

# The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 09/07/2019

### 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. MSc PATH

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

Modules: PSYC5900M, PSYC5901M, PSYC5902M, PSYC5906M, PSYC5907M, PSYC5908M, PSYC5912M, PSYC509M

### 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.*

*It is good to see rubrics/feedback sheets for each module. These help structure the feedback and ensure that the types and detail-levels of feedback is consistent across modules. However there is some inconsistency in their use. I would encourage all staff to feedback in the same way for the same module to ensure parity of the student experience.*

#### Enhancements made from the previous year

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

Changes have been made to the criteria for borderline cases to be reviewed. It was good to see this being used in practice at the recent board.

#### 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 only

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 only

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*

The feedback processes have improved so that students are now much more clear about what they need to do to gain a higher mark

## 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.*

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 .

This is a well-designed programme that covers a wide range of skills and knowledge

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)*

The research interests and expertise of the staff who teach on this programme are clearly reflected in the content and skills of the course.

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 assessment methods are appropriate. They require good understanding and application of knowledge. Students are well-supported.

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:*

The majority of students do well, and the most able excel. Some students at the lower ability levels struggle to apply their knowledge in some modules.

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

For some modules the same kinds of skills are assessed more than once e.g. poster presentation, group oral presentation. It is not clear what having these two types of assessment add. I would recommend that the course team review the skills and learning outcomes that are assessed over the course as a whole and consider whether all of the different types of assessment tasks are needed. The number of assessment tasks could be reduced in places.

### 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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>Online feedback is being used in some modules but I couldn't always see these comments. Ways to share these with external examiners should be considered.</p> <p>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.</p>		

**Other comments**

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

Some of the student projects for MSc PATH were on topics unrelated to health (maths performance and anxiety). The research project is an important opportunity for students to focus and apply the theories and knowledge they have learnt from the programme to a specific research topic. I would strongly recommend that you put in place processes to ensure that students are matched with supervisors who are able to offer appropriate health-related topics, and that checks are made to ensure that the research aims and questions are appropriate for students on this health psychology course.

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.

## Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

*Psychology*

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Programme: MPsync, BSc Advanced Psychology. MSc PATH  
Modules: PSYC5900M, PSYC5901M, PSYC5902M, PSYC5906M, PSYC5907M, PSYC5908M, PSYC5912M, PSYC509M

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

MPsync, BSc MSc

Title and Name of Responder:

Position\*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

*Faculty of Medicine & Health/School of Psychology*

Address for communication:

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) must be sent directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at [qat@leeds.ac.uk](mailto: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 pleased that the development and utilization of new rubrics has been recognised. We will continue to develop these and ensure that module leaders provide clear guidance regarding how they should be applied when used across several markers. **In relation to the point around consistency of rubric use/feedback, we will ensure that module leaders for Systematic Review and Masters projects provide instructions to all markers regarding the method of marking (paper copies vs. online) and use of rubrics/feedback sheets prior to marking.**

**Response to Enhancements made from the previous year**

As noted, for borderline cases, students will in future be required to achieve the majority of their credits at the higher level to receive the higher award. This amendment reduces the subjectivity and possible bias associated with handling borderline cases.

**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 your recognition that the programme is well-designed and covers a wide range of skills.

## 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:*

We acknowledge the general issue of over-assessment. **Changes have been implemented to reduce the assessment burden for Advanced Research Methods for the current (2019/20) academic year.** We will continue to monitor and assess the utility of the assessments across the programme and will consider additional changes for the 2020/21 academic year onwards.

## 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:*

We recognise that, in some cases, assessments were forwarded to you without feedback and that presentation slides were not provided to enable you to assess the marking standards for these assignments. In future, exemplar assignments will not be forwarded to external examiners without additional checks from the Programme Manager.

## Other comments

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

**To address the issue of appropriate allocation of projects to students, academic staff members are required to specify whether the projects that they offer are appropriate for PATH, CDAD or both sets of students. While this approach has been used previously, programme managers now check the allocation of projects to pathways. In instances where the appropriateness of the project to the pathway is not clear, the programme managers/module leader seeks to clarify this with the project supervisor. Depending on the appropriateness of the project at this stage, the projects either go ahead as initially planned or revised, removed or re-allocated to the relevant pathway. We have implemented these changes for the current cohort of MSc students (2019-20).**

We would like to thank you for the valuable and insightful comments that you have provided over the years. When possible, we have sought to implement your suggested changes and this has led to meaningful improvements in our programme.

