

BAH Music Production and Performance BAMPP

External Examiner's report summary

Please indicate in the relevant boxes below whether you agree with the statements about the threshold standards of Leeds Beckett University's awards, student achievement and the conduct of the University's assessment processes, using as a reference the framework for higher education qualifications and applicable Subject Benchmark Statements / Qualification Characteristic Statements.

Please also list any shortcomings and areas for commendation. You should expand on any issues you mention here in the main report. If any boxes are ticked "No" the Dean of School or nominee will be alerted and will oversee the response from the Course Director.

Standards set		
	Yes	No
"In my view, the threshold academic standards set for the modules/awards are appropriate."	X	
If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.		

Student achievement			
	Yes	No	N/A *
"In my view, students' achievement is comparable with similar course(s) or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar."	X		
Please provide any further comment on the comparability of collaborative provision.			
* Not applicable – if you are a practitioner and are not in a position to assess this please indicate here.			
If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.			

Conduct of processes		
	Yes	No
"In my view, the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are rigorous and fairly conducted."	X	
If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.		

Areas of good practice
Any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to learning, teaching and assessment.
I continue to be impressed by the various ways in which module leaders draw on their own experience as creative practitioners in order to make the student experience on this programme as relevant as possible.

Main report

In this section you are asked to describe more fully how the University has or has not maintained threshold academic standards and the quality of the student experience in relation to the course(s) for which you are the external examiner, using as a reference the framework for higher education qualifications and applicable Subject Benchmark Statements / Qualification Characteristic Statements.

Please complete all sections of the form fully and where not applicable please state N/A. Where applicable please also complete the sections for any collaborative provision sampled.

If you are an external examiner for any of the University's Pearson Licensed Centre Programmes (HND/HNC level) provision, please also complete the section on page 9 sections l, m and n entitled "for External Examiners Associated with Pearson Licensed Centre Programmes."

Professional Body Requirements			
"In my view, the professional body requirements for this course have been met. <i>*Not applicable if the course is not a professional body course please indicate here.</i>	Yes	No	N/A *
			X
<i>If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.</i>			

(a) The operation and conduct of the Progression and Award Board (and/or Module Board meeting you may also have attended).
Despite the large number of programmes, modules and students to get through, the Board was run very smoothly and Leeds Beckett colleagues were well-prepared and professional throughout.

(b) The action, if any was required, taken in response to your report of last year. (This will not be relevant if you are examining for the first time.)
The minor tweaks which I suggested in last year's report (mostly relating to consistency of moderation materials, etc.) have been implemented satisfactorily, making my job as External Examiner much more straightforward this year. Many thanks!

(c) The overall performance of the students, in relation to that of comparable levels of work in other institutions.
The module grades and programme results achieved by students are comparable with equivalent institutions elsewhere in the sector. There were excellent results in several modules, and I would draw particular attention to the level 6 'Music Performance' module, in which more than 40% of students achieved 70+.

(d) The strengths and weaknesses of the students in general with respect to knowledge, conceptual grasp or application of skills.

Students are well engaged with the programme, and seem to do particularly well in those areas which are most relevant to their broader career aspirations within music. Performance is a particular strength and this links clearly with their extracurricular involvement in the local music scene, thereby demonstrating the relevance of the programme design.

(e) The standards of the structure, organisation, design and marking of all examination papers and/or other forms of assessment.

The standards used are appropriate to the course and demonstrate parity with equivalent programmes at other UK HEIs. The wide range of assessment methods used makes sense in the context of this particular degree programme, allowing the students to develop a range of complementary skills and knowledge which will equip them for careers in the contemporary creative industries.

(f) The curriculum, teaching or resourcing of the programme of study as indicated by the performance of the students in the assessment.

Student performance is good, suggesting that curriculum, teaching and resourcing are all effective. Certainly, the assessment feedback written by the teaching team demonstrates strong engagement with the development of individual students and a genuine desire to help them succeed in their chosen areas of specialism.

(g) Comments on the use of My Beckett (Virtual Learning Environment) within the course (if applicable).

This seems to be working fine.

