

# The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18      QAT Received 09/01/2019

### Part A: General Information

#### Subject area and awards being examined

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

Design

*Subject(s):*

*Programme(s) / Module(s):*

MA Advertising and Design

*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

The student work demonstrated a good understanding of new technological opportunities. The students had prepared both analogue and digital campaigns and the best work was extremely innovative.

#### Enhancements made from the previous year

This is the first year that I have been external examiner so this does not apply.

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

The standard of assessment was high. The feedback on student presentations was supportive but also challenging and informative.

## 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>The programme is driven by briefs which are both stimulating and challenging. The programme structure is based on briefs and crits of work in progress. The work is very focussed on particular demographics and an understanding of target group needs and preferences (e.g. millennials). There is an emphasis on strong design principles but also a clear engagement with new technologies and opportunities for creative work in terms of both form and content.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<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>The best student work engaged directly with research not only on target demographics e.g. millennials but also new and emerging technology.</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	NA
<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?	NA
<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)?	NA
<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?	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>		

The assessment methods were appropriate and challenging but also fun, the tutors had a very strong rapport with the students		
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>As with any programme some students were stronger than others. The strongest work clearly demonstrated very high standards in very impressive portfolio presentations.</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?	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?	NA
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>The tutors and support staff were excellent but the Minerva online system was entirely unusable. It took an inordinate amount of time to complete staff training and register on Minerva. The system itself was incredibly difficult to use with classic usability problems like hidden functionality which only experienced users can overcome. As someone not working in the organisation this was very difficult to deal with.</p>		

**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):

Advertising and Design

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Advertising and Design

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

MA

Title and Name of Responder:

Position\*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

AHC School of Design

Address for communication:

School of Design  
Clothworkers Central  
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](mailto: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 appreciate the External Examiners comments in respect of student work utilising new technology.

**Response to Enhancements made from the previous year**

As the External Examiner is in their first year we will wait for comments but will endeavour to improve facilities and the student experience on an ongoing basis.

**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:

None identified.

**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:

A great deal of work has been done in order to provide students with timely, detailed and constructive criticism in the form of ongoing and continuous verbal feedback at student presentations and creative workshops (students are encouraged to record comments in notebooks and creative logs) and written feedback at the end of module submissions.

**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 team recognise that the quality of work has improved this year despite the increase in student numbers. The success is partly based on the regular interaction of the staff with the students and is to be recognised and commended. The ongoing evaluation supports both the year group, smaller groups and the individual. The programme team provide focused activities that help the individual student transition towards the industry norm of

team structures, although further programme development is looking to enhance this development, possibly during the induction period. Improvements in the communication skills of students together with an enhanced understanding of research methodologies and analysis have been identified as areas that would benefit students.

## 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:*

The programme team look to establish a synergistic partnership with students and a key element in that process is feedback. It is critical and realistic and students are introduced early in the programme to the level of enquiry and questioning of the relevance and effectiveness of their propositions. Students are continuously challenged to justify and provide coherent rationale for their decision making and proposals. Proposals are critically reviewed at student presentations. Whilst criticism can be at a high and uncompromising level, it is always conducted in a spirit of support for incremental development. The course team are committed to assisting students to achieve high quality work and transformational education and providing them with the best opportunities to fulfil their career ambitions. Recognition of this has come in consistent student success at International Student competitions (D&AD, RSA) and employment destinations.

## 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 Examiners comments on the usability issues of Minerva are noted and will be shared with IT colleagues.

## Other comments

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

N/A