

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Faculty of Medicine and Health

Subject(s):

Psychology

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Programme: MPsych, BSc Advanced Psychology.
 Modules: PSYC5902M, PSYC5906M, PSYC5907M, PSYC5908M,
 PSYC5912M

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

MPsych Psychology

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

Points of innovation and/or good practice

Good to see continued use of the detailed feedback grid for the systematic review module. This provides students with excellent guidance about what needs to be included and how well they have done at each aspect.

Really good to see the use of assessment tasks that require students to apply their knowledge.

The student self-assessment sheets were really useful and potentially valuable for students. It was interesting to note that these were not particularly closely aligned with the assessment marks given

Enhancements made from the previous year

It was clear to see what work was moderated and how this was done and that it followed the code of practice.

Matters for Urgent Attention

None

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

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.

I looked at a range of the M-level modules on this programme along with . Undergraduate level work on the programme was assessed by and .

The programme is well structured with a wide range of assessment which require students to apply their knowledge.

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)

Research clearly underpins all aspects of the programme and students undertake research and learn about research methods and analysis as part of the programme. Academic staff make clear links to their own research.

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

Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
-----	--	---

Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
-----	--	---

Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p><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> <p>There is a good range of assessment methods employed on the programme and students are generally able to achieve excellent performance in the assessment tasks indicating high quality teaching. Students receive detailed feedback about how to improve and where they have done well.</p> <p>In one module: PSYC5912M Psychology of Patient Safety one part of the group work was assessed by peer review. The peer reviewers marks were higher than that of the tutors and this artificially raised the marks for the task overall. While peer review is valuable as a learning experience and feedback from peers can be useful I would recommend that the peer marks are not used for grading this task.</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
<p><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> <p>Students demonstrated good performance that might in part reflect that fact that they were selected based on their achievement at the end of year 3 (at least 2i). The standards are comparable to other institutions.</p> <p>There are a number of group presentations that are assessed within modules and I noticed that the marks for this work were very similar across groups. While group tasks are excellent for developing team working skills they can mean that marks do not reflect the abilities of students well such that weaker students do better and stronger students do worse. While these tasks only ever contributed a portion of the module marks, the extent to which students are able to demonstrate their skills and abilities within these tasks should be considered.</p> <p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p> <p>Students on this MPsych programme undertake an M-level project that has a lower credit rating and is done in less time than the M-level project taken as part of the MSc. It is not clear what differs between the projects in terms of the expectations of the students and how this difference is taken into account in assessment criteria and marking. I would urge the team to reflect on this.</p>		

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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>We considered one case at the exam board where a student had less time to complete an option module because of the different timetables for the two programmes. The team should consider whether these choices should be made available to students if they are likely to be disadvantaged in doing so.</p>		

Other comments

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

I would like to thank the course and module team for their excellent organisation of the examining process and communication about various aspects of my role.

It was not possible for me to properly moderate presentations. While I saw the feedback and marks and could agree that these looked appropriate and consistent I was not, for most modules, able to see the slides and/or video recordings of the presentations. This would be helpful in future years.

Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)***Title and Name of Examiner:*

Subject(s):

Psychology

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Programme: MPsych, BSc Advanced Psychology.
 Modules: PSYC5902M, PSYC5906M, PSYC5907M, PSYC5908M,
 PSYC5912M

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

MPsyc/BSc; MSc

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

Psychology

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. 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

Thank you for your positive comments on the use of the detailed feedback grid for the systematic review module. We are delighted to read that you rate the guidance it provides as excellent. We were also pleased to read your positive comment about the application of knowledge that is required by our assessment tasks. Furthermore, it is useful to note that the students' own self-assessment of their work does not always match with their actual marks since a closer alignment would perhaps increase student satisfaction in the area of assessment and feedback.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Thank you for the positive comment on the clarity of our processes in relation to moderation. We are pleased that this has improved since last year.

