

BSc (Hons) Music Technology 2017/18

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."	✓	
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."	✓		
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."	✓	
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.

The inclusion of reflective student videos was very useful. Such videos support the development of reflective practice and help students to enhance their presentation skills as they articulate the development of their practical work. Such videos are very useful for an external examiner trying to gain an appreciation of the approach to learning and assessment.

The inclusion of students giving feedback on the feedback that they received from their tutor (Audio Production Portfolio) is certainly useful.

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 *
			✓
<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).
The Board was conducted well. The data was presented and a clear and efficient manner.

(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.)
N/A

(c) The overall performance of the students, in relation to that of comparable levels of work in other institutions.
The overall performance of the students was comparable to other institutions.

(d) The strengths and weaknesses of the students in general with respect to knowledge, conceptual grasp or application of skills.
Students demonstrated a good level of technical ability. I had no concerns regarding particular areas. There was typical spread of attainment.

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

Overall, I was satisfied with the approach to marking.

However, there are some modules where it could be made more explicit how the final mark was derived. On some modules marks against individual marking criteria are not indicated. On other modules bands were highlighted (rather than a mark) but there was a tendency to indicate the same band across the different criteria, I would have expected to see greater differentiation across the various criteria.

Whilst there is evidence of a good range of marks across the various modules, there may be opportunities to use marks at the higher end (I might have expected to see more marks in the mid-80s).

It would have been useful if the mark for an assessment could be included in the file name, this is very helpful for an external examiner considering samples of work. Whilst the inclusion of the mark in the file name occurs on some modules this is not consistent across the programme.

Whilst there were examples of excellent feedback, such depth was not consistent across every module. I would recommend the sharing of best practice. There are also opportunities for a greater emphasis on feed forward.

'Applied Acoustics' and 'Electroacoustic Composition' include online multiple choice tests; I would expect not expect to see the incorporation of such a tests of knowledge recall at level 6.

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

I do not have any issues with regard to delivery. I was interested to hear about the plans for the new building.

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

Whilst I can access My Beckett, I viewed module boxes via Google Drive. Accessing work in this way was generally fine. I understand that I will be viewing work via My Beckett next year.

(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.)

I considered the following modules:

Level 4 Creative Audio Programming

Level 4 Audio Recording Techniques

Level 4 Music in Context

Level 4 Audio Production Portfolio

Level 5 Mixing and Mastering.

Level 5 Interactive Audio systems)

Level 5 Audio System Design

Level 5 Acoustics and Psychoacoustics

Level 6 Applied Acoustics

Level 6 Designing Sound

Level 6 Contemporary Music in Context

Level 6 Games Audio

Level 6 Music Technology in the Community

Level 6 Audio Visual Interfaces

Level 6 Music Technology Project

Level 6 Electroacoustic Composition

I was satisfied with module content, consistency of modules and module assessment across the course and the achievement of learning outcomes.

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

Learning and teaching is informed by professional practice where appropriate.

The preparation of module boxes was much appreciated.

The approach to the collection of student feedback needs to be considered; there was a very low completion rate of the student evaluation survey across the programme.

(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)?	✓		
b.	Academic Regulations including any Professional Statutory Body requirements where appropriate (these may be included the Course Handbook)?	✓		
c.	Module specifications (these may be in the Course Handbook)?	✓		
d.	Assessment briefs/marketing criteria?	✓		

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

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

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?	✓		
	(ii) If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory?			
<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?	✓		
c.	Were the scripts marked in such a way to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?	✓		

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

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?	✓		
b.	Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?	✓		

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?			✓

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