

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 23/11/2019

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:	Dr Robin Croft
Faculty / School of:	Music
Subject(s):	Management
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Programme: MA Music and Management (inc. part time) Modules: Professional Studies, Music and Management Project, Performing Arts Education Project, Live Music Management and Promotion
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

Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.

There was strong evidence of mapping learning outcomes with assessment.

There was evidence of double-marking.

There was detailed feedback provided to students, including ways in which outcomes could have improved.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.

A second tutor assigned to the modules, bringing new breadth of vision and spreading the workload.

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

From an external examiner's point of view, the materials to be reviewed were often difficult to find, being in different electronic repositories on various platforms. In addition, this was inconsistent across modules leading to frustration on the part of the external examiners.

Ideally all materials to be scrutinised, samples of coursework, mark sheets, internal examiner reports, student feedback, etc., should all be in one place.

For Examiners in the first year of appointment only

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

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 difficult to balance the need to introduce students to a totally new subject (management) while at the same time demonstrating the critical awareness that characterises masters level study. On the whole this is done fairly well, with the emphasis being very much on employability skills.

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

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 is an opportunity to introduce students to the Journal of Arts Marketing, and to specify one of the excellent arts marketing texts or readers in place of the general marketing management texts.

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

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

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

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)?	N
-----	--	---

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?	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.

This year, given the second member of staff being involved, there was ample evidence of double-marking. Feedback was extensive, perhaps more so than was strictly necessary. Some focus on critical reflection. Excellent hands-on project work providing sound employability skills.

At the exam board, there were consistent processes relating to award classifications, particularly borderline cases. There was ample opportunity given to staff at the board to engage with and clarify the process.

There was clear demarcation of elements such as mitigating circumstances and progression.

The board ran efficiently and fairly.

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>Please see comments above relating to 'conversion courses' needing to introduce students to the basics of marketing and management as well as allowing them to critically evaluate the subject matter.</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> <p>I am nervous where group work is allowed at masters level, particularly in something as important as the final project. However I am satisfied that the teaching team make appropriate allowances in terms of contribution through the individual elements in group projects.</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?	N
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	N
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? *** Please see comments above regarding group work ***	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
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i>		

Other comments

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

Please note comments above relating to the difficulties in being able fully to evaluate all elements of these modules and this degree programme. The IT repositories are disjointed and fragmented. I commented last year about IT difficulties.

It is good to see the MA Music and Management continuing to attract substantial numbers of students. I am looking forward to continuing to work with Silviu and Stan on this programme.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:	Dr Robin Croft
Faculty / School of:	Music
Subject(s):	Management
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Programme: MA Music and Management (inc. part time) Modules: Professional Studies, Music and Management Project, Performing Arts Education Project, Live Music Management and Promotion
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MA
Title and Name of Responder:	Dr Oliver Thurley
Position*:	School Assessment Lead
Faculty / School of:	<i>Music</i>
Address for communication:	School of Music, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT
Email:	o.thurley@leeds.ac.uk
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 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 are pleased that Dr Croft found our assessment practices to be effective and closely aligned to learning outcomes.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

The addition of a new staff member as part of the Music and Management team has added additional support and breadth of expertise to the programme. We are delighted that Dr Erraught has joined us.

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:

We recognise that some of the feedback systems have been convoluted and thank Dr Croft for his patience with this. Dr Croft raises an important point about the difficulty of managing work in a convoluted, distributed manner. Moving forward, we will unify student work and feedback to a central point in order to provide external examiners a clearer overview.

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:

NA

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 team will take the recommendation on board for future teaching

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:

We are pleased that Dr Croft has noted the significance of our addition staff involved in this programme and hope that this helps to bolster the teaching provision and academic integrity of assessment. Regarding group assessment, the teaching on the programme, and the assessment methods, take into account the individual elements of group work, enabling students to support each other, while still maintaining their individual academic integrity.

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:

Other comments

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

Dr Croft's concerns regarding the distributed nature of work and feedback have been taken on board. Looking ahead, we will endeavour to make all work submitted and provided with feedback online in a single, and easy to access location (Minerva/Turnitin).

We are delighted to work with Dr Croft, and look forward to continuing to develop our teaching and assessment by taking his comments on board.