

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18 QAT Received 22/02/2019

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):

MA in Applied Psychology, 2017/8

MUSS5931M	Case Studies in Applied Psychology
MUSS5932M	Research Techniques in Applied Psychology
MUSS5030M	Professional studies
MUSS5139M	International Research Project

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

MA in Applied Psychology, 2017/8

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.

Staff feedback is consistently exemplary, showing a high level of detailed engagement with each piece of work, clear justification for the mark given and clear suggestions for further improvement.

Course handbooks are excellent, with clear reading lists, programme structure, assessment information and staff information. Student work shows in-depth engagement with a wide range of literature, well-referenced.

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

5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	<u>Y</u> / N
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y / <u>N</u>
7.	Have you acted as an External Examiner Mentor?	Y / <u>N</u>

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.

The programme structure, design, aims and intended learning out comes all appear to be very carefully considered, clearly articulated and well executed.

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)

The entire curriculum is highly influenced by current research. The International Research Project stands out in this respect, it's a great idea for course module, a unique learning experience for the student and no doubt interesting and potentially beneficial for the staff involved too. The assessment outline works well, guiding the student carefully through different stages of a collaborative, international research project, but with the focus on the final report.

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:

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
<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>In general the assessment methods are entirely appropriate. The Professional Studies course stands out in this respect - the critical bibliography and Pecha Kucha assignments are a great idea and highly appropriate for Masters students.</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
<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>The student work was generally very strong across all four courses, showing a huge amount of reading, writing and learning, across the year. There was very little, if any, poor quality work. The Applied Psychology students seem to be doing comparably to other masters students on the same course, in terms of marks.</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>		

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

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Music

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MA Applied Psychology of Music

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

MA

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Assessment Lead

Faculty / School of:

Music

Address for communication:

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 gat@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

Comments made by external examiners for other MA programmes in the School of Music similarly praise the quality of feedback provided by staff in the School. In line with comments from these external examiners, we are looking at ways of ensuring greater consistency in feedback, and in reducing the quantity of feedback provided to students, without compromising on the positive qualities identified by in report.

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:

N/A

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:

It is particularly pleasing to note the examiner's comments about the International Research Project module, which is now in its second year. Across the two iterations of the module to date, both students have produced high quality pieces of work and found the study abroad experience to be highly positive academically and personally.

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:

As notes, this year's programme cohort was particularly strong and produced some high quality work. The programme team has taken particular efforts this year to emphasise to students the importance of the theoretical grounding of their research in line with comments made in previous examiner's report and it is pleasing to see the results of these efforts implied in observations about the level of reading and learning taking place on the course.

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:

To provide some additional context for the responses to Qs 25 and 27 – the project based nature of the modules on the programme means that students devise the titles for their own research-led work in response to a standardised assessment brief, which has been in operation since the inception of the programme, and in consultation with an academic supervisor. As such, there is no requirement for the external examiner to provide feedback on specific examination / assessment questions that change each year.

Other comments

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

N/A