(h) Module content, consistency of modules and module assessment across the course and the achievement of learning outcomes. (You may be asked by your School to provide detailed comments on the modules that you examine.)

Module content and assessment processes are consistent across the programme, and there is clear evidence that colleagues communicate with one another effectively and ensure that internal moderation, etc. is carried out rigorously, as required.

There were a few minor inconsistencies in the documentation provided across the many module boxes that I looked at, but these were no problematic and are unsurprising, given the sheer volume of marking that colleagues are expected to carry out within a very tight timeframe. Many thanks to all colleagues involved, for their hard work in populating the boxes in time for me to carry out my moderation prior to the exam board.

(i) Areas of student/staff engagement in teaching and learning, scholarship, research or professional practice.

My conversations with staff were very interesting and highlighted the wealth of industry-focused, real-

world experience that informs the approach to teaching and learning which underpins both the design and delivery of this programme. Staff are active practitioners (as performers, composers, and in industry roles) and this enables them to give students an excellent experience that will not only prepare them for future employment, but also, in many cases, gives them the opportunity to engage with professional practice whilst still on the course.

(j) The University welcomes external examiners' comments on its academic regulatory framework. Such comments may not have a direct bearing on standards set and achieved or the conduct of processes and so it may not be appropriate to include them elsewhere in this report or its summary. Please record any concerns or comments you may have here.

No concerns.

(k) Collaborative Provision: please include here any comments you wish to make on elements of collaborative provision for which you have responsibility (in addition to those you may have indicated previously in this report).

N/A

External Examiners' Report Checklist

Please comment for all boxes

Course Materials				
Did you receive?		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Course Handbook(s)?	X		
b.	Academic Regulations including any Professional Statutory Body requirements where appropriate (these may be included the Course Handbook)?	X		
c.	Module specifications (these may be in the Course Handbook)?	X		
d.	Assessment briefs/marketing criteria?	X		

Draft examination papers				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	(i) Did you receive all the draft papers?	X		
	(ii) If not, was this at your request?			X
b.	(i) Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?	X		
	(ii) If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			X
c.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	X		

Draft coursework				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	(i) Did you receive all the draft coursework?	X		
	(ii) If not, was this at your request?			X
b.	(i) Was the nature and level of the coursework appropriate?	X		
	(ii) If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			X
c.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	X		

Marking Examination Scripts				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	(i) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts from both home and (if appropriate) collaborative partner students?	X		
	(ii) If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory?			X
<p>Recommended sample sizes at Leeds Beckett University are as follows:</p> <p>a) Samples should be determined by a square root of cohort size, no smaller than 6, no larger than 15. However it should be borne in mind that not all work is assessed in a way that makes a square root sample possible and allowance should be made. For example in subjects such as the performing arts where there may be a requirement for an external to come and view a performance instead, or to visit the exhibition of art work.</p> <p>b) Samples to include all classification categories, and it is helpful to concentrate around the boundaries to include some fails.</p> <p>c) Samples to consist of internally moderated work, clearly evidencing the moderation process.</p>				
b.	Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	X		
c.	Were the scripts marked in such a way to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?	X		

Dissertations/project reports				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate?	X		
b.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?	X		

Coursework/continuously assessed work				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment from both home and (if appropriate) collaborative partner students?	X		
b.	Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?	X		

Orals/performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct orals and/or moderate performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements?	X		

Module Board/Progression and Award Boards				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Were you able to attend the meetings?	X		
b.	Were the meetings conducted to your satisfaction?	X		
c.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Module Board/Progression and Award Boards?	X		

Development and support of External Examiners

Please mark the appropriate boxes:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Were you new in post in academic year 2016/17?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If you were new:

(a) Did you access the on-line External Examiner Induction Module?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If not, was there a particular reason?	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	
(b) Did you receive any specific induction or other support from your School?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Some inexperienced new examiners are formally mentored. Were you?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Did you find the mentoring you received helpful?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Any general or specific comments on the development and support offered by the University, especially improvements you would like to see:

Thanks to all colleagues involved in the administration of this programme for their cheerful and informative communication at key points during the year.