UEA

University of East Anglia

PARTNERSHIPS OFFICE

ANNUAL EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT

Name of institution examined:	INTO University of East Anglia
Faculty/School	INTO
Course Title(s)	International Yr 1 in Psychology
Academic Year:	2018-19
External Examiner Name:	Dr James Adie
External Examiner's home University / College or Other Professional / Institutional Affiliation:	Coventry University

NB – External Examiner reports are widely circulated, therefore students and staff should not be individually identified. Course Teams will respond to the recommendations made by the External Examiner in the boxes provided. The response should be counter signed by the Head of HE or equivalent within ten working days.

An electronic copy of this report should be emailed to the Head of HE (or equivalent) at the partner institution, to arrive no later than one month after the main assessment board meeting. You will receive a copy of the report with the Course Team's response completed.

Sufficient Evidence Checklist

Please can you confirm the following:

Programme materials

Did you receive:	Y	N	N/A
a. Programme handbook(s)?	/	☐	☐
b. Programme regulations (these may be in the programme handbook)?	/	☐	☐
c. Module descriptions (these may be in the programme handbook)?	/	☐	☐
d. Assessment briefs/marking criteria?	**/**	☐	☐

Draft examination papers

a. (i) Did you receive all the draft papers? ☐ ☐ /

    (ii) If not, was this at your request? ☐ ☐ /

b. (i) Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate? ☐ ☐ /

    (ii) If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments? ☐ ☐ /

c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments? ☐ ☐ /

Marking examination scripts

a. (i) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts? ☐ ☐ /

    (ii) If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory? ☐ ☐ /

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

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

Dissertations/project reports

a. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate? ☐ ☐ /

b. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate? ☐ ☐ /

Coursework/continuously assessed work

a. Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment? / ☐ ☐

b. Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory? / ☐ ☐

Orals/performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements

a. Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct orals and/or moderate performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements? ☐ ☐ /

Final examiners' meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting? / ☐ ☐

b. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction? / ☐ ☐

c. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners? / ☐ ☐

Maintaining Threshold Academic Standards

Please provide feedback on whether:

The programme and its component parts are coherent with learning outcomes aligned with the relevant qualification descriptor and subject benchmark statements where applicable

The academic standards of the INTO Yr 1 Psychology programme are appropriate, and the programme fulfils the relevant benchmark statements of the QAA framework. I found the assessment clearly captured the learning outcomes of the programme (and individual modules) and the marking of assessment and student performance was tantamount to that of expected levels in other UK HEIs.

The programme reflects appropriate PSRB requirements where applicable

The INTO Psychology programme provides a strong foundation, as well as opportunity, for students to progress onto stage 2 of a full BSc Psychology degree which is accredited by the British Psychological Society (BPS).

Assessments in modules of the same level are of a comparable standard to those in other UK HEIs

I found the range and type of assessment to be appropriate for the level of the programme and they were commensurate with that of my own and other UK HEIs. To echo my comments from last years' annual reports, the assignments not only help students develop core theoretical knowledge but also provide a strong foundation of building key skills essential for an international cohort transitioning into an UG programme in a UK HEI.

The curriculum is current

The two modules (Self and Society; Psychology of the Individual) under consideration cover the core areas (e.g., social psychology, bio-psychology, individual differences, developmental, cognitive and research methods) necessary for students progressing onto a BPS accredited Psychology degree. The curriculum itself is up-to-date with the latest topics and research whilst also taking a foothold of classic theories of psychology. The assessment is closely aligned with the content (and learning outcomes) of the modules, and students are tested on the breadth and depth of contemporary theory, research and common research methods used in psychology.

Assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level

I found the assessment criteria for each assessed component to be clear and relevant to the learning outcomes. The assessed components themselves were set at the appropriate level of study. The marking schemes used reflected best practice by providing clear descriptors of different grade boundaries awarded to students.

