

on more long-term questions about consistency of assessment, additionally providing me with a document explaining the balance of assessment types.

Matters for Urgent Attention

If there are any areas which you think require urgent attention before the programme is offered again please note them in this box

No aspects require urgent attention

For Examiners in the first year of appointment **N/A**

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

For Examiners completing their term of appointment **N/A**

| | | |
|----|---|-------|
| 4. | Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment? | Y / N |
| 5. | Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made? | Y / N |
| 6. | Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this? | Y / N |
| 7. | Have you acted as an External Examiner Mentor? | Y / N |

Please comment on your experience of the programme(s) over the period of your appointment, remarking in particular on changes from year to year and the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching provision, on standards achieved, on marking and assessment and the procedures of the School

Standards

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 8. | Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study? | Y |
| 9. | Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met? | Y |
| 10. | Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award? | Y |
| 11. | Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)? | Y |
| 12. | Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions? | Y |

Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.

The programme is structured with a mix of module credits so that students are able to experience a wide range of topics and assessment types, that appropriately test the intended learning outcomes. The topics taught are broad in their range, but are clearly focused on the research strengths of the lecturers in the School. The course clearly fulfils the requirements for BPS accreditation in terms of the topics taught

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

Please explain how this is/could be achieved (examples might include: curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research)

As above – the modules, particularly at Levels 2 and 3 are clearly research-led. The students undertake independent research in their third year, and the quality of these research projects is very high.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 14. | Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD? | N |
| <i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i> | | |
| 15. | Does the programme include clinical practice components? | N |
| <i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i> | | |
| 16. | Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)? | Y |
| <i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i> | | |
| The programme is accredited by the British Psychological Society. In terms of the topics taught, the programme clearly meets the accreditation criteria. | | |

Assessment and Feedback

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 17. | Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment? | Y |
| <i>Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs, in particular: the design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards; the quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.</i> | | |
| The module outlines make explicit the relationship between learning outcomes and assessment. They are appropriately aligned | | |
| 18. | Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award? | Y |
| 19. | Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes? | Y |
| <i>Please comment on the academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses; the strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort:</i> | | |
| The academic standard demonstrated by students is high. They demonstrate abilities in a number of forms of assessment. I noted performance in essays to be poorer than in other forms of assessment, so perhaps this is an area that the School can target for improvement. | | |
| <i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i> | | |

The Progression and Awards Process

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 20. | Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiner's role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process? | Y |
| 21. | Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner? | Y |
| 22. | Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility? | Y |
| 23. | Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility? | Y |
| 24. | Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility? | Y |
| 25. | Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments? | Y |
| 26. | Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate? | Y |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 27. | Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions? | Y |
| 28. | Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work? | Y |
| 29. | Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated? | Y |
| 30. | Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate? | Y |
| 31. | Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations? | Y |
| 32. | Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board? | Y |
| 33. | Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting? | Y |
| 34. | Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board? | Y |
| 35. | Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board? | Y |
| <i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i> | | |

Other comments

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

Once again I enjoyed visiting Leeds as external examiner. The organisation of the process in the School is excellent and makes the role of external so much easier. The marking and feedback is appropriate. Particular good practice is in asking students to reflect on their prior feedback and how they have addressed that, and the opportunity for students to ask for targeted feedback. For the most part, markers gave sufficient levels of feedback, and the moderation process was good – with a clear report from the moderator for every assignment. The questions markers set were appropriate for discriminating amongst abilities. In terms of exams, the comments provided by markers on scripts very much helped in explaining the marks awarded.

There are a mix of assessment types, and often a mix of assessments for the same module. To examine the breadth of understanding often MCQs or short answer questions are employed, with essay style questions used to examine the depth of understanding. Performance in MCQs was generally higher than in essays, and the School may wish to consider the reasons for this, and its implications. There is a potential danger that an unintended consequence of using MCQs is that they balance performance across the module, pulling up the weaker essay marks. I noted some really excellent uses of complex MCQs in some modules, and would urge lecturers using those to share that practice across the School, and for this style of MCQ to be adopted more widely. The other issue this highlights is that essay performance is generally weaker, and the School may want to consider how to address that. Obviously this is a difficult issue as it is potentially labour intensive to give more feedback on how to write effectively. Perhaps the School might use group work and learning technology for students to give one another peer support on writing exercises? Peer work within tutorials is another possibility. A one-off cost may be to provide a sample marked essay with track-changes annotations to show where marks could be improved.

