

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19 QAT Received 01/08/2019

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

School of PCI

Subject(s):

UG Theatre & Performance

Programme(s) / Module(s):

PECI2702 Researching Theatre & Performance
 PECI2704 Interpreting Theatre Histories
 PECI2706 Cultural Flashpoints in the Performing Arts
 PECI2708 Exploring Musical Theatre
 PECI2710 Industry Study
 PECI2713 Performer Training
 PECI2714 Politics, Identity and Performance
 PECI3703 Performance Project 3
 PECI3705 Arts & Cultural Management
 PECI3707 Performance Design & Space
 PECI3708 Contemporary Theatre Makers

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

It was clear from the work presented (both in terms of practical and written outputs) that the teaching team work hard to position their assessment as an integral part of teaching and learning, and work hard to resist communicating various outcomes as moments of judgement. The breadth of choice available to students is impressive and some truly excellent teaching is evident through the approach talking to assessment.

Enhancements made from the previous year

This is my first year in post, and am thus not able to offer any considerations.

Matters for Urgent Attention

I would suggest that my comments are pressing rather than urgent. My biggest take away is the lack of consistency and specificity. Tutors working on the same module take radically differing approaches to feedback (tick box vs. narrative), and often provide very generic comments with no real indication of how a student might progress.

For Examiners in the first year of appointment only

	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	Y
	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	Y
	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	?

Standards

	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Y
	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y
	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y
	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y
	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>There is a very clear relationship between ILOs, programme aims, and subject benchmarking. There is a clear sense of development from level four through to six, which suggests a programme that has been structured with every intention to develop the student's skill-set and understanding. The level of optionality is impressive at the micro level, though I do wonder how this translates to the macro. How is the student guided to make clear that the choices help to build towards a specific career?</p>		
	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>As much as I am loathe to lean into hierarchy, the quickest and most concise way to reflect the way in which research informs teaching is the presence of a professor teaching on a second year module. This is (sadly) still a relatively rare occurrence within the sector, so to see this - and all the other modules informed by research interests of the wider team - is a very strong indicator of the commitment PCI has to research informed teaching. Again, too often in the sector, this is a terminology that is employed but not really followed through on. PCI is very clearly committed to braiding research and teaching together in a genuine way, and this is both evident in the approach taken, and something that is genuinely impressive.</p>		
	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i></p> <p>N/A</p>		
	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i></p> <p>N/A</p>		
	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<p>N/A</p>		

Assessment and Feedback

	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.

There are some instances where it would be helpful for the student if the assessment feedback was mapped more explicitly to the ILO of the module, so that feedback is more directly speaking to learning and the potential for individual development. This is less about the ILOs themselves, and more about how they are interpreted in relation to the development of feedback (and crucially how this might inform feed-forward potential).

	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y
	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:

This is a question that I am not fully comfortable responding to; not because the students are lacking in some way (they are not), but because it asks me to comment on the students themselves. The work is wholly appropriate, and in keeping with level four-six students in the wider sector, and their work matches QAA benchmarking descriptors for the subject, but I would prefer to keep my commentary focussed on the work of colleagues. Without having been involved in delivery, it feels somewhat arbitrary to be commenting on students' work, *especially* in those moments where I am considering documentation and not the work itself (as is often necessary with live performance practice).

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

It would be very useful to see how the ongoing rationalisation of assessment and feedback might lead to shifts in practice. For example, there is still room for much more specific feedback to students in their essays. At present, there is a verbosity that does not seem helpful, as often the word count (and concomitant effort made by staff) does little beyond reiterate what the ILOs are. There is a sense of generic use of language which does little to inform the student as to how they might be able to develop. Whether this is done through tick-boxes, more student focussed conversation (perhaps in the form of supported student self-assessment where they can be encouraged to reflect upon their own practices). There is also value in thinking carefully about streamlining how students are being assessed; in several instances it felt as though they were being over-assessed. While it is wonderful to see a rich and varied approach to assessment being taken, there is value in seeing the degree in its entirety where considering the assessment points for one module. Does every module need a piece of writing attached to it? What are the ILOs of the module, and are these reflected by the assessment, or is the assessment driven by habit or nervousness? These are questions I would like to see considered and reflected in the development of assessments moving forward.

