

School of Arts and Creative Industries

External Examiner Reports

2013/14

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	yes
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Specific attention to:

DES10103 Major Project Module

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

B Des Product Design

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

Two formal visits were made to Napier during the academic year, along with the opportunity to view student's work at the July 2014 *New Designers* design exhibition in London.

The programme provides good scope within the curriculum and modules to challenge the students to achieve very professional results. The modules offer good breadth to the learning experience during the course. The levels of modules are consistent and well matched against other higher education institutions nationally. The assessment process and grades assigned were also well considered and appropriate.

The majority of students also exhibited work at a national graduate design event; New Designers 2014 in London, where the cohort could be directly viewed against students at other institutions. The Napier students proved comparable with a very high quality exhibit comprising a good variety of strong design work.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Academic standards for each module and the programme as a whole are appropriate and delivered well by the Napier team. The assessment process was fair and rigours and standards comparable to a national level.

The academic team have a good breadth of industrial links, key to ensure a current and industry relevant learning experience. Also of note several of the academic team are involved with external examining roles.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

The programme provides the opportunity for a full learning experience and is well supported by the academic and support team. The students were given excellent support and the assessment and feedback process was very fair and thorough with group and cross atelier marking common practice on the programme. This approach gives a very inclusive approach in supporting students to achieve their full potential.

Two formal visits during the academic year allowed good opportunity to view students work and discuss their thoughts on the programme. This years cohort were confident and vocal in each meeting. They were very supportive of the academic team and the course as a whole. This year sees a gradual improvement in final output quality, which has been evident year on year. This is no doubt down to the dedication of the academic and support staff who should

be commended for a rich curriculum that continues to introduce industry relevant projects that expose the students to new challenges.

Not only was the 2014 graduate show one of the strongest I have seen it should be noted that several of the overseas students produced some very high quality work. International students can face additional challenges when studying abroad but it is clear that the Napier students and staff have worked very hard to ensure all students are well supported and encouraged as individuals within the Napier community.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

The programme involves a good range of learning opportunities well suited to this academic level. The major project helps to encourage students to develop independent working practice and the level of depth is consistent with a degree level programme.

The Atelier structure gives students real flexibility in their final year with a good range of tutors and specialist projects on offer. Parity across groups and consistency of marking was raised by students as an area that may benefit from more transparency. I consider the marking system very fair and appropriate, but the students perception of the process may be worth addressing.

This year brought the additional challenge for staff and students with a serious workshop fire. With such a practical focus on the programme this understandably caused some problems for all students but especially final year students.

In talking with the final year students I would suggest they showed an excellent example of confidence and independence as designers to work around a problem, despite the workshop closure, to produce some very high quality projects.

There is no doubt the workshop fire was a significant challenge but the ingenuity and resolve of the students to present such a high quality final year show bodes very well for their future industrial practice.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The assessment and feedback process is both rigorous and fair.

A robust process of moderation was evident and the academic team provided good initial verbal feedback and in the main timely written feedback to the students.

Some students noted written feedback for dissertations took longer than they expected. No doubt this is due to the type of assessment and the need for additional second marking and moderation. However the academic team may want to review the process of marking and feedback deadlines.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

Several academic staff have been involved with teaching in China involving short trips away from Napier. The academic team has clearly managed this activity very well and used the experience as an advantage to feedback into the programme. The Napier students thought

the exchange and insight gained by the staff very beneficial to their own learning and student experience.

No doubt this has also helped the academic team support Chinese students on the programme, who have show strong project work this year.

Industry relevance and engagement is a key element to a design programme and the staff should be commended for the efforts made in this area. Industry speakers and visitors, industry briefs and placement links were all very much appreciated by the students. Such activates often require extra effort from staff, this should be commended and encouragement given to all staff to continue with such activates.

The nature and diversity of the Atilier projects should be commended, while the diversity can bring additional challenges in terms of parity the output and student learning clearly demonstrates the benefit. Some Design course at other institutions have seen restriction on studio and workshop capacity that has lead to student being restricted to less prototypes of smaller scale. The Napier students are, where possible, encouraged and support by staff to develop their designs freely, with informative full size prototypes being used for testing ahead of full size finished designs, such as furniture. This not only gives Napier students a very rich learning experience but also allows them scope to fulfil the potential of their designs.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

None.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

<input type="checkbox"/>		
--------------------------	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

--

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at
Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY
EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT 2011/11

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2010/11 are

- 1 July 2013 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 14 October 2013 for duties relating to taught masters provision

Section A Personal Details

This report is for: **modules & programmes/ modules/programmes**

Insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers:

DES09119	Design & Digital Arts Studio 1
DES09120	Design & Digital Arts Studio 2
DES09124	Prototyping Interactive Experiences
DES09136	Transmedia Storytelling
DES10013	Major Project - Design
DES10111	Design Professional Practice

Insert the programme title to which this report refers:

BDes (hons) Design & Design Arts

Section B

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?	Yes	
Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?	Yes	
Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?	Yes	
Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?	Yes	

If you answered no to any of the questions please provide details in section C as appropriate.

Section C

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

There are relatively few comparable programmes in the UK that undertake the depth and breadth of this course, and amongst those few that do, the standard of work produced by these students compares very favourably against national standards and benchmarks. Good final year students should have few concerns about either finding work or continuing their academic careers based on the portfolios of work that they create from their modules.

On a modular level, the programme is developing a coherent and challenging set of modules that push and develop students in exciting ways.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?

Yes, following on from my previous comment, the modules have been proactively developed by staff in response to criticism and student learning needs over the last 4 years. The course has evolved a complementary set of modules providing an engaging and challenging programme of study. The standards set have been maintained and are entirely appropriate for the levels of study.

The teaching in Transmedia Storytelling and new Prototyping Interactive Experiences module in the third year have been excellent in both encouraging intellectual curiosity and promoting cross-disciplinary teaching and learning.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

Strengths

1. The student performances in Transmedia Storytelling and Prototyping Interactive Experiences were particular highlights in the third of study. The briefs were exciting and the students clearly responded with enthusiasm and commitment to these modules.
2. Despite concerns with the final year student performance for the Major Project at my interim visit, the students clearly pulled their work around and produced some excellent projects that were bold, ambitious and confidently realised.

Weaknesses

1. The Professional Practice module was perhaps the low point of endeavour, as students appeared less motivated to perform as a team with large disparities in individual engagement amongst collaborators. Whilst the end results of the two group submissions were of an acceptable standard, the students readily admitted in discussion that they hadn't worked well as teams and reflected that they might have performed better in smaller teams where roleplaying distinctions would have been clearer.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

The multi-disciplinary teaching team has expanded its knowledge and skill sets by cross programme teaching with Product Design on the Prototyping Interactive Experiences module this year. This is a great teaching enhancement as it not only exposes students to new staff and their views but also allows them to work with students from another discipline adding to their own knowledge and skills and as well as softer transferable skills e.g. negotiation, teamworking and project management.

Indeed, from talking to the third year students about this module and their collaboration with music students in their one of their Studio modules, students have learnt a lot from these collaborative experiences whether through failure or success. All seem positive about building on these new relationships and are hopeful of further collaboration in their final year of study.

Whilst performance in the final year appeared to dip around Christmas, the year as a whole was a learning and teaching success.

The timetabling of the year seems to have gone much smoother with the previous year's more intense running of the Minor project avoided this year. The only concern from the students' perspective with this module was that they were taught entirely by staff from other programmes. Whilst this in many respects is a refreshing aspect of teaching delivery at Napier, students felt that having no familiar staff with knowledge of their own skills and interests was a negative and a balance of core DADA lecturers and the wider design staff team would have been much better.

On a more positive note, when final year student performance did dip particularly in their Major Project, the staff team was very proactive in supporting these students get back on track and deliver high calibre personal work – very impressive.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The assessment as always in my experience is extremely rigorous with the staff team

dedicated to giving students' appropriate presentation opportunities, fair assessment and in-depth consideration of their work. In my final year as examiner, I feel that I need to highlight the commendable cross-disciplinary assessment strategy employed at Napier. I know this practice is not without issue, when staff perhaps less familiar with the custom and practice of fellow disciplines disagree with discipline specialists, but as a whole the benefits of understanding the depth and breadth of the creative endeavour across the courses and their fair and robust assessment parity out weight any negatives in my experience.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

1. The latest evolution of the modules and the proposed new module structure/timetabling make the course an innovative, diverse and exciting experience for the students.
2. The multi-disciplinary staff team and cross-disciplinary teaching give students access to a wide variety of skillsets, views and experience.
3. The enthusiasm, passion and care of the course team that the students felt and expressed on during meetings with both third year and final year cohorts.
4. The commendable cross-disciplinary assessment strategy employed at Napier.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

There is only recommendation and two considerations based on what I have observed and student feedback:

1. Recommendation: A better mix of core DADA staff and the wider staff team on the Minor Project.
2. Consideration: Smaller team sizes in final year professional practice projects.
3. Consideration: Students felt they could have benefited for longer or more formalised induction into 3D workshops.

Section D

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		X
		X
X		

Marking Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
		X

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Coursework/Continuously Assessed Work

- a. Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment?
- b. Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?

X		
X		

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

	X	
	X	
		X
		X

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to eereports@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	
Modules only	X

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent,
please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

DES09100 Design and Urbanism

DES09118 Design Research Methods

DES10110 Design Dissertation

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BA Hons Design

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	X	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	X	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	X	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	X	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The standard is consistent with those nationally and there seems to be consistency across all pathways.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Yes, they comply with both.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

The level of performance is strong in what seems to be fairly difficult conditions in terms of under-staffing in terms of specialists and a reliance on studio staff to deliver supervision and assessment in an area that is not really theirs. In particular, the level of work from students articulating into third year from FE is commendable. The under-staffing is not. The quality of final submissions continues to be compromised by an unnecessary learning outcome that demands primary research. I have questioned the continuance of this and recommend the course team delete it for session 2014-5; it misleads weaker students and debilitates the strong ones.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

The end product would suggest that the methods are effective; student feedback was good regarding their final year experience. However, questions were raised as to the value of the year 3 research module that leads to the honours submission: to quote 'couldn't see a reason for it', 'no lead into next year', 'boring'. These comments suggest that some attention need to be paid to how this module is presented in 2014-5. Suggestions were that smaller groups and less formality would help.

Two submission modes are offered in Year 4, the standard dissertation and a 'research portfolio'. The latter seems to lack clarity and students were not confident that the programme team are convinced by it. In one pathway students said that they were warned off doing it. There is no point offering alternative modes of submission if they are not true alternatives.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The final grades seem fair, but the means by which they are decided is opaque. There seems to be no consistency in assessment practice, which varies from pages of handwriting by some assessors, to the odd terse comment from others. Some use post-it notes, others mark the texts up, and so on. An intolerable burden is placed upon the specialist staff to moderate the grades in such a situation and it is to their credit that the final grades are commensurate with national standards. The programme team should:

- Stop readers from marking up final submissions.
- devise standard pro-formas, to be filled in, preferably in print, for supervisors, second and third readers.
- Make the moderation process transparent to external examiners and, preferably, students as well.
- Use a format and language that could be read by the student.
- Aim to have the pro-formas returned to students after graduation to provide worthwhile feedback.

In terms of the 'research portfolio' (see 4 above), it seems to have a studio based outcome as well as a text-based one. I was only shown the text based element. I recommend that the external should have sight of both elements in future.

<p>6) Good practice Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight</p>
<p>The supervision process, run by 'atelier' seems to work well and clearly gets good results.</p>
<p>7) Recommendations Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase specialist staffing (see 3) • Remove necessity for primary research in submissions (see 3) • Review Y3 research module (see 4) • Review 'research portfolio' option (see 4 & 5) • Introduce standardised assessment procedure (see 5)

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
------------	-----------	-----------

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

a. Programme Handbook(s)

x		
---	--	--

- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

x		
x		
x		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		X

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
	X	

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

	X	
--	---	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

X		
X		
X		
X		
	X	

Any other comments?
Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to
a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body

b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Assessment procedure for the honours submission, in particular consistency of assessor feedback, needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency – see 5 above.

I have now been external for four years and I assume that my term is coming to a close, although no-one has said anything. In general, over the four years there has been a consistent standard set by the students that suggests that beneath the various issues I raise above, the teaching and standards in the programme are creditable. It is a shame that they are partially concealed by things that are very easy to address. A few hours spent on deleting an unnecessary learning outcome, devising some assessment forms and some minimal staff development in terms of their completion, would be hugely beneficial to all and respect the effort that both staff and students put into the written element of the degree.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	x
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

JAC09110 Advertising Theory and Practice
JAC09105 Online Communication
JAC09115 Communication Management
JAC09108 PR Theory and Practice
JAC09109 Critical Debates in Communication Theory
DES09116 Visual Communication

JAC10113 Audiences & Reception
JAC10110 Linguistics
JAC10109 International & Intercultural Communication
DES10115 Professional Project in PR Management
DES10114 Professional Project in Advertising Management
DES09131 Branding
JAC10100 Dissertations

Hong Kong

JAC08104 Persuasion and Negotiation
JAC09110 Advertising Theory and Practice
JAC09115 Communication Management
JAC09108 PR Theory and Practice
JAC09105 Online Communication
DES09116 Visual Communication

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BA (Hons) Communication, Advertising & Public Relations

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	x	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	x	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	x	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	x	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The work of ENU students is comparable to students at other institutions, although marking on JAC09108 may be a little overgenerous at the top end. There is some excellent work demonstrating a very good understanding of the discipline and applying that knowledge. At the bottom end students have failed to demonstrate that they have understood the material sufficiently or made sufficient effort in completing the work to a satisfactory standard and the teaching team has marked the work appropriately and consistently to reflect this spread.

Work in the partner institute of Hong Kong Space University has been rigorously internally moderated and as a consequence some grades changed and for JAC09110 Advertising Theory and Practice all marks scaled down uniformly to make the marks awarded more closely reflect the work submitted, and to bring the overall profile more into line with students on the module at ENU.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Yes and where the team had concerns regarding the partner institute, appropriate action was taken to address the issue.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

Student achievement follows a normal distribution curve with some very good work at the top end demonstrating a good understanding of the subject and its application in practice. The

work produced on modules such as DES09131 Branding is excellent and students demonstrate their innovative and creative talents producing work to a very high professional standard.