The School helpfully provided an assessment strategy document to show the guidelines the School uses for setting appropriate assessments. I fear that these guidelines are not always being followed, which could lead to some modules over- or under-assessing for the credits on offer. Over assessment also means that lecturers find themselves with a lot more work to do, so it's an issue of importance for workload as well as for student experience. The assessment strategy document does not give much guidance about the work to be completed within an exam, also making it difficult for lecturers to determine if their assessments are appropriate. For example, I noticed the Level 3 module Cognition and Nutrition was assessed by a 1500 word literature review for 60% of the module mark (in line with the assessment guidance) and a one hour exam of two short answer questions and 20 MCQs for 40%. According to the assessment guidance the 20 MCQs equate to 20% of the module mark, so the SAQs appear to be 10% each. The SAQs are not listed in the assessment rubric, but a one hour exam with a single essay should be 50% of the module mark. Are students aware that a SAQ is only one-fifth of an essay? It gets complicated. A summative presentation should be worth 20% of the module mark, according to the assessment guidance, but in Techniques in Human Neuropsychology only 10% is given to a presentation, and 45% for an exam essay (guidance = 50%) and 45% on MCQs (guidance = 30%). I don't single these modules out as though they are examples of poor practice. Far from it – it's entirely appropriate to use a range of assessments. However, staff may find themselves doing too much, and students may not feel the assessments across modules are equivalent. I would suggest that the simplest solution is to standardise the combinations of assessments, so that staff can be certain that they are choosing assessments of equivalent value across different modules. I recommend the School revisits the issue to provide greater clarity for staff and students.

The handbook marking rubric is understandably broad, and is difficult to apply to some kinds of assessment, such as presentations. In the absence of clear guidance it appears that some lecturers have devised their own marking proformas for presentations, which, individually, make good sense and are fair reflections of how a presentation should be assessed. However, for students taking more than one module with a presentation component, this looks like different lecturers are assessing different things, which is not the case. So again, I would recommend the School reflects on the criteria used to assess presentations, and to ensure that a standard proforma is used for this. More generally, it would make sense for the feedback sheets to align more closely with the rubric provided in the handbook, or for the handbook to be redesigned to better reflect the criteria used by lecturers. This should be something that is relatively easy to effect, but will help staff and students.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Title and Name of Responder: | |
| Position*: | Head of School |
| Faculty / School of: | <i>Psychology</i> |
| Address for communication: | University of Leeds Leeds LS2 9 JT |
| Email: | |
| Telephone: | |

*If the individual responding to the report is not the Head of School please state their position within the School.

Completing the School response

The completed School response (including the full original report) should be attached to an e-mail and sent to the Pro-Dean for Student Education in the relevant Faculty. Following approval by the Pro-Dean for Student Education, the School must send the response (including the full original report) directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at qat@leeds.ac.uk. External Examiners should receive a formal response no later than six weeks after receipt of the original report.

Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice

We are grateful for your positive comments regarding our provision. We will endeavour to maintain and improve the range of topics being offered together with the variety of assessments that you mention.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Thank you for the appreciative comments regarding our processes. We are also glad that the responses we have made to the issues previously drawn to our attention have been well received. We are quite sure that this has helped us to reflect on our methods of assessment and to improve our provision.

Response to Matters for Urgent Attention

If any areas have been identified for urgent attention before the programme is offered again please provide a specific response to them here:

N/A

Response to questions 1-7 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

N/A

Standards**Response to questions 8 to 16 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

We are delighted to read the positive comments made, particularly about the broad range of our provision and the high quality of our students' work.

