

Form 'External Examiners - Leeds School Of Arts' for External Examiners - Leeds School Of Arts

There is **1** other submission attached or associated with this student for this form. ([click for more info](#))

Submitted By	
Began	27 Jul 2023, 10:00 am
Finished	31 Jul 2023, 10:17 am
Updated	31 Jul 2023, 1:08 pm
Status	<p>External Examiners - Shared with School</p> <p>Last Status Change: 31 Jul 2023, 1:08 pm by Kay Hartley</p> <p>↻ Status change history</p>
Actions	<p>Edit submission</p> <p>Print submission</p> <p>Delete submission</p>

Page 1 of 9



**LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY**

Introduction

Leeds School Of Arts Undergraduate

- PERFA Performing Arts(UG)

External Examiner ID

Name Of External Examiner:

First Name

Last Name

Collaborative Institution:

Date of Main Progression and Award Board Attended:

Introduction

External Examiners are required by the terms of their appointment to submit an annual report. The report will be considered in depth during course annual monitoring activity. A record of the University's responses to examiners' reports also forms part of the documentation for this activity. It is also used in compiling our annual report on external examining.

Your report will be widely circulated and shared with Students and therefore we ask you not to refer to anyone by name or in a way that allows identification of an individual.

Please complete all sections of the report unless they are not relevant (such as you do not examine Collaborative or Degree Apprenticeship Provision). This report must be **submitted within 28 days of the main Progression and Award Board** and failure to submit within the required timescale may result in termination of your tenure as an external examiner without good reason.

NO EXAMINING FEES WILL BE PAID IF YOU FAIL TO SUBMIT YOUR ANNUAL REPORT.

Page 1 of 9

Page 2 of 9

Section A

External Examiner's Report Summary

Please indicate 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](#) applicable Subject Benchmark Statements / Qualification Characteristic Statements and [Leeds Beckett University regulations](#)

If any boxes are ticked "No" the Dean of School or nominee will be alerted and will oversee the response from the Course Director.

[\[HK1\]](#) Added Reference to correct section of Regulations in here.

Standards set

A1) "Threshold academic standards set for the modules/courses meet the applicable national academic standards." (required)

See 14.3.6a of regulations

Yes

Student achievement

A2) "Students who have been awarded qualifications have had the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in course(s) or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar." (required)

14.3.6b of regulations

Yes

A2b) Please provide any further comment on the comparability of any associated collaborative provision:

Conduct of processes

A3) "Processes for assessment and the determination of awards are reliable, rigorous and conducted in line with the regulations at all times." (required)

see 14.3.6c of regulations

Yes

Professional Body Requirements

A4) Do the learning outcomes and assessment of the courses allow successful students to meet the Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies criteria at the appropriate level'. (required)

see 14.3.6a of regulations

Yes

Actions from last year's report

A5) In respect of your feedback, has any required action from last year's report been satisfactorily responded to? (required)

Yes

Issues/point for clarity during the year

A6) Did you raise any issues/point for clarity throughout the year? (required)

Yes

A6a) Please expand below how they were/were not addressed: (required)

Excellent communication with the Programme Leader throughout the year via email, through feedback at the mid-year board and through conversation during a visit to the university in May. As always I found communication to be open, honest and with a willingness to reflect upon the programme and improve as necessary.

Areas of good practice/commendation

A7) Please outline any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features you have observed in relation to learning, teaching and assessment:

I found the 'Lift-Off' Festival of performance, which I was able to attend in person, to be managed in a very supportive way, allowing the students to develop and deliver their self-devised work and find their own voice. The festival was well attended by staff and students, and well supported by technical staff facilitating the requirements of the students' creative ideas.
Once more I would commend the individual feedback tutorials that I was able to witness through recording. This is an excellent way to give feedback, which is personal and directed for the development of learning and creative practice.

Page 2 of 9

Page 3 of 9

Section B

Academic Standards

Please advise on the Academic Standards for the Programme:

B1) Do the Courses and its modules continue to be coherent and generally up-to-date and at an appropriate level to enable students to meet the relevant aims and learning outcomes? (required)

Yes

B2) What do you believe were the strengths and weaknesses of the students in general with respect to knowledge, conceptual grasp or application of skills? (required)

The strength of the programme continues to be the facilitation of the student's personal creative practice and this year, once more, I found a range of fascinating responses to the creative tasks that had been set for them e.g. Thinking Bodies producing choreography, live art, animation, film etc. The best work was able to demonstrate an engagement with theoretical frameworks and an ongoing critical analysis leading to and informing development. Some students struggled to critically engage with performance in a way that would be hoped for at Level 6, leading to some performance outputs not being as challenging in form and/or content as might be expected. The strongest work had a clear and rigorously thought-through concept being interrogated, other work I witnessed had some performance proficiency but little in the way of an over-arching concept worthy of investigation within the context of Performance as Research. Staff appear to be aware of this and I was pleased to hear that the Lift Off Festival project, for example, will be introduced to students earlier to allow greater depth of investigation. Criteria might be reviewed and tightened in relation to this Level 6 expectation.