Students are being encouraged to analyse and critique theory and reflect on its role underpinning practice and this is particularly pertinent to students at Hong Kong Space University.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

A range of assessments are used which is commendable. Additional resources are provided through the virtual learning environment and this compliments and supports the more traditional lectures, seminars and workshops. The formative feedback and guidance provided to students on modules such as Branding and Visual Communication to help them shape their ideas is very supportive and constructive.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

Assessment seems appropriate and in the main I saw constructive feedback being provided for students. Evidence of moderation on some modules, though less obvious on others and it might be useful for the external examiner to see the moderation records. As per my request last year, a spread of marks was provided on a number of modules and this was very useful.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

Formative feedback on creative work is to be commended as it evidently helps students refine ideas.

Internal moderator's feedback to Hong Space University by the Programme Leader is detailed, constructive and supportive.

Overall work is marked carefully and very constructive and useful feedback is provided which I hope students appreciate and reflect on.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

The majority of work was delivered as hard copy in good time and I really appreciate the PL's efforts to ensure this happens each year. There were some issues accessing modules in moodle which delayed my ability to access some work. If it is possible to review hard copies I find this easier than accessing an unfamiliar on-line resource.

Due to ill health of one member of the team in June, module samples taught by this member of staff were not available for inspection by agreed dates. Some of this work was completed in semester one, so could and should have been ready for viewing prior to the Board. It required a lot of extra work for the Programme Leader to try to source samples and relevant mark sheets and required the external examiner to spend more time prior and post board at ENU to review work as it was found. As a consequence samples were incomplete and some paperwork such as feedback sheets were missing, though scripts were annotated.. It was at my request that semester one and two work was reviewed in June rather than semester one work forwarded in February but I would have expected semester one samples to be complete and prepared well in advance of the Board of Examiners meeting and recommend this is actioned accordingly for the next academic session.

Consideration could be given to setting essay titles on JAC09018 PR Theory and Practice that encourage students to explore, analyse and reflect on theory that underpins campaign strategy more specifically than the broad questions set at present. Greater focus could be directed on theory covering the agenda setting role of PR, building legitimacy, evaluation and the strategic role and approaches of PR eg PR as dialogue, activism, persuasion etc.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
		X
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

n/a

		X
		X
		X

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X	X	
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

X		

- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

X		
X		
X		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

See comments made under previous section point 7 regarding the availability of samples for review and the completeness of this material for modules delivered by one member of staff who was on sick leave at the time of the board of examiners.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	
Modules only	x

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

JAC10120 : Music Journalism

JAC09119 : Sports Journalism

JAC09111 : Literary Journalism

JAC09113 : Information Communication and Society

JAC10122 : Power, Information and Opinion

JAC09116 : Broadcast Journalism 2

JAC10121 : Professional Development and Entrepreneurship

JAC09120 : Digital Platforms

JAC10117 : Major Journalism Project

JAC09107 : Magazine Production

JAC10118: Newsroom Practice and Research

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BA (Hons) Journalism

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	Yes	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	Yes	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	Yes	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	Yes	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The standard of work I saw was impressive at the top end and is comparable with student work at other higher education institutions. As in my last report, I would like to reiterate that the programme blends practice and theory with aplomb.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Academic standards across all the modules I have moderated are strictly maintained at the appropriate level.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

I was impressed by the practical quality of the journalistic work – particularly on JAC09107 Magazine Journalism and JAC10117 Major Journalism Project. I was pleased to see that lecturers aren't afraid of awarding marks at the top of the scale – a mark of 89% was much deserved on this module.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

I believe that one of the strengths of this programme is the versatile nature of its teaching and assessment. This is a reflection of the strong staff base on both practical and theoretical modules.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

I have looked at a range of different types of assessment from oral presentations to essays, learning logs to films. Students are able to demonstrate their skills in portfolios of work that have ambitious and challenging assessment briefs.

On the whole feedback is detailed, constructive and supportive in tone. Closely annotated scripts mean students are able to clearly see where there is room for improvement or where they are excelling. This was particularly evident in Music Journalism JAC10120 and Sports Journalism JAC09119.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

The multi-media nature of JAC 10119 Newsroom Practice and Research is to be commended both in terms of teaching strategy and assessment. The Radio Napier website showcases student work and is impressive.

JAC09113 Information, Communication and Society blends theory and practice. During the class debates it was lovely to see the rapport between the lecturer and the students and it is encouraging to see the high level of student engagement here.

JAC 10122 Power, Information and Opinion – This module combines journalistic ‘news’ sense with academic ability extremely well and exemplifies what I believe is a strong selling

point of this course.

It is obvious from the feedback, that the teaching team know their students well and really care about their experience at Napier.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

Academic essays – where used by way of assessment the questions are relevant and interesting. However, I noticed there was at least one essay which didn't have any academic quotes in it, but which achieved 74%. I would like to recommend that this be looked at over the course of the next teaching year to ensure academic standards are being maintained.

Whilst I agree with the marks and academic standards set for each module sample I have seen, I would appreciate being able to see the marks profile across each module going forward.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

Y		
Y		
Y		
Y		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		NA
Y		
Y		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

Y		
Y		
Y		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Y		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

Y		
		NA
Y		

- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

Y		
Y		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	
Modules only	x

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

LMD09100 Advanced Topics in Photography and Film 1 (1st trimester)
LMD09105 Advanced Topics in Photography and Film 2 (2nd trimester)
LMD10100 Dissertation (submitted 1st trimester, but assessed 2nd trimester)

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BA (Hons) Photography and Film

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	x	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	x	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	x	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	x	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

As last year, the standard of work on these courses is comparable with what I have seen on other film studies degree programmes that are weighted towards practice.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Yes, the academic standards for these modules are set at an appropriate level.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

The written work demonstrates the same strengths and weaknesses as last year. There is a consistent attempt across the work I saw to address 'big' philosophical/aesthetic issues and to survey particular artistic practices across a long historical period. This can work very well (e.g. the dissertation on the notion of the 'cineflesh' and the essay on dreams and vampires) – in the best examples, the theoretical sweep and historical range are balanced by an attention to a well-defined object of study. In the weaker work, the expansiveness of the approach leads to more basic, survey-like writing that often does not provide much evidence of critical engagement.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

As last year, there is a discernible improvement in writing style and evidence of increased levels of research in the dissertations, when compared to the Advanced Topics material. This demonstrates that the courses are functioning together as they are designed to, the Advanced Topics courses introducing the students to the idea of developing their own research projects, a skill that is developed more fully through the dissertation. The improvement in writing is encouraged by the exemplary proof-reading of essays in the Advanced Topics courses.

There is also a development from the seminar-based teaching of the Advanced Topics courses to the one-to-one tutorial process underlying the dissertations. It is clear from student feedback that students regard small-group/one-to-one contact with their tutors as the ideal way to develop their critical thinking – indeed a number of students single this out as the most valuable dimension of their degree. The space for ‘purely’ critical/theoretical courses in the Photography and Film degree programme is quite limited and, in this context, the Level 9 and 10 courses over which I have oversight work excellently to cultivate the students’ skills of critical thinking and reflection.

I should add, however, that it is dismaying that the opportunity for small-group work in the non-practical courses seems limited to Level 9 and 10 courses. I am not asked to look at Level 7 or 8 courses, but my understanding is that the theory and history courses in the first two years are predominantly lecture-based, with little or no capacity for the student to reflect on the issues raised in a dedicated seminar situation. I also understand that there is no separate screening slot for any of the non-practical film studies courses (even those at Level 9). This suggests an under-resourcing of the non-practical courses, especially at Levels 7 and 8, that has implications for the level of teaching that can be done, and the learning that can be achieved, in the more advanced stages of the programme (so this is why I think it is within my remit to discuss the first and second year programme here). In last year’s external examiners’ reports on the practical courses within the Photography and Film degree, concerns were raised in both about the lack of critical reflection in some of the written work that accompanied practical projects. Critical thinking – and its oral and written expression – are skills that the non-practical courses are instrumental in developing, and, as such, the maintenance and proper resourcing of such courses, at all levels, is key to the success of the overall programme (in terms of the students’ achievement within the programme and their acquisition of skills of critical thinking that are applicable to a diverse range of careers).

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The assessment and feedback process is fair and rigorous. A moderation procedure has been introduced for the assessed presentations on Advanced Topics, in response to a comment in last year's report. The dissertation tutors have decided to retain the blind double (sometimes triple) marking system for the dissertation, despite my suggestions of an alternative model in last year's report. The teaching team gave me a reasonable justification for doing so and the system clearly works for this particular set of markers.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

As last year, I commend the level of copy-editing undertaken by markers, particularly in the Advanced Topics courses. I was given access to the Moodle sites for these courses, which were all informative and well-maintained. In particular, it was very useful to see the unedited student evaluation of the courses that was contained on the site and I believe that it should be common practice that student feedback is collected, and made available for external scrutiny, in this way. I do appreciate that it is difficult to motivate students to fill in the forms electronically, but there are ways of encouraging them to do so, and it does allow the feedback to be truly anonymous. If it is guaranteed to lead to a greater return, paper-based feedback is also acceptable, as long as it is truly anonymous, though collecting it electronically makes data analysis more straightforward.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

I would ask that dissertation tutors keep an open mind about the way the dissertations are marked and, indeed, supervised. The marking system in place relies on a very high level of respect and trust between markers, who sometimes suggest very different grades for the same piece of work. I recommend that all dissertation supervisors and markers look again at the criteria for assessment, as they are advertised to the students, and look to see whether they can establish some more common ground on how these criteria are interpreted – this is a discussion that may affect the advice supervisors give students during the research process as well as the way the final product is marked.

Other than that, as the Photography & Film degree is phased out, I simply recommend that the new programmes allow sufficient room for the types of courses I have been

asked to examine and that these are resourced properly at all levels (e.g. opportunities for small-group learning, dedicated screening slots for film studies courses, well-maintained Moodle sites, well-supported staff). In my view, the non-practical courses are already very 'squeezed' within the Photography & Film degree and it is to the tutors' immense credit that the Advanced Topics and Dissertation courses are as successful as they can be in this context.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		NA
		NA
		NA

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation

X		
---	--	--

A9.4)

- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

	X	
X		
X		
X		
X		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 05 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 26 October 2013 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	Yes
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

LEVEL 9 – 3rd Year

Film Practice 1 *LMD09101*
 Film Practice 3 *LMD09108*
 Film Practice 2 *LMD09103*
 Film Practice 4 *LMD09110*

LEVEL 10 – 4th Year

Research Final Year Project *LMD10101*
 Final Year Project *LMD10103* (40 Credits)

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BA (Hons) Photography and Film Programme

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	Yes	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	Yes	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	Yes	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	Yes	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

I was given ample opportunity to review samples of work across the modules above & find that the standards of student work is comparable to those in other higher education institutions which I am familiar with.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Yes. I continued to be impressed by the way in which the LMD09 level modules provide variation with differentiated practice based activities each focussing upon key elements of the film practice process. All of the modules reviewed across both levels were practice based but each also commendably contained a critical theory element and there was a variation in the nature of this in its application across the different modules. Some module guides now commendably and explicitly state that student should critically evaluate both process and product.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

There was a range of work made available in the sample across the different grades and module design also continues to have a good differentiation in the nature of tasks & assignments.

I continued to be impressed by some of the shorter form work in the level 9 craft skills areas which showed a range of creative endeavour, skill and wider awareness particularly in modules LMD09101 & 09103 and the “ Puppeteer “ film in LMD 09108. Overall some of the work was probably less strong than the previous year.

At level four the research module LMD10101 it was notable that the smaller 2014 cohort of film option students performed on average less well than those in photography (Averages - film 58% Photography 65%). In carrying this work forward into the LMD 10103 module of Final Film projects there were also some problems with one of the major films which engaged many of the students. Though this was retrieved quite well this had some detrimental effect on the overall standard of work at this level and overall in general terms the work was less strong than the previous year.

Further comment below.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

As indicated above the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules have good variation in the devices deployed and these are clearly effective in challenging students in a diverse number of ways. Clearly the team works hard to ensure that key skills and understandings are communicated to students using a variety of techniques along with creative challenge in projects.

In Film Practice 3 LMD09108 I wondered whether proposals should also include either a writers vision statement for their script or a Style outline on their pre-visualisation of this aspect..

In Film Practice 4 LMD09110 students from the cohort were offered opportunities to produce film portraits for a challenging and enterprising visit to China from which they will clearly benefit and this work was not seen in the sample. However, this brief did meet the stated learning outcomes of the module and module staff had clearly sought to avoid issues arising from students not participating in this trip by maintaining the portrait theme for them also. As with all such enterprising opportunities arising in the curriculum, when it comes to assessment, It is important that the challenge between these two groups was also seen to be equitable.

I continue to stress the importance of the use of the terms Proposal and Critical Essay raised in last year's report in respect of the need for clarity and more commonality in the use and definition of these key documents common to most modules and where there is still variation & differential response from students across modules.

As previously stated, confusion in what these terms mean is a common problem in Media/Film/Photography HE courses but in my experience it is helpful for these to be transparently clear between both tutors & students because the assessment is so often directly linked to what the Proposal statement says it wants to achieve.

Proposals –

1. Evidence of work from some students suggests that sometimes this is used variously to define either a Research Proposal (i.e.. investigation) OR a Project Proposal (e.g. a logistical plan) OR a Film (e.g. an screenplay created for a specific artistic purpose). Since the use of this term is so common these definitions need to be clear in module guides and have better commonality in use. All too often there are examples of perfectly good research merging directly into a script the aims of which are not always clearly expressed. During assessment & the students own critical work, this has a subsequent effect of them not knowing whether they are critically evaluating the project, the process of creating it or the product itself as an artistic creation.
2. The second part of this question relates to what components a written proposal for a film OR screenplay should contain e.g. outline statements about. Objectives (study themes/ motives/ cathartic experience), audience profile/ viewing environment, content, structure, style, concept, (possibly methods & schedules etc.) Whilst these may vary with different research, project or artefact tasks & in different media, these student written statements have a tendency to qualify exactly how work is described & thus what is being assessed. Again, this also has a direct connection to post production critical /evaluative comment where the functionality of these things can be discussed. I appreciate that all modules clearly do work on this but there

seems to be a variable student perception of what the word Proposal means to them in the samples viewed..