Measuring Achievement, Rigour and Fairness

Please provide feedback on whether:

The types of assessment are appropriate for the subject, the students, the level of study and the expected outcomes
As indicated above, the assessments on this programme were appropriate for meeting the the LO's and for the level assessed. The range of assessments is diverse, innovative and stimulating for students. For example, on self and society (IY0PI), I liked the fact that students are engaging with psychological issues related to hypothetical online relationships scenario, and had the opportunity to work together and present the initial findings and processes of their thematic analysis in a presentation prior to writing up a final report. I also found the new feature at the end of the essay assessment on IY0PI this year to be innovative and highly useful for developing critical thinking. Unlike traditional essays, this essay went a step further by providing a test of students' ability to take on board what they had understood about a topic and proposing a future research study.

The marking scheme/grading criteria have been properly and consistently applied, and internal marking is of an appropriate standard, fair and reliable
Generally, I was very happy with the use of the marking schemes applied and found the marking to be fair and consistent across modules. There was evidence of good internal moderation practices but these were not as transparent and rigouress as they have been in previous years when double-marking had taken place. This year, all submitted work was available to me but only a sample of it was internally moderated. There were only a few occasions when inconsistencies existed between markers and individual grade changes were made. However, there was no record that all remaining scripts had been checked for further potential discrepancies. I am not suggesting you revert back to double-marking but just be mindful the focus of moderation should be more about assessing levelness across markers (i.e., one marker is not more lenient/harsh than the others) rather than changing individual grades. If individual grades changes are necessary than all scripts should be checked and recorded for that component. Although this is a minor point, a pre-moderation calibration exercise may prevent this problem occurring in the future.
With that said, I found the marking to be in the appropriate grade boundaries awarded and thought some of the work on display was excellent, particularly at the top end. I thought the amount and quality of feedback was very good, and also provided useful feedforward comments into subsequent assessments. Although minor, I would like to pick up on a point from last year concerning inconsistencies in the number of comments provided to students. For example, a student with a lower grade on IY0PI was provided with 2 areas for improvement, whereas a student that obtained a high score was provided 6. I would suggest that the course team agree on a min/max. number of standardised diagnostic comments to be fair to all students.

The assessment processes are carried out in accordance with the institution's regulations and procedures
I found this to be the case.

Procedures governing mitigating/extenuating circumstances, academic integrity/

misconduct and borderline performances have been considered fairly and equitably applying institutional regulations

Where cases existed, I found the appropriate procedures were adhered to and the students in question treated fairly

---

Comparability of Standards and Student Performance

Reflecting on your experience at other institutions please provide feedback on:

The comparability of standards and student achievement:
- **across the modules within a single programme**
- **across programmes within a single subject area in an awarding institution**
- **across programmes within a single subject area across institutions of which you have experience**
- **any of the above, across cohorts during your period of appointment**

Student performance, was on average, comparable across modules and although past years data was absent, there was more evidence of the work at the top end.

Enhancement of Quality

Please provide comment and recommendations on:

Good practice and innovation relating to learning, teaching and assessment you have observed

I am very pleased with the way the programme continues to run. The teaching team should be commended for designing, and delivering a quality learning and teaching environment for their students, and the assessment provides a thorough assessment of the core disciplines of the subject area. The key highlights are noted below:

- The programme remains contemporary whilst covering the core areas of psychology (e.g., individual differences, biopsychology, social psychology, etc).

- Problem-based learning approaches embedded in the assessments across both modules (INTO-IYOSS/PI). For example, the seminar discussion is an example of best practice feeding forward into the thematic report. Whilst the assessments are diverse and provide a solid foundation for preparing students to enter year 2 of a psychology degree, they are also used to test and provide feedback on building essential transferable skills (e.g., presentation, interpersonal, team-work).

- The diversity and innovation of the assessment ranging from presentations and journal critiques to report writing remains impressive. Although it continues to feature in my report, I am really pleased to see a qualitative research report as part of the assessment as it provides essential scaffolding put in place to support students with this task as they progress with their psychology studies. I also liked the fact that assessments are refreshed with new data, and coursework questions are updated to make them challenging, stimulating and contemporary.