The Progression and Awards Process

	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiner's role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?	Y
	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y
	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y
	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y

	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y
	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y
	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	N/A
	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y
	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y
	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y
	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
	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>		

Other comments

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

I'm interested in how modules reflect the need of the student and not the expectations of the tutor. How might you reflect upon the shifts in primary and secondary education, and reflect these in the way modules are developed. This is not to suggest there should be a reduction in quality, simply to reflect the experience students encounter in earlier moments of their education. I am also curious how a greater sense of agency and learner autonomy might be encouraged. Could students be involved in the development of assessments in dialogue with staff, and what might have to happen to allow this (is it necessary to place a greater emphasis on seminar discussion to classes need to be shorter but smaller - these are questions I pose, rather than offered as solutions).

To continue asking questions about agency, I am curious how we might reflect language around taste formation differently. Particularly in relationship to written feedback which offers statements such as "I like the fact that you are closely analysing...". Words such as "like" can be somewhat confusing and conflicting for students. When we begin to use the language of taste formation, we open ourselves up to developing learners who wish to "please" their markers. It is imperative that we use assessment protocols and feedback to develop autonomous learners who are able to understand the assessment criteria, the intended learning outcomes, and reflect these in their work, rather than trying to "guess" what will "please" the marker.

The question here is one of autonomy. Whilst it might be gratifying to receive a good mark and know that your tutor likes your work, it does make it difficult to understand how best to replicate this in future essays. Especially if those essays are written for a different tutor. If we use language like "like" in feedback, we run the risk of undermining the clarity of learning outcomes.

Continuing the theme of tone, I noticed that there is a tendency (and this is a tendency I also suffer from) to be friendly to students who are doing well and more punitive in our use of language to students who are doing less well. I noticed that in the feedback for students who are "failing" the language is quite harsh. Again it is worth reflecting upon the value of utilising such tone. In much the same way that saying we "like" something to students who are doing well, how does a student who is not succeeding in their written work develop, if we are simply reiterate what they are doing wrong. How do we support them to improve, utilising language appropriately?

Reflecting upon my own experience, I wonder if I use more punitive language in order to resist future challenges from a student. If I am finding someone, I want them to understand why they are failing. While this is, of course, an important part of the process, I do wonder how much they will develop in relationship to my comments. I noticed the same issues emerging in some feedback from colleagues at Leeds. I very much look forward to engaging in these conversations moving forward over the next few years, especially given the exemplary work that is in evidence, and the incredibly hard work that staff are evidently undertaking to provide the best possible feedback to the students.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

School of PCI

Subject(s):

UG Theatre & Performance

Programme(s) / Module(s):

PECI2702 Researching Theatre & Performance
 PECI2704 Interpreting Theatre Histories
 PECI2706 Cultural Flashpoints in the Performing Arts
 PECI2708 Exploring Musical Theatre
 PECI2710 Industry Study
 PECI2713 Performer Training
 PECI2714 Politics, Identity and Performance
 PECI3703 Performance Project 3
 PECI3705 Arts & Cultural Management
 PECI3707 Performance Design & Space
 PECI3708 Contemporary Theatre Makers

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

BA

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

AHC/PCI

Address for communication:

School of PCI
 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) 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

reported that there is “**exemplary work** that is in evidence and the incredibly hard work that staff are evidently undertaking to provide the best possible feedback to the students”. This is a very positive indication which reflects the philosophy of the Programme and the School.