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 08/07/2019

**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):*

MPSyc, BSc Advanced Psychology

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

Modules: all TPG PSYC modules

**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 range of modules and assessments within modules.

PSYCH5901 – A good mix of quantitative and qualitative teaching and 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.

PSYCH5900 – This is a new module this year which was timely, interesting and well-assessed.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

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

Programme is running well and to a high standard. Teaching and assessments are continually reviewed to assure high quality. As assessors the inclusion of slides for presentations this year was helpful for review of material.

**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 only**

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 only**

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

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

The MPsych Advanced Psychology programme is designed to support the development of students beyond the undergraduate curriculum. The programme is appropriate and at the required level. Learning outcomes are clear and appropriate for both the programme as a whole and individual modules.

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

*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 is integrated into the whole programme of study. Research skills and awareness of the wider context of research are developed through PSYC5900 and PSYC5901. In content based modules such as PSYC 5905 and PSYC5910 it is clear how research influences outcomes and practise.

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

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

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

*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 / <del>N</del>
-----	--	------------------

*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 / <del>N</del>
-----	---	------------------

*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.*

There are a good range of different types of assessments across the programme, which encourages students to apply their knowledge and to think about the societal and clinical applications of what they are learning. Assessments are well aligned to the learning outcomes. The work produced by students is generally of a very high quality.

There remains very little variation in grades awarded for presentations. These represent a small proportion of the assessed grade and are often group presentations, however changing these to pass/fail may be something to consider given the lack of variance in grades.

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:*

The programme utilises a diverse range of assessments which allows students the opportunity to demonstrate and apply their knowledge. The feedback is helpful and I particularly commend the helpful comments for students performing very well.

The quality of students on the programme is generally moderate or high and this is reflected in the largely high grades awarded.

There appears to be an ongoing issue with MCQ offered for PSYC5905 and PSYC5910 which I have already discussed with the department, see comments below.

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

Modules PSYC5905 and PSYC5910 use MCQ as part of the assessment. It is clear that this assessment successfully distinguishes between students with grades being awarded from fail to high first levels. However a large number of students are failing the MCQ element of the modules (which was noted in 2017-18). Note that the department have spent a large amount of time reviewing MCQ assessments overall and they are at an appropriate difficulty for the level.

I raised this after Semester 1 when reviewing PSYC5910 where 34% of students failed the MCQ exam. I was concerned about this high rate but it is comparable to 2017-18. Furthermore the department has reviewed performance on MCQs which were included in both exams for 2017-18 and 2018-19. This has shown that the MCQs are comparable across years. The rate of fails on MCQ exams is unusual for the profile of students overall.

I am aware that modules have made a large effort to introduce practise MCQs this year, however fail rates remain unusually high for these assessments. I have reviewed these with the department in some detail. It appears that students joining the MSc programme (CADD) are disproportionately affected by the difficulty of the MCQ exam compared to students on the MPsych Advanced programme. Therefore my concern is more relevant to the MSc CADD programme than the MPsych Advance programme but is worth noting here. It appears that students new to the department are finding the MCQ exams very difficult, therefore they may require more support in preparation for this assessment.

Please note, I am very satisfied that the department are working to monitor this issue and to find solutions.

### 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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>Regarding point 29 above. This year feedback for a number of assessments were provided online rather than on paper. There was some inconsistency with us being able to see all the feedback when online systems were used. When online feedback is provided it would be helpful to receive all (both overall and intext feedback). I would be equally happy to review this online in the future if that is more practical.</p>		

#### Other comments

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

Overall the MPpsych provides high quality teaching with appropriate assessments and feedback. Modules are interesting and timely, and provide students with good opportunities for learning and skill development.

A few minor points for the future.

There were a few errors in marks sheets this year. I know that we have discussed this and everything has been checked, but needs to be monitored in future years.