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 happy to read the positive feedback on standards, particularly in relation to our wide range of assessments, our research methods training and research led teaching. We are also happy to note that you deem all aspects of our programmes to be clearly underpinned by research, including the research of our staff.

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:

Thank you for your positive comments about the good range of our assessment methods and the level of feedback received by the students. We were delighted to note your comment about excellent student performance indicating high quality teaching.

We have noted your comments about the contribution of peer review to the marking of group work in the Patient Safety Module (PSYC5912M). You are correct that it does inflate the marks for the first problem that students do on this module. We recognise this and, indeed, the students are informed that this is the case. This first presentation is worth 25% of the overall mark and the average of the students' marks is added to the average of the first and second markers meaning that it is recalibrated to some extent. The use of this marking strategy is deliberate a) to encourage students to understand the marking criteria and to engage with the presentations of their peers and b) to provide a bit of a buffer for their first attempt at a problem based learning assessment which is quite challenging for many students. The final mean mark for this module falls within the normal range for other modules and has done for the last 7 years so we are keen to retain this approach.

We have also noted your wider comment about how group work might not be particularly useful for differentiating between weaker and stronger students, but we agree with you that this is a useful way to develop team working skills. We recognise the issue that weaker students may achieve higher marks (and vice-versa) but allocating individual marks within groups is problematic. We have considered this in the mark weighting, for modules that include these tasks, to ensure that (within a module) the weighting of group tasks is less than or equal to that of individual tasks. One approach would be to mark individual's performance in the actual presentation but this does not recognise that students may have contributed more or less strongly in other ways (e.g., preparing materials, preparing team members for the presentation). An alternative method would be use peer review but as you note in relation to the Psychology of Patient Safety module, this is not without difficulty, and is unlikely to address the issue that weaker students may achieve higher marks. On the basis that we are keen to develop team working skills, and to maximise the efforts that individuals invest in the team (given the team performance is assessed), we feel that the current option is most appropriate. By only representing elements of module assessments, other students have a range of opportunities to indicate their respective abilities.

We also note your comment about the difference between the MPsys (5908M) and MSc research projects (5909M) which are 40 and 60 credit modules respectively. MPsys students start their projects in semester 1 (having been allocated to a project during the 3rd year of the undergraduate programme) whereas MSc students are allocated a Project during semester 1. The MPsys project is therefore undertaken during semesters 1 and 2 whereas the MSc project is undertaken during semesters 2 and 3. The assessment of each module also differs in that MPsys students deliver a poster presentation whereas MSc students deliver a PowerPoint presentation in their respective conferences. MSc students also complete a 1000 word project proposal which counts for 10% of the overall module mark whereas MPsys students are assessed 100% on their dissertation. Both dissertations are 10,000 words maximum and so do not necessarily differ much in terms of size and scope. You note that it is not clear what differs between the projects in terms of the expectations of the students and how this difference is taken into account in assessment criteria and marking. These comments will be passed onto the module leader and we will reflect on whether we can make changes to the assessment criteria to clarify the different expectations. We will also consider

the need for changes to the module descriptions (although any such changes would not be implemented until 2019/20).

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 overall positive evaluation of this process.

We have noted your comment about the issue that one student experienced when studying an elective module because of the different timetables for the two programmes and whether these choices should be made available to students if they are likely to be disadvantaged in doing so. We have, however, revised our Masters programmes for 2018/19 to replace the elective module with a new in-house module on Advances Research Issues in Psychology.

Other comments

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

Thank you for your comment about the lack of the slides and/or video recordings of presentations which meant that you could not take these into account when considering the marks for the relevant modules. We will pass this comment onto the relevant module leaders and endeavour to provide this information for all presentations in the future.

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 25/06/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Psychology

Subject(s):

Psychology

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MPsych, BSc Advanced Psychology
Modules: all TPG PSYC modules

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

MPsych, BSc Advanced Psychology

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

Points of innovation and/or good practice

Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.