Assessment and Feedback**Response to questions 17 to 19 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

Again, it is good to read the positive comments about the quality of our students' work but it is interesting to note that you feel essay writing quality may be out of line with the quality demonstrated in other types of assessment. You will be pleased to know that we have added another essay writing tutorial in level 2 prior to the submission of the first coursework essay in order to provide some extra support and guidance.

The Progression and Awards Process

Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

Thank you for the positive evaluation of this process.

Other comments

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

We welcome the comments made regarding the use of complex MCQs as part of our assessment process and that we should consider sharing this good practice more widely amongst staff. Our intention is to organise a briefing session for staff in which colleagues can share their expertise and to encourage the incorporation of complex MCQs on a wider basis for AY 2018/19.

We also note your very helpful and insightful comments regarding the equivalence of assessments, particularly in modules with a combination of assessment methods. In recent years we have made a concerted effort to standardise our L3 module workload. When using a diverse range of assessments comparisons can be difficult. Typically exam papers provide guidance to students about how long they should take on a particular section of the paper, thus identifying the relative marks available for that section. However, we are keen to rationalise our assessment strategy in line with University directives regarding the potential for over-assessment. We will, therefore, ensure that staff reflect on the points that you have made to see whether standardised combinations of assessment methods could be employed for greater clarity.

Your point about the use of different rubrics for the marking of presentations is well made. However, we do have a standard presentation feedback sheet that should be used by staff, but it may be that we need to investigate its utility for different modules and consider how we can ensure that this is used consistently.

We are currently creating clear marking criteria for research reports and perhaps should consider doing likewise for presentations.

Finally, with regard to your point about improving the alignment between marking rubrics and feedback sheets, we have taken this on board and have already done this for essays and are in the process of doing so for practical reports. We are grateful that you have emphasised that this is an important issue to address.

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <i>Faculty / School of:</i> | Psychology |
| <i>Subject(s):</i> | <i>Psychology</i> |
| <i>Programme(s) / Module(s):</i> | PSYC2509: Advanced Cognitive Psychology PSYC2503: Psychological Disorders PSYC2521: Individual Differences PSYC2522: Research Skills 3 PSYC3501: Health Psychology PSYC3502: The Biopsychology of Human Appetite PSYC3505: The Spatial World PSYC3507: Applied Psychology: Critical Issues PSYC3508: Drugs, Hormones and Behaviour PSYC3514: Occupational Health Psychology PSYC3516: Evolutionary Psychology PSYC3517: Approaches to Nutrition and Behaviour PSYC3518: Motor Learning in Children & Adults with Disability PSYC3536: Applications of Learning Theory to Psychological Disorders PSYC3537: Contemporary Memory Research PSYC2504: Advanced Social Psychology PSYC2518: Cognitive Neuroscience PSYC2519: Behavioural Neuroscience PSYC2510: Advanced Developmental Psychology PSYC2512: Evolution and Human Behaviour PSYC2523: Research Skills 4 PSYC3510: Reasoning and Decision Making PSYC3511: Drug Addiction PSYC3519: Psychology of Eyewitness Testimony PSYC3527: Techniques in Human Neuropsychology PSYC3528: One Brain, two hemispheres PSYC3529: Language Acquisition and Development PSYC3531: The Biopsychosocial Approach to Understanding Human Pain PSYC3532: Eating Disorders PSYC3533: Clinical Psychology PSYC3535: Cognition and Nutrition PSYC3520: Major Project |
| <i>Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):</i> | BSc and MPsych |

Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards

Points of innovation and/or good practice

| |
|---|
| <p><i>Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The programme offers a good statistical and research methods basis in training and there is good use of APA referencing across the board. - There are examples of excellent feedback in a range of modules, and the feedback sheet is a positive. The coursework self-assessment form is exemplary. The 2nd marker's reports are very helpful. - There are many examples of high standards of work, and good examples of challenging assignments. - I looked at a range of projects, interesting topics and good to see students working in groups. |
|---|

Enhancements made from the previous year

| |
|---|
| <p><i>Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.</i></p> |
|---|

There were some enhancements in range of assessments, for example in Clinical Psychology the use of the case study. This offered an excellent opportunity for students to demonstrate transferable skills. There were also excellent examples of formative feedback in this module.