Critical Essay: From last year's report some module guides now commendably and explicitly state that student should critically evaluate both *process* and *product* in separate sections. From samples seen, and where this happens, students continue to be very competent in describing and discussing, in the first person, their management of aspects of their production *processes*. However, examples of work more objectively providing critiques by describing, analysing, interpreting and evaluating the film outcomes is almost completely absent from these accounts. This is surprising since in Film Practice 1 LMD09101 students write some perfectly reasonable critical essays about the work of others providing textual reference etc. etc.

Final Year Practice Modules: In the Research and Final Year Projects there were some interesting individual strands of development showing investigation, experimentation and preparation. Staff monitoring, support and moderation in assessment of these projects was clearly in evidence particularly where students ran into difficulty with logistical problems, such as the loss of actors from neighbouring courses. This commendable support and adaptability helped projects come to fruition when they might otherwise have been under threat.

Students: Two External Examiners had opportunity to meet a large group of students across both film and photography in the absence of teaching staff and in a separate session. The most impressive element of this was the clear energetic response of a group of extremely engaged students with a good and amiable quality of comment. Clearly such sessions tend to note negative perceptions more than positives but there were both. Amongst the negatives some students noted that the film and photography split caused tensions, more contact with MA film students would be better, the need for more advanced film workshops, the long wait for dissertation results and access to kit sometimes caused problems. On the positives some students noted good quality of guest visits, though less in film, positive attitudes towards assignment feedback, the business module and some theory.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

Overall, I found that there was some excellent processes of feedback to students which was always detailed, relevant, insightful and helpful. I found that assessment was fair, deployed internal moderation and deployed a commendable range of methods across different modules in the course as a whole.

I questioned one instance where student work was 69.3 % and thus rated at not clearly a first or 2:1 grade. When an accumulation of 2 or 3 marks results in such marginal calculations, it is suggested that the moderation team consider these more decisively in the context of the learning outcomes of the module.

In Film Practice 4 LMD09110 in the sample of craft roles, I found that It was now more clear what the production file evidence should be and how this is assigned to individual students

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

I found that there had been a considered response of module staff to some of the comments made in last years report.

There continued to be many examples of good practice, particularly in the contrast and variety in the design of activity relating to different modules, mentioned last year.

Again, I cite Film Practice 1 LMD09101 there was excellent work relating to documentary modes of address which clearly had immediate effect on the quality of student work. In Film Practice 2 LMD09103 the opportunities for students to witness differing interpretations of the directing of the same scene (and directors workbooks) clearly engaged the students and seems invaluable in providing students with the opportunity to compare & learn from each other's work. This showed excellent applied pre-production practice.

In Film Practice 3 *LMD09108*, the questionnaire based critical evaluation was an interesting development which enables a focus on appropriate themes and also the making of comparisons more easy.

The City project in Film Practice 4 LMD09110 the China portrait productions and visit was an exciting & challenging opportunity which will bring insights for participating students.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

The team continue to consider the above comments in relation to proposals and critical essays and attempt to draw tighten conclusions/ definitions of terminology and use. Subsequent to this it is recommended that module guides and student interpretations are monitored to make the expectations of these assessed components clearly expressed.

Consideration continues to be given to the relationship between the final year research and final year film projects particularly where the cohort is relatively small causing some compression of the number of film projects available for the diversity of craft roles needed to accommodate student taking the craft role route. There could be arguments here for more films to be made by smaller teams to enable all students to fully express their ideas from their earlier research projects..

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or _____

been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		NA
		NA
Yes		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

	NO	
Yes		
		N/A
Yes		
Yes		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

No

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at
Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 05 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 26 October 2013 for duties relating to taught masters provision

Section A: Personal Details

This report is for: **modules & programmes/ modules/programmes**

Insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers:

Photography Practice 1 LMD09102

Photography Practice 2 LMD09104

Photography Practice 3 LMD09107

Photography Practice 4 LMD09109

Professional Development LMD10102

Photography Practice 4 LMD101003

Photography Practice 4 LMD10101

Please insert the programme title to which this report refers:

BA (Hons) Photography and Film

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	*	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	*	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	*	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	*	

If you answered no to any of the questions please provide details in section C as appropriate.

Section C:

<p>1) Comparability</p> <p>Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>
<p>The level of comparability with other institutions undertaking photography degrees is very high and appropriate for the sector.</p>
<p>2) Commentary on Academic issues</p> <p>Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the subject benchmark statements and SCQF level descriptors?</p>
<p>I see no problems with the level of academic standards and again feel they stand comparison within the sector as a whole. The work is in line with the benchmark statements and descriptors. I can see no disparity here and it is clearly laid out for the student what they can expect and what their responsibilities are.</p>
<p>3) Student Performance</p> <p>Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content</p>
<p>In general the student work is very strong, particularly in the final years shows where students rise to the occasion in a very professional manner. There are some issues earlier on in the programme prior to their final year where research is still problematic. I have discussed this with the course tutors and I am in full agreement with their comments and feedback to students regarding the need for a more rigorous research regime to support the practical work undertaken.</p>
<p>4) Learning and Teaching</p> <p>Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>Overall the methods (and feedback) employed work very well and give the students a wide-ranging experience that is appropriate for anyone going into the area of professional photography. The range of teaching allows the student to experience the many facets that make up the life of a professional photographer and equip the students well for life beyond the university.</p>
<p>5) Assessment</p> <p>Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>The assessments and feedback were very rigorous and fair and were very astute in terms of the students' strengths and weaknesses. The comments were wholly appropriate and designed to encourage the on going production and professional development of the students works as a whole. I felt some of the feedback was very long and in some cases the member of staff was making a rod for their own back in terms of the amount of feedback involved. This is not a criticism merely an observation.</p>

<p>6) Good practice Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight</p>
<p>I felt all staff brought good practice to the course in their own way and the wide range of specialist knowledge available to the students makes for a very strong and unified course.</p>
<p>7) Recommendations Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.</p>
<p>As the course is shortly to change to become a specialist photography degree I do not feel any recommendations would be appropriate at this point beyond perhaps my previous comments on the need to improve academic rigour within the students' research journals/outputs. I feel any other points are essentially academic until the new course is running.</p>

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
------------	-----------	-----------

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

a. Programme Handbook(s)	*		
b. Academic Regulations	*		
c. Module Descriptors	*		
d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria	*		

Draft Examination Papers

a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)			*
b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?			*
c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			*

Marking Examination Scripts

a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts? (as specified in regulation A9.4)			*
--	--	--	---

- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

*		
*	for "scripts" read presented work.	

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

*		
---	--	--

Coursework/Continuously Assessed Work

- a. Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment?
- b. Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?

*		
*		

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

	*	
	*	
		*
		*
		*

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Overall I feel the course is very well taught at all levels with a highly motivated staff cohort who bring many areas of knowledge and expertise to the course.

The staff make my visits a highly enjoyable experience and are rigorous in ensuring all student work, feedback and briefs are made available for me to see. Furthermore the staff

go out of their way to ensure I am fully aware of each module, how it works and what its aims are. In this respect I wish to thank all members of the photography team in making my visits a very smooth and easy process to undertake.
I look forward with interest to seeing how the course develops as a specialist photography course and to my continuing involvement in its future.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to eereports@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	
Modules only	x

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

TV Factual Production
LMD 10118 TV Factual Research
LMD 09135 Scriptwriting

Studio presentation
LMD 09141Drama Production
TV studies

LMD 10106 Dissertation
LMD 10120 Work Based Learning
Final Project Research

LMD 10107 Final project
Professional Development.

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BA (Hons) Television

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	Yes	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	Yes	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	Yes	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	Yes	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

I found the academic standard of each module and the overall BATV programme of study to be set and maintained at the appropriate level. Student performance is measured against that set level and the assessment process is appropriate and rigorous. The standard of work I saw was impressive at the top end of the marking scale and is comparable with student work at other higher education institutions.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Academic standards across all the modules I have moderated are strictly maintained at the appropriate level.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

At the top end of the marking scale, students demonstrated considerable strength in creativity and camera skills as well as realising their ideas in a high quality finished product. This was particularly noticeable in LMD10107.

The poor quality of sound was a recurrent theme across many modules. It's an issue I've noticed across programmes at my own institution as well as others so this is not unique to Napier!

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

I believe that one of the strengths of this programme is the engagement with potential employers and an emphasis on practical, relevant industry facing skills which strengthen the vocational nature of the programme and are vital to the employability of its students. I believe the recruitment of staff with industry experience brings credibility to the programme and the learning and teaching within it.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

I looked at a range of different types of assessment from oral presentations to essays, learning logs to films. Students are able to demonstrate their skills in portfolios of work across some challenging assignments. Feedback was fulsome and constructive. I was pleased to see student work being annotated. I would like to commend staff on the detailed level of feedback noticeable in modules such as LMD10106 and LMD09135. Second marking was also transparent.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

There were many of examples of good practice, not only evidenced in the feedback but also in the construction of modules. For example:

Modules such as LMD10120 are extremely relevant and use of the Erasmus Student Mobility Programme meant those wishing to do so could gain relevant work experience in an international setting.

LMD10107 – This is an ambitious module and students attack it with creativity and enthusiasm. Feedback is detailed, fulsome and constructive.

Poor spelling and punctuation is noticeable and is being picked up by staff. Long

may this continue!

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

Not recommendations, but 'some things to think about':

There is only one module in the programme dedicated to scriptwriting (Year 3). Given the complexity of the films and programmes the students are undertaking, I wondered if there might be scope to develop this further.

Essays - I felt the marking was generous at times given some student work was submitted without academic quotes and limited bibliographies. Given many of the students opting to take this course come via the HND route, this could be an area to develop.

If I was to be asked to do this again, I would like to see the full range of marks awarded on each module not just those with the supplied sample to give me a sense of the overall module profile.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

Y		
Y		
Y		
Y		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		NA
		NA
		NA

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

Y		
Y		
Y		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Y		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance,

N		
	Y	

progression and awards?

- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

		NA
Y		
		NA

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	<input type="checkbox"/>
Modules only	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Performance Skills I CLP09114

Performance Skills II CLP09115

Interpreting Text CLP09116

Performance Technique II CLP09118

Performance Technique I CLP09117

Leadership in the Creative Industries CLP09119

Performance Skills for Professional Practice CLP10114

Performance Skills III CLP10111

Advanced Performance: Stage CLP10112 or Advanced Performance: Screen CLP10115

Advanced Performance: Stage CLP10112 or Advanced Performance: Screen CLP10115

Festival Production I CLP10113

Festival Production II CLP10116

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

I have been given access to a wide range of materials both written and practical. I have also seen two productions at the Edinburgh Festival (2013) and two productions on the QMU campus. The productions are of a high standard and give the students a very good practical experience. I have also viewed screen acting exercises.

The student's practical work is comparable with other UK institutions. The standard of the written work is not as high. The student's essays are well written but lack criticality and evidence of research particularly at level 10.

There is evidence of research at level 9 but this is not continued throughout the self evaluation and critical reflection elements of the student's written work. When students reflect upon their own practice it would be beneficial for them to cite practitioners that they have studied and discuss how they use these systems and methods in their own work.

The students do show evidence of this in their practical application but not their written work.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

The academic standard of each module is set at the appropriate level and is correctly matched against the subject benchmark statements and the SCQF levels.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

Student Experience

The students have a range of experiences throughout each module and through the productions.

The production work is of a high standard and students work in a range of genres, giving them real life industry experience. The work performed at the QMU theatre is well attended and great care is taken to present each production in an appropriate theatrical environment. The students conduct themselves professionally and have been coached and directed to a very high standard.

The Festival Production Module gives the student the opportunity to experience a range of skills from the early planning stages, then pitching ideas, producing their own work and then performing at the prestigious Edinburgh Festival in Scotland. The students score well in their assessments and there is very good evidence of written feedback to support each student's work in Performance Techniques 1 module and Advanced Performance for Screen module.

The modules are set at the correct level and offer a number of ways in which the student can experience acting for stage and screen.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

All modules have a variety of appropriate teaching methods and the students benefit from the experience and expertise of the tutors. There is evidence of very good staff/student relationships and interaction.

The learning and teaching methods and approaches used allow the students to explore the module content in a supportive, safe environment. The assessment methods used are appropriate and the use of summative and formative assessment supports learning and development. Students are given some responsibility for their own learning and that of others in the peer review element within some modules.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The assessments outlined in the module descriptors are appropriate to the tasks. There is generally a good spread of marks throughout the modules. The averages are marginally high in comparison to UK averages.

I would encourage colleagues to use the full mark range as marks tend to be between 50-70. Often as academics we are reluctant to use either end of the scale but it is worth considering work at the higher end of the scale as to whether it is worthy of more and likewise less at the other end of the scale.

There are a variety of assessment tasks used which are pertinent to student learning and to the world of work,

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

- The team should be commended on their hard work and dedication ensuring that the students have a very good solid experience across both campuses and modules.
- The high level of commitment of the staff.
- Excellent technical support for productions i.e.- sets and props
- Good staff /student relationships
- The Festival module is an excellent module to prepare students for work in the industry.
- Very high quality of work produced in stage productions.
- The use of new work in productions

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

- To give the students more complex written tasks that show evidence of their research and independent study and learning.
- A suggestion that the students be encouraged to develop and perform more of their own original material.

--

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
------------	-----------	-----------

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		N/A
		N/A
		N/A

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Dissertations/Project reports

a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

		N/A
--	--	-----

Board of Examiners meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

	<input type="checkbox"/>	
--	--------------------------	--

b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

	<input type="checkbox"/>	
--	--------------------------	--

c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

		N/A
--	--	-----

d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

		N/A
--	--	-----

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

		N/A
--	--	-----

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Although the dates of the examination panels are sent out in August, the year before the event, it would be helpful to have a reminder nearer the time of panels in order to make arrangements to attend.

Thank you

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	x
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Module Duties

Understanding Theory

Women's Writing & Film making

Genre, Texts and Audiences

Postcolonial Fiction and Film

Theory into Practice

Science Fiction: Text and Film

Creative Writing: Genre Writing

Dissertation (Shared)

Cities: real and Imagined

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

Programme Duties

BA English

BA English and Film

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	x	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	x	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	x	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	x	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The standard of student work is comparable to other institutions with which I am familiar (Southampton and UEA). The marks achieved cover the range from thirds to firsts, with the few fails for incompleteness or disregard for the assignment brief. There are fewer thirds and 2.2s in the fourth year than in year 3, which is to be expected. The students' writing skills are also comparable across the range, with the first-class students often having a facility with language that complements their comprehension and application.

