistency between the assessment marks for students and the feedback. These all tied in very clearly. In addition it was good to see the degree of support offered to students in detailed notes online and on the electronic submission of the essay. In one instance where one tutor had not been quite so thorough, the convenor picked this up, commented back to the less experienced tutor and added remarks for the student. There were more examples this year of email exchanges between 1st and 2nd Markers to show how they resolved differences in marks. It would be preferable if this could be undertaken by all staff on a simple form or the email exchange. This helps the EE understand how larger mark differences were resolved and offers a paper trail should a student complaint arise.

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

The programme is undergoing substantial changes of structure and content and inevitably this leads to some minor issues as it embeds. These are addressed below.

Some changes are needed in the way that the EE is used on this programme as there is an impossible workload at the moment. Methods for resolving this were introduced over the last two years but these were for the former structure. With the new model of the programme fully in place for next year, a rationale can be developed across 2nd and 3rd year modules for EE engagement. This should include invitations to attend practical performance assessments planned well ahead (see below for details).

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiners Handbook?	Y / N
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School 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
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 a External Examiner Mentor?	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

This is tricky as I was EE for the older programme model and am only seeing the new structure and courses this year. Overall however, I can say with confidence that this is a thriving department that sets and meets high standards of course delivery and assessment for this BA. One of its distinct characteristics is its well-established links to industry and local community. The students comment on the value of this within their development and the significance for employability is obvious.

Over the four years I have seen improvement in assessment procedures with greater clarity in the material recorded for the EE showing 1st and 2nd marking, greater consistency in feedback comments tying exactly to the mark awarded and more evidence of discussion between examiners to resolve mark differences. The detailed, specific and helpful feedback given to students has been evident over all the years I have been EE.

One of the many positive aspects of the department that consistently contributes to assuring standards of teaching and assessment is the way that staff use the EE comments, prior to the board, to stimulate discussion on challenging issues that can be specific to the department or apply to the sector as a whole. This allows for debate that recognises the changing environment within which HE exists and how best to manage expectations with the realities we all encounter. Examples of such debates include how to develop best practice in relation to the rise in ECs and very challenging student personal experiences; how to counter the business model of education and how to manage group work assessment with individual moderation.

With the new curriculum on stream, there will inevitably be adjustments made to course content and delivery to embed the new programme. As always in this department suggestions for change and development were met with interest and engagement not defensiveness and again this year productive discussions took place on issues such as band marking, borderlines, feedback practices etc. One issue that might be taken forward is attention on how the curriculum in all courses offer theoretical readings and practical examples that support the departments drive to be inclusive.

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
<p><i>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</i></p> <p>This year spanned the final modules of the older programme and the new structure and content of the incoming programme. Next year will see the full implementation of the new programme and it is hard to comment therefore on overall structure. However, from the new modules I saw for 2nd Years all the materials were clearly presented and I found the course handbooks exceptionally helpful and detailed.</p> <p>I noted that in PECEI 2704 from the course outline I had been given, the choice of subject matter in the schedule sounded time specific and Euro/North American focused. How well are more widely international innovators and female pioneers represented within this structure? After some discussion it was suggested that the course required some modification to better represent the kinds of debates and issues that are taking place on this course but not so evident in the module documentation.</p> <p>As I've stated in previous years, the aims and outcomes for each module are clearly stated and subsequently referred to within the criteria for assessment and again in the marking feedback.</p> <p>The programme is structured to support student choice as they build from foundational courses in the first year to tailoring their degree in line with specific interests. This includes a significant range of choices across other departments in the discovery module and quite different pathways should students wish to focus more fully on links to industry or design.</p>		
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)

Yes very much so and see comments above under B Good Practice. This is a major strength of the department that it is so research active and able to draw on this within the design and delivery of courses.

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
-----	---	---

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.

This has always been a strength of the design of this programme and good practice in this area continues as noted above.

There are a wide range of assessment methods appropriate to this type of course that include substantial practice as research elements. I've noted this in previous years. This year, having been given new modules on industry, I was impressed at the way the theoretical and academic aspects of these modules were balanced with the hands on practical work of running a substantial project plan.

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
-----	---	---

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:

As in previous years overall the standards of academic achievement were high. It was notable however that in the 2nd Year cohort there were some examples of blocks of lower achievement and some very high marks. This was discussed prior to the board and it was clear that this was quite an unusual cohort of students. The overall progression was not problematic and issues of attendance/engagement are being actively addressed within the department to try to deal with the unevenness (as compared to previous years) of achievement.

The Enterprise Project (PEC1 3107) produced some excellent results with one outstanding project that was analysed and documented in a most impressive way. Some students on this module found it hard to maintain academic rigour alongside the practical research they needed to undertake but careful feedback supported development.

I was asked to look at two groups' work project for PECI Processes of Performance 5 where there had been a student complaint. Semester 2. B3 Group Performance – 'These Faces'

This was described as an adaptation but the reasons for making the changes seemed somewhat underdeveloped. It was not clear for instance, since the original play included an incestuous relationship between mother and son, why was this removed and supplanted with a 'close' relationship between mother and daughter?

Viewing the final performance I found some of the acting engaging and sound but the whole presentation was confusing with abrupt changes brought in through workshop ideas. It was hard to see how this piece would have fulfilled the criteria of the assessment without these more radical interventions but, as it was, they did not offer more to the performance. It was surprising to see students of this level using basic status games (numbered cards) within a final presentation. The whole piece lacked coherent motivation.

