

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18 QAT Received 24/10/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

School of Music

Subject(s):

Music

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MArts, BA Music and Music Psychology

MUSS2920: Psychology of Listening & Performance

MUSS3940: Music Psychology

MUSS3945: Researching Music Psychology

MUSS5160M: Integrated Masters Dissertation

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 new Integrated Masters programme is a great idea and appears to be an excellent, well-structured degree. The work was very varied and generally of a very high quality. I enjoyed reading the reflective reports on the qualitative and quantitative projects.

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

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

My overall impression is of a very well organised, well-considered programme, with a structure in which staff can focus on their own research specialisms and students can choose their own key topics of interest. The students are clearly exposed to a range of research questions, methodologies and approaches.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	<u>Y</u> / N
-----	---	--------------

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)

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

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

The programme is good training for a PhD – there is a focus on contemporary research literature and different approaches to research methodology.

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y / <u>N</u>
-----	--	--------------

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 / <u>N</u>
-----	--	--------------

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?	<u>Y</u> / N
-----	---	--------------

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.

The assessment methods were all suitable. Of particular note was the outstanding level of detail in feedback given to students, which seems to lead to strong learning outcomes over the course of the degree programme.

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 standard of work was comparable to other degrees, with particular strengths in demonstrating an understanding of research methodology. One possible weakness was demonstrating an understanding of different theoretical frameworks.

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 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?	Y / <u>N</u>
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?	Y / 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?	<u>Y</u> / N
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	<u>Y</u> / N
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	<u>Y</u> / N

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

Other comments

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

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Music

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MArts, BA Music and Music Psychology

MUSS2920: Psychology of Listening & Performance

MUSS3940: Music Psychology

MUSS3945: Researching Music Psychology

MUSS5160M: Integrated Masters Dissertation

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

MArts, BA

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Assessment Lead

Faculty / School of:

School of Music

Address for communication:

School of Music,
University of Leeds
LEEDS
LS2 9JT

Email:

Telephone:

*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

This year's graduates from the programme represent a particularly strong cohort and it is pleasing to the high quality of their work (amongst that of other students on the programme) emphasised in the examiner's comments as reflections of the elements of innovation and good practice within the programme.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

N/A

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:

There were not specific previous external examiner reports for this programme to share given that in previous years this programme has been considered alongside the rest of the School of Music's undergraduate provision. Given that _____ was already external examiner for some of the School's taught postgraduate provision, it was felt that the role of an external examiner mentor was not required in this instance.

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:

The programme complements the emphasis that the Leeds Curriculum places on research-based learning by allowing students to pursue independent projects in their final years of study, which are stimulated by the breadth of topic areas and methods that they have been introduced to in their taught modules. Several students graduating from the MA Applied Psychology of Music (which shares modules with this programme) have gone on to extend this research at doctoral level, and it is hoped that as more students progress through the Integrated Masters that we may see a similar trend here.

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:

's comments about the quantity and quality of feedback produced by the School of Music resonate with comments made by external examiners for other programmes. We are currently exploring ways of rationalising the amount of feedback that is provided, whilst not compromising on the quality of this feedback, via Teaching Enhancement Strand activities and wider discussions at STSEC. Module staff will seek to emphasise the importance of engaging with relevant theory as well as methodology in their feedback on formative work and in class, in order to try and further develop students' engagement with theory.

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:

N/A

Other comments

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

N/A