None of the modules I reviewed had more than 10% first-class marks, except for the dissertation module. (I have some further comments on the range of marks below.) However, if English dissertations are separated from English and Film dissertations, then the latter is well below that figure. I have yet to see final degree marks, but I suspect that the English and Film students will acquire firsts at a rate lower than the national average. This is in and of itself not a major critique, but something about which to be aware. It is my experience at Southampton that combined honours students do acquire fewer firsts overall, and it seems important to pay attention to this so that student achievement in CH degrees matches the intellectual, pedagogical and employability value of those degrees.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Yes, the modules each incorporate a range of texts, theories and critical approaches that require students to strive for confident analytic skills in their textual analysis and critical argument. The Theory into Practice module is particularly good at developing these skills through analytical reading and reflection assignments that develop understanding of literary theory that is then applied to specific texts. It is clear to see that training returning in the year 4 modules as well as in the dissertation.

The dissertations I read show a range of students meeting the typical standards of an English degree. Some showed particularly powerful analytical skills in their application of theory to non-mainstream texts.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

Student performance across the range of modules is very strong in understanding theory and its application to texts. In the various modules, students move with ease between literature and film analysis, and often are quite capable with cultural analysis. The good visual analysis in the coursework seems to slightly disappear in the dissertations that I read.

The creative writing assignments in modules other than Genre Writing appear to produce some weaker work from students who achieve higher marks in critical assignments. Though many students do very well on these assignments in Cities Real and Imagined and Science Fiction Text and Film, producing impressively imaginative and skilful work alongside rigorous critical reflections, some of the lowest marks were achieved by students who had much higher marks in previous analytical assignments. I have some further comments below on this but I wonder if some of the students perceive creative writing assignments as easier options (as is my experience elsewhere).

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

All the modules made available to me employ the standard lecture/seminar model. Each tutor, at least once, used feedback to point out to students when they should have paid better attention in lectures, a practice which I admire. All module handbooks clearly stated the amounts of reading required and the levels of participation necessary for students to achieve at their highest abilities.

Several modules use presentations or discussion-leading assignments for the first assessment. In addition to the employability skills that these kinds of assessment encourage and facilitate, they are clearly an effective practice for the development of their knowledge and understanding, as each has a two-stage process of performance and reflection.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

Assessment across the range of modules I read is rigorous with questions that ask students to employ skilful textual analysis alongside critical thinking and an independent argument. There are a range of assignments that include classroom speaking (discussion leading and presentations), creative writing and analysis, all of which give students the opportunity to engage with both the aesthetics and politics of the diverse cinematic and literary texts studied. I was particularly pleased to see the inclusion of peer feedback on the discussion

leading assignments. Several student comments were very incisive and thoughtful. This seems a very good way to help students understand the value of formative assessment.

Assessment briefs were clear and detailed, and assignments that did not meet these criteria were given specific feedback about following the brief. In Genre Writing, the second assignment feedback on several submissions said that at least four secondary academic sources were required for the critical reflection. This instruction may have been given to the students verbally, but I did not see it in the module handbook. The progression of assessment in Cities Real and Imagined from discussion leading, to reading diary to creative/critical essay is impressive and gives students a lot of room to explore. I do wonder though if there is a bit too much room. The final assessment offers several options that range from a traditional analytical essay to a comparison of two existing city tours, with critical analysis, as well as more creative projects such as an outline for a TV documentary or the creation of a city tour (both with critical analyses). Out of the top 7 module marks, only one student acquired (roughly) consistent grades across all three pieces of assessment. Only one student acquired an overall first, and the final assessment's 50% weighting meant that low marks on this assignment dropped several students by a class mark. The briefs for the more creative assessments are clear, and I do not wish to suggest that they should be dropped. However, it does seem that, at least this year, the students struggle to perform well on them.

The moderation of modules is consistent in practice across all modules, if not in form. Different types of forms/lists were used. The University's assessment handbook says that moderation should not include the changing of individual marks; however there are notes that this did happen on Cities Real and Imagine and Science Fiction Text and Film. The moderator on Genre Writing agreed marks without indicating any reasons. In general handwritten feedback is very difficult to read.

Addendum – at the exam board we discussed that these mark changes made during moderation were small and agreed by both parties.

The double marking of dissertations is done well and with rigour. The agreement process works more than satisfactorily. For all dissertations with large discrepancies between first and second marker, I agreed with the final outcome. The third markers for Catlin and Eastop made the same decision I would have made, and the final negotiated agreements on McCartnely and Gerrard are most certainly fair. I was particularly pleased to see explanations for the agreement on Gerrard. They are clear, sensible and fair.

The feedback into Practice module had feedback on a few assignments that suggested that the student was bordering on plagiarism by either repeating lecture material or not appropriately referencing and that it should not be repeated in the future. This approach seems slightly fuzzy and therefore less helpful to students than it might be.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

The varied types of assessment are innovative and creative. The various 'discussion leading' assignments are particularly good practice of employability skills – being able to lead in this manner is necessary for the students' ambitions in the workforce and an excellent skill for becoming leaders in any field they choose.

The inclusion of mixed creative writing and critical thinking across a range of modules clearly encourages students to see the connection between the analytical skills they are learning

and the creative ambitions they may have for the future. The consistent inclusion of theory in all modules, including creative writing, encourages ambitious thinking that generates some very compelling dissertations.

The feedback on all modules is thorough, detailed and appropriate. All staff employ a good balance of criticism and encouragement. Students at the lower end of the scale are consistently given advice on how to improve.

Overall, moderators give full explanations of their agreements and an appropriate range of marks is considered.

The agreement of dissertation marks shows a clear process of dealing with initial discrepancies through discussion or a third marker that is fair and clear.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

Feedback (except for on the script) should be typed.

Moderation should be more consistent, using the same form and preferably typing all comments. A clear line on changing or not changing individual marks in moderation should be maintained.

Plagiarism should have a clear definition with a progression of sanctions that are punitive but also allow for learning (beginning with a formal warning and moving on). It might be helpful to have a definition of 'Bad Academic Practice' that allows for noting lost footnotes etc.

Consider the variety of assessments on single modules. Do too many options put students at a disadvantage.

**A discussion on the low numbers of firsts for English and Film students.
-This is particularly evident in the dissertation marks. Instead of the 'typical projects' list in the handbook, which, though general, seems limiting, a list of example topics (from previous students or staff suggestions) might be helpful.
Addendum – during the exam board we discussed that the low numbers of first class degrees for English and Film students in this year's cohort was anomaly and that previous years had first class marks on par with English graduates.**

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

N/A		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

X		

- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

x		
x		
x		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	X
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Romantic, Victorian and Modern Poetry CLP09107

The Idea of India CLP09122

Rise of the Novel CLP09109

The Twentieth-Century Scottish Novel CLP10106

Gothic Tradition CLP10100

Crime in Text and Film CLP10108

Dissertations JAC10100

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate): **English**

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	x	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	x	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	x	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	x	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

Standards are very similar to what I'm used to nationally. There is a good spread of marks with a greater proportion of "good degree" marks (2:1 and above) in Year 4 – an expected result entirely in accord with other universities.

I am delighted to see use being made of marks at the top end of the usual scale in exceptional cases – well deserved.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Yes – this is all very clear. The English subject benchmark statements are very accommodating and the team exploits this to generate interesting, challenging and innovative courses

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

The usual remarks apply: poorer work suffers from the generic defects of lack of preparation, reflection, rigour -- though presentation skills are on the whole pretty decent and better than at some other institutions. Strong work manifests attention to detail, well-constructed argument, thoughtful presentation, good preparation and a sense of independent work.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

I have not seen any teaching but it is evidently effective from the work generated by the modules. Course handbooks very sensible but varied in format: standardisation to some degree might help students navigate. However, this is for the team to discuss. Enforcing it might lead to a failure to acknowledge course diversity. Some courses directed students to online material – very good to know cognizance is taken of the vast array of resources now available to us beyond paper and film.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

Organisation of the assessments is in general very sensible – not too long, too short or too many – and there is in many cases clear progression as marks rise from one assessment to the next. The use of presentations to feed into essay was good to see – even if marks for presentations were on the whole higher than for written work (contradicting what I’ve just written about increasing velocity). This, however, is normal for the Napier student demographic.

I liked the limited number of essay questions students were given: students can get confused with too many possibilities and the course risks losing focus in trying to cover them all.

I am delighted to see use being made of marks at the top end of the usual scale in exceptional cases – well deserved

There is clear evidence of rigorous moderation – both of the actual acts of 2nd and even 3rd marking but also of how marks were discussed. In one course (Crime) a very helpful comparative sheet was supplied – to be commended. That said, the rationale for the materials sent me was always clear.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

It’s obvious that the overall organisation of the programme works well: the documentation sent me was exemplary, as were all dealings with me as an external. Transparency and rigour are firmly embedded in the management and running of this programme.

Fascinating and unusual approach in final year Crime module – to be commended.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

It may be that the team needs to consider a specialist English dissertation taught element. Certainly the dissertations I read were satisfactory – when not outstanding – but students might be helped by more focus on the subject-specific set of skills needed.

One student I feel should be formally congratulated by the institution for an outstanding dissertation. He was awarded a 78 for it but I should have been just as happy to see a higher mark (work of this exceptional level is hard to mark precisely: as it is so unusual, there are almost no comparators). This is one of the best, if not perhaps the best, undergraduate dissertation I have encountered in my teaching career.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		X
		X
		X

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

X		
		X

- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

X		
X		
X		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

The team is to be congratulated for the delivery of teaching that has led to high quality learning.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	x
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

- MUS09130** Popular Music Analysis
- MUS09127** Music for the Screen
- MUS09121** Recording Studio Theory & Practice 3
- MUS09116** World Music
- MUS09122** Music Software Applications
- MUS09133** Creative Practice
- MUS09134** Recording Studio and Practice
- MUS10105** Major Music Project
- MUS10124** Dissertation
- MUS10114** Recording Studio Professional Practice
- MUS101029** Entrepreneurship in the Music Industry

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BA(Hons) Popular Music

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	x	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	x	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	x	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	x	

Section C:

<p>1) Comparability Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>
<p>Having looked at a cross-section of work from each of the modules presented by the course team on my visit, I can confirm that the practical and academic standards of this programme are comparable with those achieved on similar undergraduate programmes at other higher education institutions.</p>
<p>2) Commentary on Academic issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the subject benchmark statements and SCQF level descriptors</p>
<p>In my opinion the academic standard of each module is set and maintained at the appropriate level.</p>
<p>3) Student Performance Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content</p>
<p>High levels of performance have been achieved by many students this year. The move to the new site has clearly been a very positive step, creating enhanced study and assessment opportunities for students through a number of practical developments, e.g. 24-hour studio access and the ease with which wider student collaboration (for example with the Design School) can take place.</p>
<p>4) Learning and Teaching Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>The overall quality of student work submitted this year is testament to the effectiveness of the teaching and learning methods employed on the programme. The delivery team is to be commended for this.</p> <p>There has also been a significant increase in the wider uptake of some of the modules offered on the programme.</p> <p>Module feedback to the Board by the staff team again made their expertise, commitment and enthusiasm for continual refinement of learning and teaching very clear.</p>

The team is reviewing student tutorial support for the Major Project next year.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

I can confirm that the assessment process continues to be thorough and fair, with methodical marking, moderation and student feedback.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

1. The philosophy and structure of this highly effective vocational programme.
2. The integrated engagement by the programme delivery team with the various branches of the music profession.
3. The continued quest for personal professional development, through which the programme retains its vitality, credibility and relevance.
4. The team's continued commitment to the development of the programme and to enhancing the quality of the student experience.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

1. The delivery team is to be commended for the quality of teaching and learning on the programme.
2. Rationalisation and consolidation of support and work structures are required by the delivery team to ensure the continuation of the development of the individual research profiles through which the programme retains its contemporary vocational relevance.

--

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

x		
x		
x		
x		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		x
		x
		x

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

		x
x		
x		

Dissertations/Project reports

a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

X		
---	--	--

b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

		X
--	--	---

c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

X		
---	--	--

d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

X		
---	--	--

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

X		
---	--	--

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

As this is the last year of my appointment, I would like to take the opportunity to thank the delivery team for their assistance in the fulfilling of my role as External Examiner. I hold the team in high regard and it has been a pleasure to see how their work has ensured that incremental improvements and refinements to the student experience take place year on year. I therefore wish the programme continued success and am sure that it will continue to build on its reputation as an excellent preparation for entry into the music profession.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	BMus (all honours modules)
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

- MUS09100 Language & Structures of Music 3.1
- MUS09103 Language & Structures of Music 3.2
- MUS09109 Introduction to Music Therapy
- MUS09128 Principal Study 3.2 (Composition portfolios)
- MUS09131 Principal Study 3.1 (Composition portfolios)
- MUS09132 Applied Music Skills
- MUS10100 Public Recital (Composers)
- MUS10102 Dissertation
- MUS10104 Music Analysis
- MUS10108 Music Psychology
- MUS10116 Music & Aesthetics
- MUS10124 Dissertation
- MUS10130 Music Analysis 1
- MUS10131 Principal Study 4 (Composition portfolios)
- MUS10132 Music Analysis 2

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BMus

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?	x	
Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?	x	

<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	x	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	x	

Section C:

<p>1) Comparability Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>
<p>As in previous years, I find the standard of student work, both within and across modules, to be comparable to expectations at other HEIs across the sector in this field.</p>
<p>2) Commentary on Academic issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the subject benchmark statements and SCQF level descriptors</p>
<p>Yes. (See also my comments under 3. below.)</p>
<p>3) Student Performance Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content</p>
<p>As regards the significant increase in the number of first-class degree were awarded this year, I can report that this is consistent with the student work that I have seen across all modules, some of which was indeed of an exceptional standard both internally and externally (i.e. compared to work at the same level elsewhere). The programme team is to be congratulated for fostering and supporting students in attaining such a high standard.</p> <p>Where there is evidence of students underperforming or failing to meet learning outcomes, I am convinced and satisfied that academic staff provide all the necessary support through the usual appropriate mechanisms.</p>
<p>4) Learning and Teaching Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>Following on from my request to the programme leader at the end of last year, I was able this year to meet all the module leaders for the various modules and, where applicable, the strands within them. This has given me a much firmer grasp of the programme structure and the relationship between modules, both across the years within a single subject (e.g. recital or composition) and across modules in individual year. I wish to thank the programme leader and the team as a whole for their help in organising these meetings and making them run smoothly and efficiently. Following these meetings that I can report that I commend the programme team on the coherence of the programme, the level of integration of its components, and the remarkable spirit of collegiality within the programme team.</p>

In the sections below I comment further on specific aspects, identifying several examples of excellent practice.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The marking process (as I have observed it) is conducted with scrupulous fairness, rigour, and efficiency. Feedback, though varying in quantity between members of the programme team, is at all times ample and sufficient to identify and make known to students both their strengths and areas for improvement.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

I was very impressed with the strand teaching in third-year Applied Music Skills, in which students are required to pick two of the strands. All possible pairings of the available strands are coherent, and maximise students' ability to tailor choices to their individual needs. I was also impressed by the coherence and commonality of approach between strand leaders, and with their due consideration of the possible pitfalls in strand teaching, which I'm satisfied that they have resolved appropriately.