A good selection of modules in both compulsory and elective options. Feedback is at a uniformly high standard including suggestions for improvement even at the higher grades.

PSYCH5901 – A good mix of quantitative and qualitative assessments.

PSYCH5911M – A good mix of assessments, I particularly liked to contrast of the essay and practioner report.

PSYCH5908M – An interesting and diverse range of research projects.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.

N/A – New programme this year.

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 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

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

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

The MPsych programme is at an appropriate level and is designed to continue supporting student development beyond the UG programme. The learning outcomes for the programme as a whole and the individual modules are clear and appropriate.

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

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)

Research led teaching and practice are embedded in the MPsych programme. This is most obvious in the assessments for PSYCH5911M and PSYCH5909, but is present in the learning outcomes across the programme.

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

Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y / N
-----	--	-------

Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y / N
-----	--	-------

Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y / N
-----	---	-------

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.

The type of assessments is broad and these are generally very well aligned with the learning outcomes. I am particularly impressed by the way assessments encourage students to apply their knowledge in a number of different ways. The quality of work produced is generally very high.

I was slightly surprised to see MCQs at this level (for PSYCH5910 and PSYCH5905) as in the current format they tend to measure mostly fact-based knowledge rather than critical thinking or application. Note, no guess correction was included in the marking. However, there was a very good range of scores on the MCQ indicating that the assessment differentiated students. It may be worth noting that the mean grade for the semester 1 module with MCQs (PSYCH5910) was lower than the semester 2 module with MCQs (PSYCH5905) and this may reflect students adjusting to the difficulty of MCQ assessments at this level. If MCQs are to remain as assessments in their current form, it may be worth assuring that students are prepared for the difficulty of MCQs at MSc level.

There was very little variation in marks awarded for presentations, some of which were group presentations. Although the weighting of the presentations was not particularly high, there could be an argument for making this element pass/fail as it is not distinguishing between students.

18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y / N
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y / N

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:

Although generally the grades awarded are moderate or high I think this accurate and reflects both the teaching and students on the programmes. Despite this, the cohort includes a number of students who appear to struggle with certain assessments (notably PSYCH5905 MCQ, please see comment below; and PSYCH5901 Statistics). For PSYCH5901 Statistics, this likely in part reflect the previous training received by students prior to MSc level study and it may be worth monitoring student background to assure that all students are able to perform at the appropriate level

There are a diverse range of assessments which should allow students to demonstrate and apply their knowledge regardless of their assessment-preference. The feedback is helpful and I particularly commend the helpful comments for students performing very well.

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:

PSYCH5910

I was asked to review the MCQ assessment for PSYCH5910. Some students felt that this was an especially difficult assessment. While some students did perform poorly on this assessment, this was not uniform across the cohort and very good grades were also awarded. I would be more concerned about the difficulty of the paper if all students had struggled equally. Note that the MCQ does not include a guess correction penalty which means that the paper is already being generously marked. Note too that the mean for the module as a whole (M=59) was only very slightly below the mean for the semester (M=62) and therefore I do not feel that adjustment of marks is warranted.

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

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

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

With reference to point 25 above: While I received most examinations and assessments in advance I did not receive all of them (eg PSYCH5901 IPA). All were available to review prior to the exam board.

With reference to point 29 above: All coursework was clearly marked however there is no work to compare to for presentations. Obviously these are assessed "live" however accompanying slides would be have useful. MCQ papers were not provide but this should not be an issue.

I was provided with moderation reports and a range of scripts. Given that marks are generally very good it is important to make sure that grades at the lower end are fully represented. It was clear why marks had been awarded on most modules. Moderation reports were provided and explained the moderation processes.

Other comments

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

Please find some additional comments on the individual modules.

PSYCH5910: Presentation, note there was no variation in the grades awarded.

Essay, Good use of the range of marking. It was nice to see examples from all three essay questions and also that students chose different questions. It would have been good to see a breakdown of the essay grades by question, ie did stronger students favour a certain essay topic. Please also see comment under point 19.