Could I please see mark breakdowns by question for coursework and exams?

I would like to review all the fails in the future.

Can we continue to monitor MCQ performance?

**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)**

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

*Psychology*

Programme(s) / Module(s):

PSYC TGP modules

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

MPsyc, BSc Advanced Psychology (including industrial and international variants)

Title and Name of Responder:

Position\*:

Head of School of Medicine

Faculty / School of:

*Faculty of Medicine and Health*

Address for communication:

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) must be sent directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at [gat@leeds.ac.uk](mailto: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**

We would like to thank the reviewer for their positive comments on these modules.

**Response to Enhancements made from the previous year**

We would like to thank the reviewer for their positive comments regarding enhancements made from previous years.

**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:

Thank you for the positive responses 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:*

The positive comments here are appreciated.

Re. marks awarded for presentations; we are currently looking into the possibility of changing the marks for the presentation element of this module to Pass/Fail – the University deadline for these sort of changes to assessment has passed for next year so we expect we will have to delay by one year. Oral presentation and group work are important key skills to assess at Masters level. That said, we will continue to monitor presentation grades, and encourage teaching staff to use the broader marking scale where appropriate.

Re. MCQ marks, as suggested, we will continue to monitor grades for students overall and on the different Masters programmes. We will also ensure that the practice MCQs appropriately prepare students for the examination by using some of the previous year's exam questions and we will emphasise these materials to students as a way of preparing for the assessments.

## 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:*

Re. providing online and paper feedback to examiners, it was an error this year that the markers' feedback was omitted from the work we sent to you. Thanks for flagging this; we will ensure that the feedback is included in the work we send in future.

## Other comments

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

Thank you for the positive comments. We plan to ensure that the minor points are addressed for future.

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QA Team received 18/07/2019

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

Psychology

*Subject(s):*

*Programme(s) / Module(s):*

All psychology undergraduate degree programmes and modules.

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

**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.*

The opportunity provided for students to receive one-to-one feedback on examinations.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

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

**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*

**For Examiners in the first year of appointment only**

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

**For Examiners completing their term of appointment only**

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

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

The programmes are coherent in terms of their structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.

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

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)

This is clear from the content of the range of assessments, and the relevance and quality of final year research projects.

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

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

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

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

The courses are aligned to the appropriate subject benchmarks and appear to be compliant with the requirements of the British Psychological Society (the relevant PSRB) for accredited undergraduate programmes in Psychology. Such accreditation is extremely valuable in relation to graduate employability and professional development opportunities.

## Assessment and Feedback

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

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 design of the programmes clearly align learning outcomes with assessment.

18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y / <del>N</del>
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y / <del>N</del>
<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>The academic standards achieved by students on the undergraduate psychology programmes are very good and are comparable to academic standards achieved on similar courses in the UK.</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>		

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

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

The examination scripts that I saw had all been annotated with good, helpful notes and comments.

There was a very good range of final year project topics. Occasionally, however, the agreed mark was not supported with adequate justification of the process by which the agreed mark was determined.

The administrative arrangements were very effective throughout the year. I received samples of work and draft assessments in good time to provide feedback and comments. These were responded to very quickly and thoroughly by Module Leaders.

#### Other comments

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

**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)**

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

*Psychology*

Programme(s) / Module(s):

All Psychology UG programmes and modules

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

All psychology undergraduate degree programmes.

Title and Name of Responder:

Position\*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

*School of Psychology*

Address for communication:

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) must be sent directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at [gat@leeds.ac.uk](mailto: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**

We were pleased for your positive comments on this aspect of our work. Increased feedback is something our students consistently request and this is one of our various efforts made to address this.

**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:

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:

Thank you for your positive comments on our overall 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:*

Thank you for your reassuring observations on our work in this area.

## 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 your positive feedback on our processes and responsiveness.

And thank you for highlighting where we could improve on the occasions where you felt that the final year project marks were not supported with adequate justification of the process by which the agreed mark was determined. We will add a reminder to staff on the markers' report forms to address this and will reiterate its importance at our staff teaching briefing day.

## Other comments

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

N/A