Another conspicuous success is the **Public Recital** module. The overwhelming majority of these were in performance, so I did not see them; but I did see the work of a couple of composers. Although in neither case was the mark obtained excellent, I was particularly impressed by the scope provided in this module offers for students' development of self-directed, organisational, collaborative, and employability skills, including as it does all aspects of project management. I believe that this approach ought to serve as a model throughout the sector (in that, although I have seen other examples of similar things elsewhere, I cannot think of any better managed).

The teaching of analysis likewise demonstrated evidence of students attaining excellent results.

Finally, I have seen some potentially very useful, and generally applicable, approaches to grading in the context of the Music Psychology module. Given appropriate flexibility to reflect varying module requirements, this should be considered by the programme team as a whole as part of its review of processes. I understand that the programme leader is to explore this with other members of the team.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

1. Following discussion with the programme leader, I recommend, as above, that due consideration be given to the implementation of marking criteria at both module and programme levels. This follows my recommendation in previous years, which have already resulted in encouraging moves in this direction (see above under 'good practice').
2. Following discussion with the programme leader, I recommend that formal opportunity be created for external examiners to meet a representative sample of students in order to receive their impressions of the program and the teaching and learning environment, broadly conceived. This is good practice in other institutions, and I have no reason to believe that such a move would be anything other than constructive and a credit to the programme team.
3. Following the excellent timetabled structure of this year's external examining diet, I recommend that the programme team consider adopting such an approach for every

external examiner in future, at least once during their period of tenure (preferably at the start). This needs not to take place every year, and instead other areas may be explored thereafter. This structured approach has the benefit of making much clearer to the EE the structure of the programme, and to gauge the degree of cohesion and commitment of the programme team as a whole. With the role of EE progressively moving away from the resolution of marks (barring exceptional circumstances, naturally), it seems logical to consider how the most effective use can be made of the EE, including consideration of the programme's general approach, by allowing time to discuss with those delivering them their philosophy and aspirations.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		X
		X
		X

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

x		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

x		
---	--	--

b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

		x
--	--	---

c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

x		
---	--	--

d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

x		
---	--	--

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

x		
---	--	--

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

I commend the programme team as a whole, and the programme leader in particular, for the great strides taken in the organisation of the programme during my period of tenure as EE is so far. As far as I can tell this has not resulted in an increase of bureaucracy, rather a gain in focus and clarity, resulting in clear benefits to the student body and also to the team as a whole.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	
Modules only	X

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Public Recital

Instrumental and Vocal Teaching 1

Instrumental and Vocal Teaching 2

Ensemble 1

Ensemble 2

Principal Study 4

Principal Study 3.2

Principal Study 3.1

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BMus (Hons) Music

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	X	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	X	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	X	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	X	

Section C:

<p>1) Comparability</p> <p>Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>
<p>Each module presents an appropriate range of challenges, and is well calibrated to each level. The standards of musical performance are higher than the equivalent in the university sector, reflecting the quality and quantity of learning support each student receives at the Edinburgh Napier University.</p>
<p>2) Commentary on Academic issues</p> <p>Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the subject benchmark statements and SCQF level descriptors</p>
<p>The academic standard of modules related to the discipline of musical performance is carefully considered for each level and well maintained/delivered throughout the undergraduate degree course.</p>
<p>3) Student Performance</p> <p>Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content</p>
<p>The Final Year Recital Project stands out as an excellent example of the quality of teaching and the originality of learning environment where student has an opportunity to combine imagination, strategic thinking, practical skills and knowledge. This is where very good students achieve their potential and gain confidence in their ability for independent learning. For this year, I noted that less able students had also managed to demonstrate their strength through making good use of the freedom and independence this module offers.</p>
<p>4) Learning and Teaching</p> <p>Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>There is an excellent use of a 'marking grid' in feedback across all performance-related modules. The calibration of this grid corresponds well to the assessment criteria, and provides clarity and rationale to each mark. The feedback practice is very useful for student in grasping their strengths and weaknesses and in gaining an overview of where she stands in terms of achievement.</p> <p>The level of preparation for each assessment (particularly for the Recital) is very good. There is ample evidence of high quality in student learning.</p> <p>The balance between one-to-one and group tuition is good, and there is good evidence that students are well and effectively supported.</p>

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The assessment is rigorous and fair. The double independent marking system is appropriately implemented and conducted. Written feedback is exemplary.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

The quality of feedback is excellent, and the practice of giving feedback within a day demonstrates a high level of commitment on the part of the members of staff.

Each student is well supported and well guided in developing confidence as a performer.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

None.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		X
X		
		X

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

	X	
	X	

- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

		X
X		
X		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

None.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	x
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Level 9

Jazz Improvisation 2: MUS09107

Performance Studies Instrument 5: MUS09117

Performance Studies Voice 5: MUS09118

Performance Studies Composition 5: MUS09119

Entrepreneurship In the Music Industries: MUS10128

Level 10

Advanced Musical Performance Instrument: MUS10109

Advanced Popular Music Performance Voice: MUS10113

Advanced Popular Music Composition: MUS10111

Jazz Improvisation 3: MUS10107

Recording studio Production and Professional Practice: MUS10129

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate): BA Popular Music

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	x	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	x	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	x	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	x	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

As stated in other sections of this report, I consider student work to be comparable to similar courses I have witnessed elsewhere in the UK.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

The general academic standards for the modules I examined are as one would expect for a course of this nature. The points discussed throughout this report are mainly reflective of discussion on the day of my visit - and are included as constructive advice for the course team to consider.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

As I have indicated in previous visits, the practical work is always going to be more advanced than written in awards such as this. I can confirm however that the high performance grades are accurate, and a fair reflection on student ability. I continue to recommend however that the teaching team find ways to facilitate the ways in which 'traditional' academic work, including critical reflections such as diaries and 'track rationales', are undertaken analytically (as opposed to descriptively), with as much philosophical underpinning as possible. I have pasted below my brief notes regarding specific modules - which may be useful to module teams.

Jazz Performance: this module had a high average grade, but as stated, I agree with this due to the advanced standard of many students. I would consider the feedback to be reasonably comprehensive for the Practicals, although the 'Negotiated Feedback' looks more sparse. I

understand from speaking to the Award leader that this feedback tends to take place during a viva type conversation with the student. I therefore suggest that some sort of 'global statement' is pasted into this section of the feedback pro forma, so both students and future externals are made aware.

Instrumental Performance 5: Good comprehensive feedback. I examined the high and low graded work and agree with the classifications - some excellent work.

Voice 5: Comprehensive and useful feedback throughout. As with all practical performances - students are generally displaying a high standard.

Composition 5, Advanced Composition and Jazz 3. Good feedback - although I could not listen to some of the work due to the lack of a DVD/CD player.

Advanced Performance. Again some fantastic performances. I did note that the portfolios seem to be more jazz orientated than normal - but I do not consider this an issue.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

As stated last year, although I did not witness any teaching on my visit, it is apparent that students have access to a dedicated team of professionals - all of whom are involved in professional practice. I did not get the opportunity to revisit the facilities this year, but would like to do this during my final visit in 2015 to ensure all teething issues have been resolved. I continue to be impressed with the commitment the university makes regarding time allocated for instrumental tuition (40 mins). As indicated elsewhere in this report, my issues concerning the implementation of uniform module guides appears to be resolved - at least for the modules under my remit.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

I would like to confirm that all modules I examined now have clear and uniform module guides, which will make it much easier for students to navigate modules throughout the award. It was also good to see all modules now have a sample 'module moderation form' - which clearly displays double marking has taken place. A very minor point - but some moderation forms show both 1st and 2nd double marked grades, while others don't - just displaying the agreed grade. Although either format is acceptable, it would be useful for course teams to agree on what the final format is. It was also very useful to see a spreadsheet of all student marks in addition to feedback being presented on uniform templates. Regarding the latter, this once again will facilitate students to comprehend course procedures. There were no issues with the grades and feedback I examined during my visit.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

As always, thanks to Bryden for setting things up on the office Mac. Also, I had my first opportunity to have a brief look at student work via Moodle this year. This will assist both myself and future external examiners to be able to examine student work prior to the actual visit - which could consequently be used for more dialogue. Also, thank you to the course team for taking on board previous suggestions, as indicated elsewhere in this report. I would also like to commend the 24 hour access policy the university has adopted.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

Although I did not get the opportunity to discuss this in detail with course teams, I recommend that staff consider more use of Turnitin and grademark when assessing written work. Not only does this act as excellent plagiarism detection, but also potentially makes student feedback easier to document (in addition to being more prompt). There is a fabulous Ipad app which enables not only the grading of written work - but also the facility for easily sharing feedback with students and external examiners. Certainly not a stipulation - but maybe some staff development would assist all staff incorporating technology such as this into their working procedures?

It is good to hear that collaboration is taking place with other subject areas such as photography. Just to note that I am happy to advise on how my own institution engages in collaborative projects if required. Just let me know.

I noted the potential research pressures on staff during this visit, and would suggest they are typical for a 'new university' seeking to diversity income. Although I am sure this already happens, but I suggest staff would benefit with input which assists them in positioning their research in line with university objectives. The LOLA research and the employability projects may be good examples or work that could be positioned more officially as 'research' for example? I will carry this point forward during my next visit.

I also got the impression on this visit that some staff are being stretched time wise. Although not officially part of my remit, I can only recommend that module teams consider assessment reduction (for example capping the number of assessments for a 20 credit module) when practicable, and that senior staff ensure workloads are adhered to rigorously and constantly.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		X
		X
		X

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression

X		
X		

and awards?

- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

X		
X		
X		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

NA

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	X
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Techtonics 3 (DES09108)

Interior Architecture Studio 3 (DES09110)

Design and Urbanism (DES09100)

Techtonics 4 (DES09109)

Interior Architecture Studio 4 (DES09111)

Design Research Methods (DES09118)

Minor Project (DES10102)

Major Project pt 1 (DES10013)

Major Project pt2 (DES10013)

Exhibition and Portfolio Development (DES10104)

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BDes./BDes(Hons) Interior Architecture

MDes Interiors

MDes Lighting

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	X	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	X	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	X	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	X	

Section C:

<p>1) Comparability Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>
<p>BDes(Hons) The work compares well with that of students from other institutions. This year I looked at the projects submitted by students on four other BDes/BA(Hons) Interiors based courses and visited the Interior Design Courses exhibition in London. I feel that the work submitted by students from Napier compares very well with these.</p>
<p>MDes The work seems to be of a similar standard to other Masters Interiors courses that I have witnessed. I have not seen the work of any other Masters Lighting course, but if comparisons are made with similar courses, then it seems to be of a the same standard</p>
<p>2) Commentary on Academic issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the subject benchmark statements and SCQF level descriptors</p>
<p>BDes(Hons) The academic standard of the majority of the modules is appropriate. The focus of the course is distinct; the emphasis is upon the development of design proposals through an understanding of concept and place. The expectations placed upon the students are high but for the majority of the modules they are again, appropriate.</p> <p>MDes: The Interiors course does not exhibit a clear academic basis; the students seem to lack a lot of basic theoretical knowledge. I discussed with the course leader, a number of different methods for developing the students knowledge, through key texts, building visits and visiting speakers, all of which, to a certain extent, are missing at the moment. The Lighting course has the advantage of the Course Leader who has written a significant book on the subject and can therefore be considered as an authority.</p>
<p>3) Student Performance Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content</p>
<p>BDes(Hons): Strengths The initial research work produced by the students is extremely strong. The students had carried out a thorough investigation of their chosen building or site, they were well aware of the structural and functional possibilities that it had to offer. This process of analysis, in a large number of cases was presented in a professional and meticulous manner.</p> <p>The research that the students conducted into the nature of the new function was very</p>

strong; some of this initial work was extremely good.

A lot of the students had strong concepts for their projects; the time spent on this initial research meant that their proposals were well-founded and convincing. This is one of the most difficult aspects of the design process and the staff should be commended on this. Even the weakest students had a strong proposition.

The link between the studio programme and the dissertation means that the students developed a substantial piece of research.

I saw some excellent models. These area great aid to the communication of Interior Architecture projects.

The students had produced some very well executed drawings and it was pleasing to see the use of computers and hand drawings. The best students were combining both to create really powerful images.

BDes(Hons):Weaknesses: student performance

Some of the student presentations suffered from too stringent an editing process. I would have like to have seen more preparatory work, more analytical investigations and sketch proposals. I am sure that these students had done this work, they chose not to submit it for external examination.

MDes: Strengths

The students had all developed their own approach, they were all following their own, distinct design trajectory and thus pursuing an individual research proposal.

The students had produced a substantial piece of high quality research, which will underpin their design projects.

MDes: Weaknesses

The lack of theoretical knowledge of the subject of interiors means that some students are not developing as far as they could be.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

BDes(Hons)

I am not convinced that full advantage is being taken of the Atelier system. The course structure encourages diversity and difference, and the Atelier system, (which is already in place) is designed to allow for the research practice of the of the individual Atelier leader to be the basis of the unit. Within the final year are three different Ateliers, each led by a different academic with a different research driven design focus, yet the majority of the student projects had a phenomenological basis. The course has the opportunity to offer a much more substantial collection of approaches and attitudes towards spatial and interior design, and should really be pursuing this in a much more rigorous manner.

MDes

Most of the students work is self directed, which does produced diverse, yet focused work. This should really be underpinned with strong theoretical knowledge.