B3) Are the marking/grading criteria or marking schemes set at the appropriate level of study and have they been consistently applied including internal moderation processes? (required)

Yes

B4) Did students receive adequate and helpful feedback to inform their future learning? (required)

Yes

B5) In your view please indicate how well you feel the course prepares students for progression to managerial or professional employment or further study? (required)

0= not at all, 10= fully

5

B6) Please provide any further comments to indicate how the course could better prepare students for progression to managerial or professional employment or further study (if applicable)

I do not feel that this is an appropriate criteria to apply to university degree programmes, particularly within the Arts and Humanities. I therefore would not wish to participate in recognising this as any kind of benchmark of 'value' because it is too narrow and politicised.

B7) Have you had the opportunity to comment on or contribute to a review of the course including any proposed modifications or enhancements to provision? (required)

Yes

B8) If you have answered no to any of the above or would like to add any further points of clarity, please expand in the box below:

Page 3 of 9

Page 4 of 9

Section C

Assessment

Please advise on the Assessment Process for the Programme:

C1) The internal assessment / examination procedures are comparable with similar awards in the UK. (required)

Yes

C2) Procedures for the Exam Boards were fairly and rigorously conducted (including procedures governing extenuating circumstances, academic misconduct and borderline performance), and in accordance with the University's Academic Regulations. (required)

Yes

C3) The design and structure of the assessment methods used were appropriate; there was comparability within and across modules/awards in terms of level and their effectiveness in measuring the overall learning outcomes. (required)

Yes

C4) There was sufficient rigour in the achievement of learning outcomes in professional placements / work-based learning / work experience (where relevant).

Yes

C5) The moderation process is rigorous and there is consistency in marking standards. (required)

Yes

C6) The range of exam papers / assignments provided for sampling purposes and their appropriateness in terms of subject / level / learning outcomes were appropriate. (required)

Yes

C7) If You have answered no to any of the above or would like to add any further points of clarity, please expand in the box below:

I raised some points in my report last year regarding assessment and was pleased with the assurances received in the Programme Leaders response, Assurances of moving away from continuous assessment and single component assessment for a module were welcome and I look forward to seeing further progress on these points. A 'second marker' form has been designed in terms of parity and recording of the moderation process, but may have been shelved due to the Marking Assessment Boycott. Again, I look forward to seeing this in practice next year. Staff should seriously consider moving away from having two assessment components within a single weighting e.g. where 50% of the module assessment contains both a performance and a piece of writing (Thinking Bodies) as it would not appear to be transparent how the final mark has been reached between these two aspects of the assessment. In other modules the assessment components are clearly separated out and weighted e.g. Lift Off 2 - 70% performance and 30% Vive Voce. I would recommend that all modules follow this practice and not have a number of assessment modes within a single weighting, so that the student can clearly see their strengths, weaknesses and development required and clearly how a mark has been reached.

Page 4 of 9

Page 5 of 9

Section D

Organisation and Arrangements

Please advise on the organisation and arrangements for you undertaking this role:

D1) I was new in post this academic year. (required)

Yes

D2) The University has helped me to undertake my role effectively. (required)

Yes

D3) I am satisfied with the range of external examiner activities undertaken and with my involvement in assessment procedures at module level. (required)

Yes

D4) I am satisfied with the appropriateness and timing of information, of draft examination papers for approval and student work for moderation. (required)

Yes

D5) I am satisfied with the on-line induction training designed to familiarise External Examiners with the University's Regulations/Procedures concerning assessment.

Newly appointed External Examiners only

Yes

D6) I am satisfied with the level of support received from my mentor.

External Examiners new to the role only

N/A

D7) I am satisfied with the programme-level induction provided by the Course Director to familiarise me with the programme itself. (required)

Yes

D8) Are there any general or specific comments on the development and support offered by the University, especially improvements you would like to see:

I would be grateful if the timing of the boards in relation to marking deadlines could be looked at. I had very little time to fulfil my EE duties from the point of receiving the work to the board.

D9) If You have answered no to any of the above or would like to add any further points of clarity, please expand in the box below:

Page 5 of 9

Page 6 of 9

Section E

Collaborative Provision

Please indicate if you have been satisfied with the following:

E) Do you examine collaborative provision?

No

Page 6 of 9

Page 7 of 9

Section F

Degree Apprenticeships

F1) Were you involved in the examination of Apprenticeship Provision?

No

Open comments

Page 7 of 9

Page 8 of 9

Section G

End Point Assessment

G1) I have seen evidence that Apprentices have the opportunity to practice the assessment methods that will be used at End Point Assessment before undertaking the End Point Assessment.

G2) If you examine integrated apprenticeship provision, please provide specific comments on the suitability and content of End Point Assessment:

G3) If you have answered no to any of the above or would like to add any further points of clarity, please expand in the box below:

Where applicable, a copy of your report will be shared with the Chief External Examiner who is appointed to provide oversight of related modules and/or courses.

Page 8 of 9

Page 9 of 9

Final Comments

Are there any other final comments you would like to make in relation to your role as External Examiner?

End of Tenure Report

If you are at the end of your tenure as External Examiner, please provide an overview of the development of the programme during your term of office. This overview will be of value to the University, the programme team and to the incoming External Examiner.

Please include commentary regarding academic standards and student achievement across cohorts during the examiner's period of appointment:

This Section is only to be completed by external examiners at the end of their tenure.

Email Address (required)

Date (required)

Page 9 of 9