The marks for this and the feedback are generous and support the rather better elements of the work. I would probably have gone for a rather lower mark given the poor initial intention and rather fragmented final presentation.

Semester 1 B5 Group Performance, an installation 'Barrier Reef'

The fail for these students was due to the collapse of a computer containing their installation materials. All they could show on the day was an outline of their intentions, the project and potential applications together with one screen of material they had retrieved.

Materials shown demonstrated a serious and interesting project with great potential that was not fulfilled. The internal examiners' decision to allow a 'first sit' retake seems reasonable in this exceptional case. In fact both students have passed the whole module even with the failed element but it seems fair and generous to allow for a resit in this instance. This should not be seen as an invitation through precedence of allowing other students' computer problems being accepted as extenuating circumstances. Rather it is a special waiver due to the nature of the project that relied on mass storage of very large files. This pair should however, show in any resit how they have acted to prevent another such disaster!!

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

The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiners 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?	N/A
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	N/A
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

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

The other external examiner looked at the final year projects and dissertations.

Both EEs agreed that there is too much material for us at the last moment for us to be able to look through it adequately. We both worked intensively on the packs provided. Mine came to me in very good order with some outstanding packs that even included images of the students so I could see them on the VLE presentations.

However, with the need to look in detail at the disputed group work (see above) and the sheer number of modules to be considered, it is not possible to do a full job on everything. Therefore, I suggest two recommendations:

1. That each year module assessments from Semester 1 are sent out early to examiners (this is happening) to ensure that some examining scrutiny can take place prior to the day before the exam board. For Semester 2, that a selection of modules is made to represent all teaching staff and rotated each year to cover all courses in a 2 – 3 year cycle.

2. The department rightly prides itself on the mixed assessment modes including full recognition of the value of practice as research outcomes (performances and larger scale presentations of different forms). In line with this it is important to invite EEs to at least one practical assessment each year. This will demonstrate to students the value accorded their practical work and will help ease the log jam of EE work the day before the board.

Other comments

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

Since this is my last year I would just like to officially thank the department's exam tutor who has been exceptionally helpful and diligent throughout the last four years. It has been a pleasure working with this department and I wish them well for the future development and changes. Thanks also go to the departmental administrator who has been very efficient, welcoming and thoroughly reliable and speedy in organising matters relating to the EE visits.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

Head of School	

**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

For Level 1 or 2 Modules: We very much welcome the EE's recognition of the programme's focus on employability and engagement with communities and client groups beyond the campus, and certainly intend to strengthen this aspect of our applied performance practice in the coming years. We are pleased also that the efforts made to engage with current research in PECE 2701 Creative Practice and Performance Contexts has been acknowledged by EE and students alike.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

For Level 1 or 2 modules: Processes for improving consistency of tutor feedback on written work especially are under review by the PCI Assessment Lead for the 2017/18 session.

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:

For Level 1 or 2 modules: The programme team will be working closely with the PCI Assessment Lead in the 2017/18 session to ensure that the EE is able to have access to more programme and module materials at an early stage, and we will be discussing a more manageable schedule of module scrutiny, and will send invitations to attend practical performances at the earliest opportunity.

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:

For Level 1 or 2 modules: We are pleased that greater consistency in feedback and marking has been evident in recent years, and we are confident that the new developments in assessment processes to be explored by the PCI Assessment Lead will yield more dividends in the future. The EE comments before, during and after the Exam Boards have always been invaluable to the programme team, and the ongoing conversations about broader pedagogical aims and methods as well as specific expressions of these in module and programme learning outcomes have helped us immeasurably. We very much hope to be able to continue this dialogue in future with our External Examiners as a key aspect of our Curriculum Development processes. We will be certainly be giving renewed attention to the relationship between module readings, examples of practice and inclusivity.

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:

For Level 1 or 2 modules: The observation that the module content for PECl 2704 Interpreting Theatre & Performance Histories may have too great a focus on Euro-American materials will be addressed in the next iteration of the module in the 2017/18 session. The research-driven nature of much of the Level Two teaching will also be strengthened as we move forwards.

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:

For Level 1 or 2 modules: The patterns of low achievement for a minority of the Level Two cohort have certainly been acknowledged, and we hope to be able to improve standards for this particular sub-group as they move into the new Level Three of their programme, which includes a wider range of optional modules and more opportunity generally to tailor their programme experience around their strengths and interests.

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:

For Level 1 or 2 modules: The volume of materials presented to External Examiners will be addressed in the 2017/18 by closer coordination with the PCI Assessment Lead, and a more manageable schedule of module scrutiny around particular themes from year to year, or on a cycle as suggested by the EE. Invitations to attend practical performances will be sent at the earliest possible opportunity.

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

For Level 1 or 2 modules: The programme team for the new BA T&P programme extend our thanks to the EE for the very valuable comments and discussions over the last number of years that have allowed us to develop this new programme with refreshed learning outcomes and a new portfolio of modules with confidence. While we would have been delighted to have the EE be able to follow the new programme into the first run of its Level Three modules in the 2017/18 session, many thoughtful and reasoned comments in our continuous dialogue with will no doubt resonate across our programme planning for many years to come.