The students have access to a well equipped workshop and a very pleasant studio

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

BDes(Hons)

The assessment and moderation did appear to be rigorous and fair. The students were aware of the expectations that were place upon them, and were certain of the aims and objectives of the course.

As an external examiner, I would like to have seen an overview of each student. I did not have a chance to see the complete spread of studio marks for each student. So the grades for work that was examined in the Winter were not available.

MDes

It is difficult to comment upon the assessment procedures. The aims and objectives of each project are made clear to the students, but I have never observed the assessment process, and I have not been shown the marks.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

BDes(Hons)

The initial research, which is conducted in semester 1, is of a very high standard. The students are expected to conduct a great deal of investigation into the background of any project, they are then encouraged to analyse this research. This process encourages the students to be very knowledgeable about the possibilities that any situation could offer. This gives all of the students, even the weakest, a sound basis from which to start the development process.

The dedicated studio for the Yr 4 students is very successful; it encourages interaction and means that there exists a creative studio culture and group momentum.

The joint projects with other courses appear to build successful liaisons and encourage diverse and cross-disciplinary thinking and interaction.

The Atelier system in the final year should encourage the students to develop their own approach towards design.

Some good quality drawings using a variety of different communication techniques, including CAD, hand drawing, model making; sometimes in combination.

The students had the opportunity to visit a couple of interiors/buildings then speak to the specific designers about the creative process. This is a successful and well-received element of the course.

MDes:

There seems to be a momentum among the students, they appear to get on well together and when we met, were obviously enjoying their course. They enjoyed the cross-disciplinary interaction that is made possible through the shared learning space.

The students have access to a well equipped workshop and a very pleasant studio

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

BDes(Hons):

There is very little time built into the academic year programme between internal marking and moderation and the arrival of the external examiner. Can I suggest that more time is allocated to the internal moderation process, so that the marks are certain before the arrival of the external examiner.

MDes:

The Interiors course need significant and specialist input.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		X
		X
		X

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)

X		
---	--	--

b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?

X		
X		

c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

Dissertations/Project reports

a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

	X	
--	---	--

b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

	X	
--	---	--

c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

		X
--	--	---

d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

		X
--	--	---

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

X		
---	--	--

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

This is my last year as an examiner. During this time both the undergraduate and post-graduate courses have undergone much change, not just the title, but also significant changes in focus and academic staff. The transition from an interiors focussed course, to one that is much more multi-disciplinary does reflect the changes that have occurred within the architectural industry, thus hopefully equipping the students more successfully for this uncertain world.

The more generic nature of the course encompasses the skills and interests of the existing staff, and importantly, it will ensure that the course will be able to accommodate the expertise of future academic staff. Attitudes towards the delivery of design education have had to change. The implications that funding cuts have brought means that methods of delivery, allocations of space and access to resources have all had to adjust to the more stringent position that all educational establishments find themselves/will find themselves in. The revalidation of the undergraduate course put the course in a position to respond to this situation in a positive and productive manner.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at
Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	
Modules only	DES09106 Graphic Design Studio 4

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent,
please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	Y	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	Y	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	Y	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	Y	

Section C:

<p>1) Comparability Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>
<p>I am satisfied that the standards achieved by students on this course are of comparable standards across other institutions I am familiar with.</p>
<p>2) Commentary on Academic issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the subject benchmark statements and SCQF level descriptors</p>
<p>I am satisfied with the academic levels.</p>
<p>3) Student Performance Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content</p>
<p>As may be expected student's marks cover the full spectrum attainable. The poor marks are a not a reflection on the course or its delivery but simply reflect the abilities of particular students in response to the particular demands of this module.</p>
<p>4) Learning and Teaching Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>Throughout my time as EE I have been impressed by the commitment of the staff and by their effectiveness in delivering the module in an interesting and effective manner.</p>
<p>5) Assessment Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>The marking is fair and rigorous, I am always able to see all students at both visits, and we are able to have informed discussion about their marks.</p> <p>Students overall seem very happy with the way the course progresses and by the quality of feedback given.</p>
<p>6) Good practice Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight</p>
<p>The attention the staff give to the students who are engaging on difficult and personal subject areas.</p>

7) Recommendations Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.
The staff have talked in the past about establishing some analogue print facilities and I would like to see that explored further.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
------------	-----------	-----------

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

Y		
Y		
Y		
Y		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		n/a
		n/a
		n/a

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

Y		
		n/a

Dissertations/Project reports

a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

		n/a
--	--	-----

Board of Examiners meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

	N	
--	---	--

b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

Y		
---	--	--

c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

		n/a
--	--	-----

d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

		n/a
--	--	-----

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

		n/a
--	--	-----

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

- a) —
- b) I have enjoyed my time as external and it has been interesting to see how students respond to, and develop work, against the particular outline of this final year module. It places quite particular demands on them that at times I felt were perhaps too onerous for weaker students. There was some concern about this from the staff too and we have discussed this topic on-and-off during the period. The staff have responded by breaking up the workload with the addition of other, smaller and more tightly focussed projects, and this has I think been very successful in giving students a variety of outcomes for the year. What also has developed over the time has been an acceptance that the deliverable for the module is more than one major output but rather a body of work. This is more applicable to the nature of much commercial graphic design work.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2012/13 are

- 07 July 2013 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2013 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	√
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

BSV09108 Planning and Development 2

BSV09110 Rating and Statutory Valuations

BSV 10109 Valuation 3

BSV11101 Dissertation

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

52259BH Property Development and Valuation

52263BH Estate Management

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	√	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	√	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	√	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	√	

Section C:

<p>1) Comparability Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>

This year I have seen a very limited sample of work as the student numbers have unfortunately been very low. However, the standard of work which I read was comparable to that of other institutions. Within the Dissertation module I only had 2 completed works to read – both were good and the students has clearly benefitted from the supervision process. Possibly due to the very small cohorts a tail was not discernible. However, I did note a number of non-completions which is always disappointing.

I can report that the Course Team had picked up and taken action on my comments from last year.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Over the first 2 years of my appointment I commented on the fact that I had seen few examples (other than the Dissertation) where students had been invited or expected to apply and challenge this knowledge to scenarios of practice. However last year I was pleased to note the introduction of a very challenging scenario question BSV 10109 – this year I was delighted that greater use of project work had been met. I had the opportunity to meet 2 students who had experienced this and it was clear that it had been a very good learning experience and had developed not just their knowledge base but their personal confidence and their transferable skills. This is gratifying and I commend the Team on this.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

Given the very small cohort sizes (in one Module there was only 1 student to assess), it is perhaps a little meaningless to make comments as to strengths and weaknesses at the cohort level. From reading scripts and meeting students it is clear that students get a good grounding in the traditional aspects of their discipline – but if there is a weakness it is in developing a knowledge and deep understanding of the profession which accredits the programme. I do appreciate that the course team bring an RICS representative in to the Department but stronger practitioner/professional body engagement or weaving of professional practice issues more into the programme content might help them prepare for the dilemmas of practice that they will face on graduation. However these comments are based on a small and possibly unrepresentative cohort. Therefore it is difficult- and perhaps invidious to draw too many conclusions.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

The overall results point to effective learning and teaching methods. However the students raised an issue regarding the volume of content in the Valuation module. I discussed this with the Course Team who have the matter in hand and I am confident that it is being addressed.

I have commented in the past that the small size of cohort is undoubtedly helpful as the Course Team know their students well and are thus well placed to help the learning process. However the current final year was so small as to possibly disadvantage the students due to a lack of potentially divergent views among the group to stimulate healthy discussion. I was therefore pleased to hear that numbers coming through are a little larger.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

As in previous years there was clear evidence of robust double marking. Assessment was appropriate, fair and rigorous. Feedback given to students continues to be helpful and supportive.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

My remarks from previous years still stand:

Marking scheme of the dissertation was very clear and left little room for overt subjectivity.

Presentation of module results is very clear and helpful to examiners – though I am unsure how the comparability of averages against modules is calculated!

Quality and structure of feedback to students

Success rates were very satisfactory.

Students very supportive of the Course Team

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

The students felt that they would like some more systematised input in terms of learning styles and preparation for group work and presentations. Whilst it may be that they do receive this I would encourage the Course Team to review this element to support the more to more project and problem based learning.

The introduction of more specific preparation for the Dissertation was also raised. This was discussed with the Course Team who I think will consider whether it is appropriate.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

√		
√		
√		
√		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

√		
√		
√		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

√		
√		
√		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

√		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?(January Module and programme board only. Not June Module Board)
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

√		
√		

- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

√		
√		
√		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Please see comments above related to skills for professional life. The programme is accredited and the next time it is reviewed the Course Team might care to consider how they could better integrate into the curriculum current professional issues – at the moment there is a major concern around the practice and insurance implications of valuation and the notion of professional negligence for example. Currently I cannot see how such matters can easily integrate with the curriculum as written – but to do so might offer the opportunity to help students connect with the ‘real world’

As ever, I would like to thank the Team for their efficiency and hospitality and for travel arrangements which, as usual, were efficiently handled by the University.

This is my final year of appointment although I understand the Team might request an extension – which I would be happy to undertake.

However as an overview, the programme is very well delivered to appreciative students who are generally well prepared for their assessments. It is traditional in its approach and covers the knowledge base well. I have made suggestions for bringing more dynamic real world experiences into the assessment regime. These the Team have acted on – seemingly to the benefit of students. If there is a concern moving forward it is that the numbers are low which has the benefit of personal attention and a strong sense of belonging – but limits the stimulus of competition within a cohort that can help the stronger students to raise their game still further and challenge the weaker ones. I would also like to see professional ties strengthened further and this is an much the responsibility of RICS as the Course Team

Overall though I comment the Team.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at
Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	SCA 11100, 11101, 11102, 11103, 11104,11105,11106
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent,
please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

W54707 MA SCREENWRITING

W54715 PG CERTIFICATE IN SCREENWRITING (ONLINE) BLENDED LEARNING

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	yes	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	yes	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	yes	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	yes	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

There was a consistency of standards across student work comparable to other higher education institutions.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

The academic standard of each module is being maintained at the appropriate level.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

The strengths of the student performance is in the written creative work – the weaknesses in the breadth of their contextual reading and the critical rigour of their journals and self-reflection.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

The most effective teaching is at the level of small group and one to one tutorial support for the creative work. The course is still seeking to find an effective way of teaching the writing of the journals. The approach of teaching across several story genres while giving the students the experience of writing for a range of formats, also leads at times to a superficial outcome and a limited preparation for the writing of the major project.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

Assessments were fair but there was a variation in the rigour and quality of feedback. The distinction between formative and summative feedback was sometimes clear and sometimes less so.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

It is evident that there is a good range of lectures, workshops and visiting industry specialists to help writers contextualise their work and prepare them for working outside the course. The combined classes with the MA Film students are to be commended for introducing the writers to the realities of team work and collaboration.

The Case Studies and Market Analysis are usefully linked to the students' own projects and encourage them to consider the audience and market for their ideas in a practical way: this is a good example of the way the course is designed to link analysis/research with project development.

The Script and Story Reports demonstrate that students are acquiring good transferable skills of script analysis and feedback that can also be applied to their own work in development. This module also highlights the importance of research both in terms of project content and the market while helping students understand the forms and formats, as well as the language and terminology of the development process.

Students write a range of proposals, outlines and shorter scripts, as well as learning about re-writing, presentation and adaptation – and are introduced to the skills involved in script editing, collaboration, pitching ideas and team-work. The use of written lectures and online lessons compliment the weekly class sessions - while collaboration with students on other courses at Napier and Edinburgh College of Art are encouraged. These are all examples of good practice.

The small group and one to one tutorial support for the creative writing is a clear example of effective and good practice on the course.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

More support for the students during the preparation and development of the major project.
More support and guidance for the students in the writing of the critical journal.
Review of the quality and consistency of assessment and feedback to students.
Review the usefulness of the Personal Development Plan
Encourage a wider set of references and study around the development of the creative work and the writing of the critical journal.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

yes		
yes		
yes		
yes		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		NA
		NA
		NA

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

yes		
yes		
yes		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

yes		
-----	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

no		
yes		
yes		
yes		

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

yes		
-----	--	--

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

I have now completed four years as External Examiner on the MA Screenwriting programme at Edinburgh Napier. In this time I have found the course leader and team responsive to suggestions and continually involved in improving the design and quality of the course.

It is clear from the range of work that I read as well as the accounts given by the students in their journal that the MA Screenwriting at Napier University continues to provide a good level of guidance to writers across a range of media and is supported by experienced and committed professionals.

Issues going forward will surely include finding a way of supporting more one to one input from these skilled practitioners and more time for the writers to complete their major projects and give a proper account of the relation between their theory and practice.

I thank the course leader and Edinburgh Napier for their support and the opportunity to engage in the discussion around course development and wish them well in the future.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk



EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	x
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

CLP11119 Creating Narrative - Writer's Toolkit
 CLP11120 Innovation - Concept and Technique
 CLP11117 Writing Practice - First Person Narrative
 CLP11118 Narrative Practice - Vocational Skillset
 CLP11116 Authorship - Culture and Practice
 CLP11111 Writing Genre Fiction (option)
 CLP11115 Creative Non-Fiction (option)
 CLP11110 Major Project

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

MA Creative Writing

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	x	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	x	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	x	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	x	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

Both the creative work and theoretical work I have encountered on the MA Creative Writing at Edinburgh Napier compares favourably with similar work in other UK institutions.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

The academic standard of each module and of the overall programme meets the threshold for academic standards.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

As usual I was sent a range of material, including some exemplary work and some less accomplished material (as one would expect to see). As a rule I would say there were very few out and out bad ideas, but that the execution wasn't always what it could be (again, this is entirely to be expected on a programme of this sort).

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

As ever the Learning and Teaching methods were very effective. The core team don't use workshops but they do use a variety of other methods, including many formative approaches which have consistently proven their worth.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The assessment for this last batch was characteristically detailed, consistently constructive and honest when it needed to be.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

There are many examples of good practice on the course which I intend to emulate in my new institution. I'm particularly eager to push for a writer-in-residence as I think the experience of a high profile practising writer lends a significant added to dimension to this kind of course, and greatly enhances the student experience. Utilising graduates in the classroom is something I intend to emulate on our new BA programme, partially in response to the success of this strategy on Napier's MA Creative Writing.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

I'd like the team to consider giving more word space to the more explicitly theoretical elements of assessment as sometimes it feels like students are constrained in terms of they can say in this regard.