Matters for Urgent Attention

If there are any areas which you think require urgent attention before the programme is offered again please note them in this box
N/A

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

| | | |
|----|---|-------|
| 4. | Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment? | Y / N |
| 5. | Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made? | Y / N |
| 6. | Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this? | Y / N |
| 7. | Have you acted as a External Examiner Mentor? | Y /N |

Please comment on your experience of the programme(s) over the period of your appointment, remarking in particular on changes from year to year and the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching provision, on standards achieved, on marking and assessment and the procedures of the School

Standards

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 8. | Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study? | Y |
| 9. | Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met? | Y |
| 10. | Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award? | Y |
| 11. | Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)? | Y |
| 12. | Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions? | Y |

Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.

The structure, design, aims, and ILOs are appropriate for the discipline and the standards expected. There is a clear pathway with introduction to modules and then greater specialisation later on. The final year project provides an opportunity for a more in depth piece of work, and the link to professional ethics and integration of learning.

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

Please explain how this is/could be achieved (examples might include: curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research)

All work is informed by research, and is generally kept up to date with the most recent research examples and integration into assessments. There are a range of assessments very relevant to ensuring a research based learning experience, for example, practical reports, critical reviews, presentations. The final year project ensures the students have experiential learning in research.

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

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | |
| <i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i> | | |
| 15. | Does the programme include clinical practice components? | N |
| <i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i> | | |
| 16. | Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)? | Y |
| <i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i> | | |
| <p>The programme is appropriate for the requirements of the British Psychological Society. All core areas of the discipline are covered, there is the opportunity for specialisation, there is excellent grounding in statistics and research methods, and an appropriately challenging final year project.</p> | | |

Assessment and Feedback

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 17. | Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment? | Y |
| <i>Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs, in particular: the design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards; the quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.</i> | | |
| <p>Assessments are appropriately linked with the ILOs. There is diversity in the assessment methods, sufficient to give the opportunity to demonstrate achievement of appropriate learning outcomes but with some consistency to ensure breadth and depth of learning (e.g. MCQ used consistently to assess breadth).</p> | | |
| 18. | Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award? | Y |
| 19. | Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes? | Y |
| <i>Please comment on the academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses; the strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort:</i> | | |
| <p>The academic standards were high, and as would be expected with comparable courses. There were examples where more extensive use of the full range of marks might have been appropriate (especially at the upper end – distinguishing quality in first class work), and this might avoid borderline cases on occasions.</p> | | |
| <i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i> | | |
| <p>There was one module with some differences between markers and the conclusion was to move the higher markers down. This module had a lower overall mean than some modules. Perhaps moving the more conservative markers up would have been more appropriate. Perhaps the Chief Examiner, or Director of Education could offer an overview in these cases.</p> | | |

The Progression and Awards Process

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 20. | Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiners role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process? | Y |
| 21. | Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner? | Y |
| 22. | Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility? | Y |
| 23. | Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility? | Y |

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 24. | Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility? | Y |
| 25. | Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments? | Y |
| 26. | Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate? | Y |
| 27. | Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions? | Y |
| 28. | Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work? | Y |
| 29. | Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated? | Y |
| 30. | Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate? | Y |
| 31. | Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations? | Y |
| 32. | Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board? | Y |
| 33. | Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting? | Y |
| 34. | Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board? | Y |
| 35. | Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board? | Y |

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:

Many thanks to the programme team for a smooth and efficient administration of the examination process. I received everything well in time, with appropriate instructions and clear deadlines.

There were borderline cases to investigate, and having the opportunity for the examiner to look at these as an overall case is useful. The School guidelines on consideration of borderline cases is quite fixed, and may need review. The School may feel existing guidelines are appropriate but some tweaking might be helpful (e.g. is superior performance in final year rewarded more than steady performance across years; how are year in industry/abroad considered).