- The marking schemes are used effectively and feedback comments were constructive, supportive and helpful.

Opportunities to enhance the quality of the learning opportunities provided to students

Despite the programme running well, I have a few minor comments relating to course enhancement for teaching team to reflect upon:

- As per last year, I would like to see a copy of module/programme student evaluation to see how satisfied students are with the programme, and what provisions are put in place to address students concerns.

- I have kept my comment from last year, 'Running a possible calibration exercise pre-marking. For some marked components, there was discrepancy between 1st and 2nd marker, which was explained and resolved in the moderation forms, and in line with institutional regulations. However, the programme team may want to consider conducting a calibration exercise prior to beginning marking so that levelness is established from the outset. This applies to coursework components only'. This seems more pertinent given that only samples were moderated, rather than having all work double-marked.

- To have more balance in terms of the length and number of comments (i.e., for improvement) in the feedback summary sheets. To also reflect on how feedback is provided and absorbed. For example, in the seminar discussion only half students improved their grade feeding forward into their thematic report.

Also, please:

State whether you received sufficient evidence to enable your role to be fulfilled. If not, please provide details

Yes, advanced confirmation was sent.

State whether issues raised in the previous report(s) have been, or are being, addressed to your satisfaction

All my comments were addressed/acknowledged. Although I understand that there may be constraints with respect to changing/reducing the number of assessments, it was nice to see some enhancements with respect to different essay choices, new data for the thematic report etc. With respect to meeting my request for programme statistics, these were provided for the current cohort, but qualitative data (i.e., course evaluation questionnaires in terms of what students say and how this is addressed) was not.

Use this space to address any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body

N/A

Give an overview of your term of office if this is your final year

N/A

RECOMMENDATIONS, RESPONSE AND ACTION PLAN

Please list your recommendations for action by the course team:

External Examiner's Recommendations for action *(to be completed by External Examiner)*	Course Team's Response (action to be taken and measurable outcomes) *(to be completed by Course Leader)*	By whom *(to be completed by Course Leader)*	By when *(to be completed by Course Leader)*
Reflect upon the new internal moderation form and procedures. Consider more transparency in terms of internal moderation practices and documentation (i.e., if individual marks are changed in a sample of work are all scripts then checked/reviewed?)	New internal moderation procedures to be followed with any changes to individual marks triggering a stage of reviewing other work.	PC	Next cycle (July 2020)
Consider applying a policy for standardising the number of points for key strengths and areas for improvement on feedback sheets	Been addressed using the formative evaluation process throughout the course and summative process at the end of the course.	PC	2019 formative evaluation stage (Nov 2019)
Provide course evaluations (what students said and what course changes occurred?)	Formative and summative course evaluations to be streamlined and incorporated into next review cycle as with IYO DEV programme.	PC, DP, AR	Next cycle (July 2020)

Report completed by:

Signature   J.Adie   Date: 23rd July, 2019

COURSE TEAM'S GENERAL RESPONSE TO THE REPORT

We are pleased with the positive comments regarding currency, applicability, and clearness of course outlines and assessments. The recommendations are fair and actions to be taken will cover these over the next cycle of the programme. We believe that student evaluation is particularly important and so will include these in the next examination cycle (both formative and summative assessments), standardised across all Psychology courses.

Responses and Action Plan completed by:

Course Leader: Philip Chambers   Date: 01/11/2019

(Please print name and sign)

Countersigned by:

Head of HE (or
equivalent)   Date:
                   Jeremy Moyle   1/11/2019

To be completed by the Partnerships Office:

A	No action identified	
B	Identified action and picked up appropriately	X
C	Identified action and not picked up appropriately or action not identified	

H Jackson

Assistant Head of Partnerships

7 November 2019

To be completed by Academic Director of Partnerships

A	No action identified	
B	Identified action and picked up appropriately	X
C	Identified action and not picked up appropriately or action not identified	

Professor Ian Dewing

Academic Director of Partnerships

13 November 2019