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:

In the Matters of Urgent Attention, encouraged us to address the **'lack of consistency'** in regards to feedback ('generic comments with no real indication how a student might progress'). We will address this serious recommendation in the module where we found this takes place. The Assessment Lead has prepared a strategy which is aligned with the new LEAF recommendation on how to ensure that feedback is consistent and useful. Staff are now given detailed guidelines on what needs to be included in the feedback (overview, key achievements and key areas of development) and this will be discussed in the next Programme Team Meeting. We are also in conversation with the student voice to ensure that we respond to their understanding of 'clear and useful' feedback.

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:

has commented that PCI is **'braiding research and teaching together in a genuine way, and this is both evident in the approach taken, and something that is genuinely impressive'**.

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 External suggested that feedback 'was **mapped more explicitly** to the ILO of the module'. We are currently going through a process of re-mapping all modules with their ILO via LEAF and this will be addressed during this process.

There was a comment on students being **'over-assessed'**. As a I mentioned above, we have addressed this for the next academic session by having a single assessment point for PECE 2703 and 3703 (Performance Project modules) and by reducing word count on a range of modules including PECE 2701, 3700, 3708 and in the newly written 3709 and 3711).

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

Regarding 'more **specific feedback** to students in essays' and the 'language around **taste formation**' we are working with staff to avoid language which uses 'I like' as an opening statement and to ensure an appropriate, advantageous and constructive tone both in the excellent and failing students alike.

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 25/07/2019

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

PCI

Subject(s):

Theatre and Performance

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Level 2
 PECI2701 Creative Practice and Performance Contexts
 PECI2703 Performance Project 2
 PECI2705 Theatre Directing
 PECI2707 Arts Marketing
 PECI2709 Performance Design

Level 3
 PECI3700 IRP
 PECI3701 Contemporary Issues in Arts and Culture
 PECI3702 Enterprise Project
 PECI3704 Independent Practice
 PECI8004 Year in Industry

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. The extension of the work into participatory areas e.g. schools, SEND.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box. As this is my first year I cannot provide an evidence-based comment. However, the interesting work identified by the previous external examiner, and the associated ethos and environment in which that work takes place have certainly been maintained and, in a number of cases, enhanced.

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

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?	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.

It is worth noting that the subject area is undergoing significant changes and is subject to some significant external pressures. The programme – as it stands – appears, generally, to be a strong, well-designed and innovative programme, structurally coherent and appropriate for the level of study. It clearly has adapted to ensure that it remains relevant and provides an educational experience that is of value and utility. The learning outcomes at each level are appropriate, and there is a clear sense of logical progression between the levels.

As with other such programmes, while there are few if any concerns or doubts about the quality of the work, there are concerns that the programme might be overloaded, with students (and to some extent staff) being 'hit' by the double pressures of producing intensive and high quality practical work and having to fulfil the requirements and high expectations of Leeds' academic standards.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y / 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)

There are clear indications that the programme is infused with notions of praxis (practice imbricated with theory) and there are obvious and dynamic relationships and interactions between research, learning and teaching. This is apparent both in the written work and practical work which are informed by and benefit from a wide range of research methodologies, reflecting the research interests of staff. The idea of the 'emergent researcher' is clearly embedded in the programme, with students able to position themselves as researchers.