Other comments

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

Project Supervision:

Observationally without the data it seemed like students who worked individually were either doing much better or much worse – this might need reviewing. The use of group projects is sensible to encourage development of skill of collaboration and also to continue to deliver such high-quality supervision given growing student numbers. On a related point, several students seemed to have more than one supervisor (in at least one case acknowledging 3 supervisors), this might be worth the School considering to ensure consistency of student experience and also manageable workloads.

Feedback:

The feedback is always good, but there are a range of feedback forms used, even within assessment type (e.g. presentation). This might be worth looking at as a School overall to ensure best student experience and links to learning outcomes.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Title and Name of Responder: | |
| Position*: | Head of School |
| Faculty / School of: | <i>School of Psychology</i> |
| Address for communication: | University of Leeds Leeds LS2 9 JT |
| Email: | |
| Telephone: | |

*If the individual responding to the report is not the Head of School please state their position within the School.

Completing the School response

The completed School response (including the full original report) should be attached to an e-mail and sent to the Pro-Dean for Student Education in the relevant Faculty. Following approval by the Pro-Dean for Student Education, the School must send the response (including the full original report) directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at qat@leeds.ac.uk. External Examiners should receive a formal response no later than six weeks after receipt of the original report.

Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice

It is extremely reassuring to learn of the value of some of our innovations and practices from our peers outside of the University.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We are pleased that you have highlighted the opportunities that we give our students to gain transferable skills as a positive enhancement, and this will feed into our discussions about student education at our September briefing-day.

Response to Matters for Urgent Attention

If any areas have been identified for urgent attention before the programme is offered again please provide a specific response to them here:

N/A

Response to questions 1-7 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

N/A - Examiner is not in first or last year of appointment.

Standards**Response to questions 8 to 16 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

It is reassuring to read the positive feedback on standards.

Assessment and Feedback**Response to questions 17 to 19 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

Your positive feedback on assessment and feedback is well-received, particularly as this is an area in which we are consistently trying to make improvements.

Regarding the point about using the full range of the marking scheme, and following discussions at the previous year's UG Exam Board, the DSE has made announcements at staff meetings to encourage staff to make full use of the upper end of the marking scale. Furthermore, a new document providing guidance for second marking includes advice about checking that excellent work has received appropriate marks. Nevertheless, the fact that this has been highlighted by one of our external examiners is particularly useful in supporting these initiatives.

Your views on team marking are also helpful, particularly in highlighting the need to avoid conservative assumptions if some markers are using higher marks than others. We have decided to implement a procedure for team marking, such that the second marker assesses the consistency of marks awarded across the different markers. If any marker is noticeably higher or lower than the others then the team leader (typically the practical leader or module leader) is consulted and is involved in any decision regarding action to be taken. We will be highlighting this procedure at our away day in September.

The Progression and Awards Process

Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

It was pleasing to note that our organisational arrangements were supportive for you in the examining process. Thank you for your thoughts on the academic discretionary criteria; we will keep you informed of developments on this as we discuss ways of refining these.

Other comments

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

You have raised an interesting point for us to follow up regarding potential differences in performance between those doing group work and those working on their own. If these discrepancies do exist, one explanation may be that both the weaker students and the more capable students may be more likely to work independently but for different reasons. Nevertheless, we will start to compare the marks between students who work in groups and those working individually to see if there is evidence to support your perception about the existence of such differences.

We also note your comment about the possible variation in the number of staff involved in jointly supervised projects and we will endeavour to bear this in mind when project allocations are made.

We will take on board your point about the use of more than one presentation feedback sheet; it makes full sense to use one standard format. In fact, last year the School introduced a presentation feedback form that should be used by all staff, so we will check that this is happening. It is also acknowledged that presentations can have a wide variety of purposes and therefore some of the feedback may be provided on additional feedback sheets.