

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QA Team received 17/07/2019

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:	Dr Katie Overy
Faculty / School of:	School of Music
Subject(s):	<i>Music</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MArts, BA Music and Music Psychology MUSS1920 Intro to Psychology of Music MUSS2920 Psychology of Listening & Performance MUSS3940 Music Psychology MUSS3945 Researching Music Psychology MUSS5160M Integrated Masters Dissertation MUSS5931M Case Studies in the Applied Psychology of Music MUSS5130M Issues in Musicology
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.

There is clear consideration of the trajectory of learning from Level 1 to Level 4, with appropriate assessments and feedback to support this development.

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 was the first year I was sent videos of student presentations – that was helpful.

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 only

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 only

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-considered and carefully constructed degree programme.

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)

Most of the courses and assignments are based on a review of current research in the field.

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>The range of assessment types is exemplary, and clearly appropriate to the ILOs.</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>Overall, the students seemed to be extremely strong in areas such as general, up-to-date literature reviews, clear and appropriate referencing, and understanding and reporting on research methodology. A possible weak area was demonstrating a depth of understanding on a particular topic, in relation to more general psychological theories of perception, cognition and so forth.</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?	<u>Y</u> / N
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?	<u>Y</u> / 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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>Last year (in the exam board) I commented that as an external navigating the work, marks and feedback in three separate locations, this can be quite challenging and time-consuming. I asked if there could possibly be consistency with naming student work (such as always using Surnames) and I think I remember the other external examiner agreeing with me. That would be extremely helpful going forward, if indeed it's possible.</p> <p>This year it was especially difficult to navigate the work in time, and it became apparent that there hadn't been enough time between the marking deadline and the exam board. Going forward, I would recommend leaving a full week between these two dates (to leave time for both organisation of the marks and work, and external examining), if indeed that's possible – I understand that these things can be difficult to schedule.</p>		

Other comments

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

Overall, it was a pleasure to examine these courses and to see the extent of the staff engagement with students, via excellent course design, teaching and feedback.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:	Dr Katie Overy
Subject(s):	<i>Music</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MArts, BA Music and Music Psychology
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MArts, BA
Title and Name of Responder:	Dr David Ireland
Position*:	School Assessment Lead
Faculty / School of:	<i>Music</i>
Address for communication:	School of Music, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT
Email:	D.I.Ireland@leeds.ac.uk
Telephone:	0113 343 8216

*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) must be sent 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

As part of recent programme revisions and the development of a formative level 1 module in music psychology, the programme team has given particular attention to the scaffolding of the opportunities to develop requisite skills and knowledge (both practical and theoretical) and it is pleasing to note Dr Overy's comments about this trajectory of learning in the programme design.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

This is the first year we have used oral presentations to assess the MUSS3940 module and are glad that the provision of the recordings were helpful for Dr Overy's audit of our assessment processes.

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:

Given that this is Dr Overy's second year in post as external examiner for this programme, there was no need to provide an external examiner mentor on this occasion. Prior to Dr Overy's appointment, this programme was overseen by an external examiner with responsibility for a range of programmes offered by the School of Music and, as such, there were no previous external examiner reports for this programme specifically.

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 strive to ensure that the programme content remains current and that students have optionality to pursue projects in topic areas that are of particular interest to them. As such, it is pleasing to note Dr Overy's comments about the programme structure and central positioning of current research within our modules and assessments.

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:

With the introduction of the presentation component in MUSS3940, as Dr Overy notes, this year sees a broader range of assessment types being used across the programme. In response to student module evaluation questionnaires, the module team are continuing to monitor the impact of this new assessment type in order to further support students in their preparation for this assignment (which represents the first assessed presentation that many students will have completed since level 1). We will continue to work to encourage students to engage with theory to a greater level in their project work: Dr Overy has identified similar qualities in the MA Applied Psychology of Music course and the team have been working to address these in the level 5 modules, so will adopt similar strategies for the level 1-3 modules.

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 introduction of the assessed presentations presented particular challenges in terms of getting materials to Dr Overy in the same online location as that of other work. Similarly, due to logistical reasons, there were some challenges in providing electronic access to some modules in a timely fashion this year. The School is currently reviewing its assessment as part of the University's assessment mapping exercise and in-School discussions about our programme structure, as well as anticipating a move towards the greater use of online marking. One result of these exercises should be a more consistent approach to the format in which feedback and marks can be made available and labelled.

The timeframe for competing the assessment of work submitted in May was indeed shorter than usual given the late Easter and a number of other logistical reasons (in some cases resulting in final exams taking place less than 15 working days before the Assessment Board, and thus requiring staff to mark the final scripts in less time than the stipulated University guidelines). Similarly, unexpected factors such as staff illness across the year resulted in additional adjustments needing to be made to our marking allocations across the year. There is much to reflect on to try and prevent or limit the impact of similar challenges in future years, several of which (such as the bunching of assessment deadlines) will be considered in relation to our programme revisions and as a result of the assessment mapping exercise currently being undertaken by the School.

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

The programme team has enjoyed working with Dr Overy again this year and are grateful for her encouraging comments and patience with some of the logistical challenges we have faced this year.