PSYCH5901: SPSS Assignment, I thought the assessment was very good and assessed both use of SPSS and interpretation of results, as well as demonstrating practical application of skills/knowledge. Feedback on the assignment was excellent with clear rationale for marks awarded, the main difficulty was space available for feedback (maybe insist on a wider margin on one side of the paper). Please also see comment under point 19.

IPA, A nice qualitative contrast to the quantitative analysis in the SPSS test. It was good to see a range of different interpretations. I didn't have guidelines for the assessment. However, I agree with the marks I reviewed. I was not provided with a detailed breakdown of the grades, but it sounds like the lowest grade was in the "mid-lower second range". No fails were awarded. The lowest assignment grade was 58, and I would have liked to see the lowest grade.

PSYC5905M01: MCQ a range of grades awarded. Presentation, good to see a range of grades awarded. Clinical Protocol, A very interesting assessment that will develop students' real-world skills.

From the selection of scripts I reviewed there seemed to be a bias towards two out of the three possible clinical case studies; it may be worth monitoring this in the future to assure that this is not related to module content.

PSYCH5911M: General comment: The two pieces of coursework were different and a range of questions were available. There were a number of occasions when students had selected the same topic for both pieces of work ie working memory for both essay and the summary article. This led to a very small amount of overlap in content between the pieces of work, which was not especially significant. However, pedagogically, you may want to monitor

this to assure that you are assessing students' knowledge across a broad range of topics as well as assessment methods.

Practitioner report, This is an interesting piece of coursework which enables student to focus on their own interests and understand communicating across different audiences. The range of marks awarded are appropriate and use the whole classification range. Essay, I reviewed the essays including one fail. Three out of four of the essay titles were available for review. The grades were appropriate and included a wide range across the grade boundaries.

PSYCH5908M: The research topics were on varied topics and generally at a high standard. In the three studies I reviewed two suffered from low power (the other student shared data with another 4 students). I wonder if this is related to a shorter duration available for data collection in a 9 month Integrated Masters programme. It may be worth monitoring in the future. Where several students have contributed data to a project, could they please add a statement of contribution, ie how many datasets they contributed? This can be added as a statement at the start of the dissertation.

Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Psychology

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MPsyc, BSc, Advanced Psychology; MSc Cognitive Development and Disorders

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

MPsyc/BSc; MSc

Title and Name of Responder:

Position:*

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

Psychology

Address for communication:

*School of Psychology,
University of Leeds
Leeds LS2 9JT*

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 gat@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

Thank you for your comments on our MPsyc course for the year 2017/18. We appreciate the positive feedback regarding teaching, assessment, and classification, and the standard of work submitted by our students, particularly as this is the first year that this programme has run.

As noted in your report, in developing the modules on this programme we have attempted to provide advanced-level research-led teaching and integrate varied and innovative assessment methods that would assess learning outcomes while also capturing real-world skills. We are pleased that this has generally been successful in the first year of teaching but will seek to refine and improve for subsequent years.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

N/A

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:

No response required

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 thank the examiner for the positive comments to these questions.

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:

17. Lack of variation in presentation marks

We acknowledge this issue, particularly for PSYC5910M. Staff on the relevant modules will be encouraged to use the full marking scale, and mark range will be monitored.

18. Some students appear to struggle with statistics in PSYC5901, possibly reflecting variation in previous training.

To support those students who may be less competent, experienced, or confident in their statistics, we will encourage any who feel they need it to attend additional statistics classes (running during semester 1) designed for intercalating medics and new Level 2 entry students. We will closely monitor how many (and which) students take up this opportunity, along with progress of students on the module in general.

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:

35. Provision of presentation slides

We will aim to provide these where possible for 2018/19.

Other comments

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

We will monitor those additional issues raised regarding specific modules and consider addressing them if they continue to arise in subsequent years.