--

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
------------	-----------	-----------

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

x		
x		
x		
x		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		x
		x
		x

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

x		
x		
x		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

x		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

	x	
		x
		x
		x
		x

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

This is my last report for Edinburgh Napier's MA Creative Writing. I have thoroughly enjoyed my time as the course's External Examiner and been consistently impressed by the professionalism, diligence and acuity of the course team. As I've noted before, the team bring to the task years of experience in the publishing and writing industries, and both members of the team are highly accomplished teachers in their own right, as is evident in the quality and diversity of the material I've been given to examine over the years. I'm also deeply impressed by the fact that the team have been willing to modify the course over the years, attenuating the syllabus, modes of delivery and assessment strategies as they've continued. I'm sad that my term as External Examiner has come to an end and I wish the team and institution the best of luck for the future for what remains an innovative and relevant course.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at

Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY
EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT 2012/13

This report is for the **two programmes and relevant modules** listed below:

Module Code

Module Title

(1) MA Film:

SCA 11118	Collaborative Techniques in Film 1
SCA 11130	Creative Practice for Film and TV
SCA 11122	Collaborative Techniques in Film 2
SCA 11129	Creative Practice for Cinema
SCA 11123	Critical Film Study
SCA 11127	Masters Film Project

(2) MFA Advanced Film Practice:

SCA 11128	Project Preparation
SCA 11115	Project Production and Post Production

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
Academic Issues	Yes	

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?		
Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?	Yes	
Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?	Yes	
Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?	Yes	

If you answered no to any of the questions please provide details in section C as appropriate.

Section C:

<p>1) Comparability Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>
<p><i>As in previous years I can confirm that the work viewed for MA and MFA is on a par with the standard of work pertaining at other UK and international institutions offering practical film programmes of a similar nature</i></p>
<p>2) Commentary on Academic issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>
<p>Yes</p>
<p>3) Student Performance Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content</p>
<p><i>The course and project elements that I viewed this year (in both their preparatory and final forms) indicated a steady progression of improvement and confidence during the year. The best on the MA programme showed originality as well as technical confidence with no one this year dropping below an acceptable standard in their contribution to the final films. On the MFA the final work completed in this examination year showed that this programme's longer duration</i></p>

offers students a chance of producing more complex and ambitious work. The preparatory work I viewed for the coming final project (a documentary filmed in Northern Africa) showed great commitment and professionalism of approach.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

I was satisfied with the level of teaching and supervision in evidence this year and am aware of the conscientiousness of staff involved. On the MA in particular the coherence and relevance of taught modules in the first and second semester has greatly improved. Supervision on the MFA may need to be looked at as a new course leader takes control there in the coming academic year.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

Assessment methods seem to have improved this year in the light of comments I made last year – especially in the MA's 1st Semester modules.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

I am glad to note that my recommendation for admitting specialist editing students on the MA programme was taken up for this intake. The admission of one sound student is also a step in the right direction.

The new guidelines on writing critical reflections alongside practical work (a replacement for the old workbook on the MA) has improved the quality and coherence of the students' contributions. The work on the MFA in this area remains of a high standard.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

1. On the MA, the course leader needs to look at the manner of assessment of final projects in order to ensure that each student is assessed fairly on the basis of their specialist contribution. This might, for instance, involve changing the weighting between marks for the finished product and the reflection elements.

2. I would continue to recommend admission of more sound specialists too and better staff provision for this specialisation.

3. As a result of the reorganisation MFA course leadership, the new course leader needs to ensure he makes his own independent contact with the external examiner whilst liaising effectively with the MA course leader to coordinate meetings with and provision of relevant materials for the examiner on his visits.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Marking Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Coursework/Continuously Assessed Work

- a. Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment?
- b. Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?

Yes		
Yes		

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

No		
N/A		
N/A		
Yes		
Yes (but see repeated recommendation in this report)		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

No other issues.

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	P and M
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

MA International Journalism for Media Professionals

Course Code: 54736MM (FT) / 54737 (PT)

JAC11102	Cross-Platform Journalism and Media Practice
JAC11104	Global Current Affairs across Cultures
JAC11107	Leadership and Entrepreneur-ship in the Media
JAC11117	Professional Media Industry Placement
JAC11114	Investigative Journalism (Core)
JAC11115	Global Business and Finance Reporting (Core)
JAC11116	Documentary Film Production (Core)
JAC11118	Professional Media Production Dissertation

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

MA International Journalism for Media Professionals

Course Code: 54736MM (FT) / 54737 (PT)

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	Y	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	Y	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	Y	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	Y	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The MA in International Journalism for Media Professionals is comparable to other Masters programmes in terms standards of work I would expect to see in a Masters programme. It is comparable in terms of standards of student work, specifically in standards of ethically sound and robust journalism and outputs from modules which reflect industry practice. The standard of academic work such as the dissertation is comparable to that in other higher education institutions I am familiar with.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Academic standards appear to be set and maintained at an appropriate level reflecting threshold academic standards and descriptors.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

This is the second year of this programme and the work is of a generally high standard. It is clear that within this small, bespoke programme a couple of students were producing excellent work of industry standard. The ambition and scope, especially apparent in the international target markets, are commendable.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

I am pleased to comment that the online teaching tools have been added to and are being developed to include audio and video. The site itself is easy to navigate with clear pathways to modules, lectures and teaching materials. There has been a clear effort to engage students to interact online between themselves and their tutors which is essential in online distance learning.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

Feedback is fair and rigorous. Of particular note is the comprehensive feedback given to dissertation submissions.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

It is clear the teaching team and leader of the programme are making an effort to engage students online and encourage them to have confidence and the intellectual tools to help them, whatever their industry profile or aims or ambitions. The residential component of the degree seems to be an essential part of the engagement process. Marking shows a fair, accurate and balanced spread of marks.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

The course is in its second year and continues to develop. It is worth noting that my recommendations from last year are being worked on in terms of developing the online portal, learning tools and use of multimedia.

I would recommend:

- 1. students be encouraged more to actively to use social media in all their journalism but ALSO during the course to communicate with each other and their tutors. This should be embedded in all modules**
- 2. students to develop their convergence journalism techniques and actively demonstrate them in submissions**

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

Y		
Y		
Y		
Y		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not

		N/A
--	--	-----

because it was at your request)

- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

Y		
Y		
Y		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Y		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

Y		
Y		
Y		
Y		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

This is the second year of the course. I am happy to talk to and engage with the programme leader at each trimester in terms of input to guide the continued success of the degree.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at
Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	Yes
Modules only	No

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

DES10102	Minor Project
DES11101	Research Methods
DES11106	Sketching in Hardware and Software
DES11107	Minor Design Project
DES11119	Design Management
DES11121	Design Project
DES11125	Design Dissertation
DES11127	Concept Creation
DES11128	Creative Research Portfolio
DES11129	Design for Exhibition
DES11130	3D Prototyping
DES11131	Interpretative Design (starting 2014)
DES11132	Major Design Project

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

Edinburgh Napier University: School of Arts & Creative Industries.

ART, DESIGN & COMMUNICATION SUBJECT GROUP

MA / MDes Design [Graphics]

MA / MDes Design [Interaction]

MA / MDes Design [Interior Architecture]

MA / MDes Design [Lighting]

MA / MDes Design [Sustainability]

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	Yes	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	Yes	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	Yes	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	Yes	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The quality standard of work between modules was comparable as can be evidenced by the variety of grades across the design modules delivered on the programmes. The combination of shared and discipline specific modules assists the cohort in appreciating the overall quality levels.

As an external examiner I am satisfied that the masters standards are comparable to a range of national and international institutions delivering postgraduate design masters courses. Napier can be confident that this course represents itself well at both national and international levels both in terms of the diversity of students backgrounds, project directions and range of grades achieved at final examination.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

It is clear that some of the start up issues from last year have been resolved and this years cohort felt much more confident and cohesive than the previous year. It was evident that this group of student had a unified identity that they shared across disciplines.

A fire that damaged the workshop in the spring term had a significant impact on the course and staff should be complimented on their hard work to mitigate the effects and provide alternative resources and adjust timelines accordingly to ensure students completed successfully.

The new modules and running order are improved from last year and it was clear that students benefitted from this and could see the logic in how the course was constructed and delivered a clear learning journey. The master's academic standards are well maintained and both staff and students are aware of the various thresholds and levels required to develop their skills and achieve the results they seek. In conversations with staff and students it was clear that assessment benchmarks are an active part of discussion and written project feedback reports. With one or two exceptions feedback now seems to be consistent in terms of delivery across the modules and the overall standard of work was higher than last year.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

The collaborative studio environment has certainly benefitted this year's group and it was clear they have reaped the advantages of this. All the students interviewed were managing the development of their own education and aware of their roles and learning responsibilities

on a creative masters. Occasionally the transition between an undergraduate and post-graduate programme with its higher dependence on self-direction and personal development means that a small number of students struggle with this transition. In general there were no modules that stood out by being weaker than others and in discussions with staff it was evident that they were continually assessing the modules performance and improving or altering them to provide the best learning opportunities.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

A number of teaching strategies are deployed on the programme including theory to practice where students understand the application of principles, and practice to theory models where experimentation and outcomes are compared to knowledge in the field. The majority of modules are practice led where relatively open design briefs are offered in a way that provides plenty of creative space for students individual interests.

The student group requested that the major project could be improved with individual presentations shared across the whole group for feedback and comments.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The assessment process has been clarified and the development of an internal grading matrix has aided the agreement of grades at the final examination board. Student work fell across the whole range of grades on the scale with a clear articulation from staff for the grades awarded in relation to the work. When sampling work at the high, middle and lower grades there was clear parity between work at the same grades and distinctions between those of higher and lower levels. In the majority of cases feedback to students clearly signified which elements needed attention in order to improve learning.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

The research methods course gained strong praise from students and was seen as one of the key learning moments on the course. In particular it was cited as a useful way to move from research to practice in a structured way and helped demystify some of the design process.

Staff who brought in experiences from their own practices were held in high regard with Lighting design amongst others was mentioned.

Last years report commented on the timing of the thesis after the project work and noted that this was unconventional. The majority of design degree timetable the thesis at an earlier stage of the programme for inspiration and research for later capstone projects. Feedback from students however was very positive for a thesis following the major project and the ability to reflect and deepen insights from the project work in the thesis that followed was seen as a positive aspect of timetabling the thesis later.

Student feedback again was very positive on the commitment and professionalism of teaching staff and the effort and thought that was put into their teaching. Top strengths were

cited as faculty involvement and enthusiasm, full scale mock-ups and prototyping and a dense schedule that maximised learning. The students know the staff well and are comfortable in being able to approach them for extra support and guidance when needed.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

There are three main recommendations:

The first is a request for more industrial connections from students. While it is recognised that financial constraint may make it difficult to engage a large amount of industrial visitors, some site visits to projects, manufacturers, consultancies, presenting in external professional scenarios could be beneficial in increasing professional connections and awareness.

The second is to consider more group work on the course. Students clearly benefit from collaborative working and interdisciplinary perspectives while success in professional practice depends on team working skills.

The third is to share individual presentations of major project at key stages for group feedback (if this is not already taking place).

The other recommendation are relatively minor:

- Improvement to timetabling visibility
- Some comments on one or two sets of grades being late (minor project)
- Suggestion not to have hand in dates in vacations where foreign students may have returned home
- Recommendation for a short induction session explaining the masters learning model in order to manage expectation from students transitioning from undergrad to postgraduate education.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
------------	-----------	-----------

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

Yes		
-----	--	--

Draft Examination Papers

a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)

		N/A
--	--	-----

b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?

		N/A
--	--	-----

c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		N/A
--	--	-----

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)

Yes		
-----	--	--

b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?

Yes		
-----	--	--

c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Dissertations/Project reports

a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

	No	
--	----	--

b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

Yes		
-----	--	--

c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

		N/A
--	--	-----

d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

Yes		
-----	--	--

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- N/A

b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

This report has taken into consideration discussions and communications with the student cohort, lecturers and subject specialist external examiners during two visits to Napier in January and May in the 2013-14 academic year.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	X
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Media Law JAC 11132
News Writing JAC 1119
Public Affairs JAC 11136
Radio JAC 11120
Journalism Information & Society JAC 11131
TV & Multimedia News JAC 11133
Dissertation JAC 11134

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

MA Postgraduate Journalism

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	Y	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	Y	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	Y	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	Y	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The level of student work within the course is of a good standard and compares favourably with that of other institutions.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

From the selection of material I saw the academic levels appear to be consistent and maintained at the requisite level.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

Students are performing to the norm; one student produced exceptional work in broadcast and print. Such all-round ability is rare and this student clearly has a great future ahead. I would suggest, however, that students should be reminded that their on-screen appearance is very important and they need to look "professional" at all times. Some of the students were too sloppily dressed for on-screen work and need to smarten up.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

From the selection of materials I saw and following a regrettably brief discussion with members of the academic team the learning and teaching methods are effective and compare favourably with other institutions (See my comments below).

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The assessments are fair and suitable for the level of study. Feedback is satisfactory and compares well with other institutions.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

I was impressed by the Media Law module which succeeds in combining the theoretical with the practical in a very clever way i.e. a crime report in which students write up a court story, a legalling exercise in which they are required to spot legal errors. The News Writing module JAC 119 is well constructed, the notion of including an appreciation of a contemporary journalist is also an excellent idea. The structure of Public Affairs is worth noting – students are asked to produce two comment/op ed pieces on a topical subject, followed by an essay. So often Public Affairs modules are a series of dreary lectures leading to a regurgitation of facts in an exam; this module is an ideal antidote. The Journalism Information & Society module (JAC11131) provides students with the opportunity to debate a topical issue, which in turn links well to other modules, both practical and theoretical. I believe I have mentioned before the “televised debate” and the Freedom of Information exercise are useful tools to get students thinking and acting like journalists i.e. engendering a spirit of inquiry/curiosity. The revised dissertations (JAC 11134) are working well i.e. the move from a purely theoretical piece of written work to a practice based project with an accompanying report are more suitable for a vocational programme of this nature. They also provide students with something relevant to show potential employers which is essential for the competitive industry they are planning to enter.

7) Recommendations
Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.
<p>I was surprised by the small number of academic staff at the board – one of whom was on sick leave – and was alarmed that the Subject Group Leader for postgraduate journalism and publishing didn't put in appearance. I would recommend that this situation is addressed as a matter of urgency.</p>

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
------------	-----------	-----------

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

	X	
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?