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

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

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

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

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> <p>As to be expected, the programme utilises a wide range of assessments which are, generally, appropriate and relevant. The programme team is continually seeking to find ways to enhance assessment and to ensure that, above all, that the pedagogic focus is on assessment for learning. Nevertheless, the inevitable constraints and limitations of university-wide assessment protocols can act as inhibiting factors when seeking to find genuine, authentic and more holistic forms of assessment that will best serve the needs and aspirations of students.</p> <p>The forms of assessment allow the students to take ownership of their work, though a question for the programme (and the university?) is to what extent students are enabled to become agents in their own assessment rather than objects of assessment by staff?</p> <p>As with other similar programmes, the perennial issue of over-assessment hangs over the programme. There is a strong sense that there are too many assessment points, and that the assessment workload, in which students get 'hit' by the double pressure of the intensities and rigours of practical work and the pressures of 'traditional' academic work amounts to a heavy burden on both students and staff. There are clearly concerns about this amongst the programme team, and it will be interesting to see whether assessment on the programme can be and will be enhanced in regard to the roll out of the LEAF project.</p> <p>In regard to feedback, I was struck by the enormous amount of time and effort some staff put into providing extensive and highly detailed written feedback. While on the one hand this is commendable, on the other hand it does beg the question of whether this is time and effort well spent and whether there are better ways to ensure that students receive feedback that is timely and valuable and useful.</p> <p>A comment on language and consistency: as the previous external examiner comments, "there continues to be a tendency to mismatch comments and marks". It is essential that the language used in giving feedback matches – as far as possible – the grade the student receives. I came across several examples where very similar language and tone (e.g. the use of 'excellent') resulted in very different grades, and also where very different language and tone (e.g. generally positive v. generally negative) resulted in similar grades.</p> <p>At the exam board I noticed (contradicting the comment of the previous external examiner) that there were, what seemed to me, to be a significant number of borderline marks, particularly 69s. This, ideally, should be avoided, as it points to a possible lack of confidence or reticence to award a first class mark – if deserved. This might be understandable in view of the current controversies over grade inflation, but it does not serve the student well.</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
<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>I am confident that academic standards are comparable with other similar courses in the UK.</p>		

The practical work I observed (both live and recorded) was, generally, of a high standard, and the diversity of the work is to be commended. I particularly appreciated the opportunity to see several of the Level 3 Independent Practice projects when I visited in May.

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?	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

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

As the incoming External Examiner I must commend the programme leader for the extensive and comprehensive support and guidance I received.

I obtained a very strong sense of a highly skilled, dynamic, committed group of staff, working with a group of students striving – in the vast majority of cases – to do and achieve their very best.

I very much appreciated, once I obtained access to Minerva, the fact that I was able easily to navigate my way around the site and find the materials and documents I need to see. The organisation of files is to be commended.

I attended the Progression and Awards Board meeting, and thought it was undertaken in an entirely professional and ethical manner. Special circumstances cases were dealt with due care and concern for the students concerned.

It would be useful, unless that work is undertaken elsewhere, for the system to flag up cases where marks are either unduly bunched together or at significant variance with the norm.

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:

Faculty / School of:

PCI

Subject(s):

Theatre and Performance

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Level 2
 PECI2701 Creative Practice and Performance Contexts
 PECI2703 Performance Project 2
 PECI2705 Theatre Directing
 PECI2707 Arts Marketing
 PECI2709 Performance Design

Level 3
 PECI3700 IRP
 PECI3701 Contemporary Issues in Arts and Culture
 PECI3702 Enterprise Project
 PECI3704 Independent Practice
 PECI8004 Year in Industry

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

BA

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

AHC/PCI

Address for communication:

School of PCI
 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) 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

specifically commended our **'well designed and innovative programme**, structurally coherent and appropriate for the level of study'.

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:

also reported that ... the idea of "**emergent researcher**" is clearly embedded in the programme'. This is a very positive indication which reflects the ethos of the Programme and the School.

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:

In his report, encouraged us to think about students becoming 'the **agents in their own assessment**' – this is already happening in the third year module 3704 and we will encourage staff through LEAF to find other appropriate modules to consider this.

The External commented on '**over-assessment** ...students get "hit" by the double pressure of the intensities and rigours of practical work and the pressures of "traditional" academic work'. We have addressed this for the next academic session by having a single assessment point for Peci 2703 and 3703 (Performance Project modules) and by reducing word count on a range of modules including Peci 2701, 3700, 3708 and in the newly written 3709 and 3711.

Regarding feedback there was a clear suggestion to re-think the '**extensive and highly detailed written feedback**' and the language/tone used. We are addressing this with meetings with students (student voice) and changes made to our assessment via LEAF.

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:

also reported that there is a '**significant number of borderline** marks, particularly 69s'. The Programme Leader has discussed this with the team and encouraged them to place their marks firmer in the different classifications to avoid borderline marks.

Other comments

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

N/A