		X
		X

c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		X
--	--	---

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)

X		
---	--	--

b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
---	--	--

Dissertations/Project reports

a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

X		
---	--	--

b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

		X
--	--	---

c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction? (**see comment in recommendations**)

	X	
--	---	--

d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

		X
--	--	---

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

		X
--	--	---

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

I have enjoyed my period as external examiner and am pleased to see that the course is clearly performing well and students are benefitting from the excellent teaching they receive. It's clear tutors are well acquainted with their students. Finally I wish the programme and its staff every success for the future.



Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

This report is for: **modules & programme**

Modules:

MUS11100 Studio Practice 1, MUS11101 Screen Sound 1, MUS11102 Live sound and Events 1.

MUS11103 Audio Hardware and Software, MUS11105 Screen Sound 2, LMUS11106 Live sound and Events 2, MUS11104 Studio Practice 2.

MUS11108 Project.

Programme: *MA Sound Production*

Section B

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?	X	
Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?	X	
Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?	X	
Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?	X	

If you answered no to any of the questions please provide details in section C as appropriate.

Section C

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

Standards were consistent across all modules and in line with other similar programmes.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?

Yes.

Project

Given the quality of these submissions, it is a pity that the evaluation components were not included as an integral part (although I acknowledge the separate submission as placing emphasis on evaluation as has been discussed previously). These components form an essential part of the holistic submission, and should the University wish to develop an archive of these projects then the evaluations should be included, albeit with explicit assessment.

SS1

This is an excellent module that offers a good vocational perspective. I noticed that different parts of the course documentation cited three different module leaders, which could conceivably be confusing to students.

LE1

Academic standards were appropriate and well implemented.

SS2

There still seems to be a slight tension in the required approach to the essay as either Critical Evaluation or Critical Self-Reflection. Pedagogically, these approaches are well defined, and thus the required thrust of the task could possibly be further clarified.

SP1

As for SS1, this is an excellent module that offers a good vocational perspective.

LE2

The online exam was shown to me.

SP2

Everything was well collated and robust. Once again, it was pleasing to be able to scrutinize a transcript version of the Pro Tools exam and indeed the video evidence.

Audio HW & SW

Once again, I was presented with a well-collated package for external scrutiny.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

As in previous years, over all modules, the best practical work was of a very good standard and all was appropriate. Written work seemed better this year. It is my understanding that students are being encouraged in this area from an early stage of the course, which is excellent; however, the realities of students' implementation of this need to be monitored and use of academic sources encouraged.

Project

Students have seemed to embrace an academic approach to the writing this year. This is very encouraging, and clearly builds on my comments from last year; the teaching team are to be credited with precipitating this.

SS1

Written (research-based) work could still develop from an academic perspective.

SP1

As usual, the practical work was of excellent quality, and students gave good demonstrations of their understanding of salient processes.

Audio HW & SW

The sample provided reflects a good range of student achievement

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

SP1

I wonder to what extent the mixing console report specifically fulfils any of the module learning outcomes...

LE2

The module offers a robust training in relevant technologies, and these appear fully assessed.

SP2

The Project Report seems to have matured well, particularly in regard to an academic approach. It is good to see stronger students making use of book-based references, breaking free of the Internet-only culture, but they should however be still encouraged to research higher-level references, for instance conference papers or journal articles.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

Project

It was good to see more expansive feedback this year, particularly at the formative proposal stage. I noticed a large amount of very useful handwritten annotated feedback in the body of the hardcopy proposal submissions; whilst I understand that this year's cohort are returning to pick it up, it is conceivable that some people might not be able to and this offers another argument for rolling the e-feedback system into Trimester 3.

It might have been nice to see explicit comments from second markers.

It was also good to note that feedback associated with higher grades still offered advice of how the submission could have been further developed.

SS1

Feedback on the Sound Replacement task was very good and grading was appropriate.

Grading of the written exam seemed generous at the lower end. In-situ comments on the submission were pertinent, although it would be helpful for students if they could see a tally for how their submission generated marks or indeed otherwise; this was something that I think was implemented last year at my suggestion.

Feedback on the research component did not seem to cover referencing (which featured in the assessment rubric). This could be useful for students, especially since this is a trimester one module and this feedback could be built upon in the remainder of the course.

LE1

As for last year, the exam features a well-designed premise and questions, and the assessment is robust and accurate with helpful feedback.

Although no students failed the relevant component this year, I repeat my suggestion regarding an H+S threshold.

The well-rounded assessment regime tested all, and allowed the best students to shine.

SP1

Assessment was good and generally appropriate; however, the grading for the critical evaluation component (in both written tasks) was in my view too high. Such evaluation at M-Level requires personal opinions objectified through the synthesis of available (referenced) information, and not just a conclusion which functions as a summary at the end of the greater text. Having said that, such evaluation in the context in which it is conducted does not directly compromise stated learning outcomes for this module (as I have highlighted previously), although I think my point remains relevant.

SP2

Grademark might prove powerful and time-efficient for feedback on this assignment.

LE2

The report is an excellent assessment, and students appear to have responded very well to technical aspects. There is still a reluctance in true critical engagement, which is strictly required by LO4; however, grading picked up on this which demonstrates solid assessment.

Grademark feedback has now been implemented and this is to be commended.

Audio HW & SW

The module continues to maintain its robustness in general and in my view, grading was entirely accurate. Grademark feedback has now been implemented and this is to be commended.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight
<p>There are many areas of good practice, now so widespread as can be taken for granted; the teaching team should be credited for this. A small number of specific observations will also be offered...</p> <p>Staff have responded well to my previous observations, and in general, it is encouraging that after last year's slight dip, this year the quality of academic writing appears to have developed very well. It is great to be able to rely on such comprehensive and consistent module and assessment paperwork to support external evaluation.</p> <p>Greater use of electronic feedback.</p> <p>Project The collation and approach is consistent and very good. It was delightful to see some formally-bound hardback submissions this year.</p> <p>LE2 The report as assessment tool – not so much in a general sense, but this one is particularly notable.</p>
<p>7) Recommendations Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.</p> <p>As Scotland's only postgraduate qualification in the field, the MASP holds a unique position in the educational infrastructure, and its suspension can only contribute towards a brain drain towards south of the border. After such diligent development over the last few years, it will be very disappointing if it is not rekindled in the future. I recommend that the University seriously considers this.</p>

Section D

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
------------	-----------	-----------

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

	X	
X		
X		

Marking Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Coursework/Continuously Assessed Work

- a. Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment?
- b. Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?

X		
X		

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

X		
X		
X		
X		

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to eereports@napier.ac.uk

Questions.

There has been discussion of extending my tenure at a number of boards, yet I am still to receive any formal clarification or exact dates for this.

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	x
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

CLP11114 Magazine Publishing
CLP11102 Publishing in Practice

CLP10107 Book History

CLP10119 Publishing Production

CLP09105 Applied Publishing

JAC 1106, Dissertation

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

54601BH BA (Hons) Creative Industries

MSc Publishing

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	x	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	x	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	x	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	x	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The MSc Publishing students are attempting and completing a series of challenging task and modules that stretch them appropriately, and are comparable with competitor programmes I have been external on in past.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Standards are appropriate, and match threshold required under relevant subject benchmark criteria.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

Samples viewed demonstrated that students at the top end were strongly reflective and engaged with the subject and as a result did well and produced valuable projects and work. Students at bottom end demonstrated less ability in terms of synthesising and critically evaluating subject topics accordingly.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

A good mix of peer assessed projects, individual essays and reports, and oral presentations, enabling students to demonstrate a range of critical and reflective skills.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

Marking was fair with strong examples of good feedback.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

Excellent projects this year, including one that delivered an online app which clearly challenged students to excel.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

Continue to offer peer assessed opportunities and a mix of reflective and practice based approaches to assessments and projects.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

X		
X		
X		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

x		
x		
x		
x		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

The MSc in Publishing is a strong programme run by a committed set of staff who encourage students to develop accordingly.

The BA in Creative industries this year saw some excellent results in dissertations, which was heartening to review.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	x
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Modules:

SCA11100OL - Writing and Screen project development

SCA11102OL - Script Development Workshop 1

SCA11105OL- Script Workshop 2

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

PG Certificate in Screenwriting 2013 -2014 (On –line)

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	x	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	x	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	x	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	x	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The students work was of a standard which compares favourably with other higher educations institutions/ courses at which I teach or am familiar with.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

The academic standard of each module is maintained at the appropriate MA level and complies with subject benchmark statements and the SCQF descriptors

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

The course continues to build on its strengths, the most important of which is to deliver a broad range of student work covering a variety of writing styles for film to a professional standard. Course work includes the mastery of the 'script report', the more personalised and self-reflective writing style of the 'Creative and critical Journal', and disciplined creative writing for short film. Having studied a cross section of student out put, I am satisfied that the course continues to produce multi – disciplined work of a high standard. The feedback from the tutors is warm, encouraging, insightful and constructive and appears to be more detailed than last year, which was pleasing to see. General enthusiasm for the course was reflected in the students in depth, 'Creative and Critical Journals'.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

The course is a combination of video lectures, workshops, tutorials and writing exercises that relies, primarily, upon on-line and self-study. The course is comprehensive and, amongst other topics, should be applauded for covering, formatting, depth and subtext, adaptation, character, location, re drafting and dialogue.

The lack of direct 'face to face' or 'human' contact continues to be compensated by the clarity of the course notes and structure, the very helpful device of the 'creative and critical journal', which allows for in depth self reflection and insight into the running of the course and the tutor's feedback, which remains expansive and thorough.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

- Feedback from the course tutors continues to be vigorous, clear and thorough with a softer and more encouraging tone.
- The double marking system for the assignments feels fair and the occasional adjustment in individual module grades indicates that room for manoeuvre and debate has been built into the assessment process, which is always advisable when marking film scripts in particular as it relies on a level of level subjective opinion.
- The creative journal the students are asked to produce allows them a space to give feedback on the course, comment on their own progress and reflect upon the on-going relationship with their tutors.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

- The broad range of writing encouraged from the students
- The course is well designed and interfaces well with current industry practice.
- The tutor feedback is thorough and shows genuine interest in the students work
- Tutors and the course leader keep up to date with developments in the film and TV industry and make helpful suggestions to students of extra curricular activities they can be involved with which compliments their study and helps forge industry links.
- The course outline is concise, clear and well written, which is critical when relying less on 'face to face' teaching.
- The tie up with the EIFF is a good strategy and allows the opportunity for students to

pitch their work to industry and network with professionals, but more importantly to get in touch with 'reality' and move beyond the relative isolation of on- line study. This activity is important for the students on going development.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

- **I would continue to encourage more of a focus on the construction of on- line drama, particularly episodic forms and creation of on – line channel concepts for fiction and semi-fiction. This idea was welcomed by course leader who, despite a lack of student demand for on – line writing training, continues to look for time, funding and opportunities to develop this suggestion further.**
- **It is refreshing to see such a high standard of work and an emphasis on sub – text and visual storytelling within the course, however, on one or two occasions I felt there was a tendency for the writers to be 'too clever' in their screenplays, often favouring sub text over exposition at the expense of clarity.**
- **One student on the course devised a method of using a 'digital ideas in –box', to collate ideas, which might be worth adopting as a tool/ suggestion for next years course.**
- **For tutors and the course leader to continue encouraging students to participate in industry events, attend networking functions and guide them to competitions, web sites and film festivals so that they can connect as much as possible with the outside world. The short film festival at Glasgow Film festival continues to expand and offers many symposiums, screenings of curated short films from all over the world and opportunities for students (current and graduated) to network and is worth highlighting. The 'Go North festival' run by the Highlands and islands enterprises, and other events outside the central belt (i.e Wigtown Book festival – which now has a focus on adaptation and film) should also be promoted to on - line students.**

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		N/A
		N/A
		N/A

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

No		
Yes		
		N/A
		N/A

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Again, due to work commitments, I was unable to meet the students face to face. However the course leader has been in regular contact, informing me of any developments, answering my queries and supplying me with a steady stream of student work throughout the year.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	
Modules only	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Module: DES11130 - 3D Prototyping

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

Programme: MA/MDes Design (Product)

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Section C:

<p>1) Comparability Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>
<p>The standard of the student work presented for this module was consistent with and well matched against other higher education institutions nationally at Masters level.</p> <p>While the student numbers on the course are relatively small the quality of the work produced was of a comparable standard nationally. The assessment process and grades assigned were also well considered and appropriate (all students work and assessment process/feedback was provided for this module).</p>
<p>2) Commentary on Academic issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the subject benchmark statements and SCQF level descriptors</p>
<p>Academic standards set for this module are appropriate and clearly delivered very well by the lead tutor, with all students producing a good standard of Master level work. The assessment process was fair and rigours and standards comparable to a national level.</p>
<p>3) Student Performance Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content</p>
<p>For the 3D Prototyping module at this Masters level the students were tasked with an extensive design and build type brief. Each student has clearly engaged well and produced a good range of prototypes, most of card, wood, plastic. Several students also explored additional processes and materials, demonstrating good depth of exploration and understanding.</p>
<p>4) Learning and Teaching Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>The 3D Prototyping module encourages students to develop independent working practice and explore materials and processes through their own initiative. The teaching approach clearly puts the student at the heart of the learning process, allowing the individual to develop a deeper insight and understanding of the material and process in combination.</p> <p>For such a module technical support is key and this module has clearly been a very well</p>

supported module, as seen by the variety and number of prototypes produced by each student.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The assessment and feedback process is both rigorous and fair. The written feedback to each student gave valuable constructive criticism and suggested areas of improvement. Students were also given the opportunity to add their own reflections in a specific feedback section, an excellent example of good practice at Masters level.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

This module demonstrated the importance of Master level modules having the scope to allow students to develop their own design direction. This can be seen in the range of outcomes and different directions student took the project work.

Crucial to such a practical *design and make* focused module is the combined academic and technical support required. The close working of the academic and technical support staff is key in providing students with a strong platform to design and produce creative practical work.

Allowing each student the freedom and support to develop their own individual solutions can generate some technical challenges, especially for the workshop support team, but this module demonstrates that students working can be well supported, as seen in the range of techniques used by the cohort.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

none

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

		<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	--------------------------

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		
		<input type="checkbox"/>

Any other comments?
Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not

limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at
Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk