

ANNUAL EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT

Name of Institution Examined: INTO University of East Anglia

Faculty/School: INTO

Course Title(s): International Year One in Psychology

Academic Year: 2021/2022

External Examiner Name: Dr Wendy Garnham

External Examiner's home University / College or Other Professional / Institutional Affiliation: University of Sussex

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 Academic Partnerships, to arrive no later than 6 weeks 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)?	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Programme regulations (these may be in the programme handbook)?	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Module descriptions (these may be in the programme handbook)?	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria?	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Draft examination papers

a. (i) Did you receive all the draft papers?	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) If not, was this at your request?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x

- b. (i) Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate? x
- (ii) If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments? x
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments? x

Marking examination scripts

- a. (i) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts? x
- (ii) If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory? x
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate? x
- c. Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks? x

Dissertations/project reports

- a. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate? x
- b. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate? x

Coursework/continuously assessed work

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

Orals/performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements

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

Final examiners' meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting? x
- b. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction? x
- c. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners? x

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 programme and all component parts are certainly coherent with the learning outcomes of these courses. Students are guided through key areas of psychology, from developmental psychology topics such as the nature-nurture debate through to social psychology topics such as the measurement of personality. Students are introduced not only to the current knowledge base but also to topical issues and to evaluation points.

The integration of the programme to the main UEA degree programmes is excellent and ensures that from the very beginning students are immersed in the subject area but with appropriate support.

The programme reflects appropriate PSRB requirements where applicable

N/A

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

The assessments are of a comparable standard to other modules of the same level. There are a variety of assessment types and detailed briefings for each giving students a clear idea of what they are aiming to do and how to go about the task. I would say that the quality of the work provided in response exceeds that of other institutions, supporting my feeling that the assessments are both appropriate, in line with modules at other institutions and delivered clearly.

The curriculum is current

Coverage of the curriculum is excellent. Key areas of psychology are covered: Developmental, Individual differences, Social, Cognitive and Biological. The curriculum is therefore giving students a rounded view of the discipline. The content is current, drawing on topical issues such as vaccines and autism for example.

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

The assessment criteria are clearly set out for students and the marking schemes show an appropriate separation of marking criteria. Although the student sample was very small this year, which may go some way to explaining this, I did note that most marks fell within the boundary of 50-59 or 60-69. Given the range of scores goes from 0-100, I wonder if it would be worth looking at the mark scheme to see if it is differentiating between weaker and stronger students sufficiently? However, as mentioned, the sample is very small and I suspect this is the reason for this.

Please provide feedback on whether:

The types of assessment are appropriate for the subject, the students, the level of study and the expected outcomes

The learning goals set for the students on these programmes are set high and are to be commended. The work submitted is impressive both in range and quality. It is great to see the variety of tasks used in the portfolios covering not only more traditional assessments such as the essay but also covering reflective writing, selection and evaluation of research articles and poster presentations. As well as giving students a thorough grounding in how to complete these types of task themselves, there is a strong ethos of working together to give presentations, to comment on each other's contributions and to reflect on their group work achievements and difficulties.

The marking scheme/grading criteria have been properly and consistently applied, and internal marking is of an appropriate standard, fair and reliable

The feedback provided to students is informative and encourages students to develop feed-forward goals. I wonder if it would be useful to have a section on the feedback form for students to reply, for example to identify any difficulties they anticipate in being able to act on the feedback provided and how they might overcome these. Having a chance to comment on previous feedback before embarking on the next may help the students to focus on these going forward.

The assessment processes are carried out in accordance with the institution's regulations and procedures

The assessment processes are thorough and compliant with the regulations and procedures to my knowledge. The moderation of marking on the scripts suggested good communication between the markers and sensitivity to the specific objectives of each task and the particular challenges the students brought to these.

Procedures governing mitigating/extenuating circumstances, academic integrity/misconduct and borderline performances have been considered fairly and equitably applying institutional regulations

As far as I can see, these have regulations have been adhered to.

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

From my experience working with international students on foundation level programmes, I would suggest that the quality of work that students achieve on this course exceeds that at other institutions. From the work sampled, it is clear that students make incredible progress with their written and spoken English and that this is common to all students on the course not just one or two. The assignments sampled demonstrate a deep understanding of the course content, the ability to research the literature and present findings clearly and the ability to reflect on progress. This is very evidently the result of tutors being prepared to push students to take on challenges at a high level which is to be very much admired. Expectations are set high and students are well supported to rise to meet these. As such this course compares very favourably with other similar modules at other institutions.

Enhancement of Quality

Please provide comment and recommendations on:

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

The variety of assessments is a particular strength of this course, with students able to demonstrate their competencies in a number of ways from essay writing to verbal presentations, to reflective pieces. The feedback given is clear and detailed, identifying not just strengths of the submitted work but also giving suggestions for how to develop/progress going forward. This is excellent practice.

In terms of recommendations, I wonder if it might be useful to have an additional box on the feedback sheet for students to respond to the feedback. In one of the reflective pieces, a student reported feeling frustrated that she had not been able to improve her grade. Encouraging conversation around the feedback might be a way of addressing this.

The only other, rather minimal, recommendation mentioned above is maybe to ensure that the mark scheme does differentiate the stronger and weaker students effectively. This is something that tutors on this course will have a feel for as the number of students on this course is very small this year so may just reflect the smaller numbers but I mention it here just as something to be aware of going forward.

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

The learning opportunities provided to students are excellent and as such I would not suggest changing these. The positive encouragement, feedback and support given to the students on this course shines through in the work samples and is something that has definitely impacted on the student's ability to achieve. Students are given choice, but not too much choice, in their assignment titles which empowers them to make decisions based on their own interests and are guided through a range of key areas of psychology at an appropriate level.

Also, please:

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

Yes, I have received sufficient evidence.

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

N/A – this is my first year of EE at UEA

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

None

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 <i>(to be completed by External Examiner)</i>	Course Team's Response (action to be taken and measurable outcomes) <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i>	By whom <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i>	By when <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i>	Progress as of February 2023 <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i>	Progress as of end of Year <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i>
Consider having an additional box on the feedback sheet for students to respond to the feedback they receive to ensure they understand what they need to do going forward and to address questions that remain about that assignment mark.	We will trial this constructive idea in the 2022/23 year. This may well be a useful thing to include in feedback tutorials which we have after giving the written feedback.	DP & PA	Throughout the 22/23 academic year as per our feedback schedule.		
Check that the mark scheme does differentiate the stronger and weaker students effectively (see comments above about small numbers though)	We feel that our marking scheme does differentiate between weaker and stronger students. It often seems to be the case that our student body have a very diverse range of 'strengths and weaknesses', for example in English level, High Order Thinking Skills and general resilience so that during the year their overall grades might tend to cluster for a variety of reasons.	DP	Throughout the academic year as per our marking schedule.		

	That said, we will keep the marking of content modules under review.				

Report completed by:

Signature

W. Banker

Date: 20.06.22

COURSE TEAM'S GENERAL RESPONSE TO THE REPORT

We are very pleased with the response which we feel shows a sensitive appreciation of the course and the work we do. The recommendations are helpful and constructive.

Responses and Action Plan completed by:

Course Leader:

Date: 20/10/22

Diane Parkin

(Please print name and sign)

Countersigned by:

Head of HE (or equivalent)

Date:

Jeremy Moyle

20/10/22

MID-YEAR REVIEW OF ACTIONS (FEBRUARY 20)

To be completed by Course Leader:

Mid-Year Review of Actions Completed:	Signature:	Date:
External Examiner Notified:	Signature:	Date:

YEAR END REVIEW OF ACTIONS (MONTH 20)

To be completed by Course Leader:

Year End Review of Actions Completed:	Signature:	Date:
External Examiner Notified:	Signature:	Date:

To be completed by the Academic Partnerships:

A	No action identified	
B	Identified action and picked up appropriately	✓
C	Identified action and not picked up appropriately or action not identified	
Reviewed by A.Smith 24.10.2022		

To be completed by Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor of Partnerships and Apprenticeships:

A	No action identified	
B	Identified action and picked up appropriately	✓
C	Identified action and not picked up appropriately or action not identified	
Reviewed by Z Butterfint 24.10.22		

DOCUMENT OWNER: Academic Partnerships

DOCUMENT TYPE: Form

APPROVED BY: Academic Partnerships

VERSION NUMBER: 2

DUE FOR REVIEW: June 2020

VERSION LOG:

Date	Version no.	Summary of changes	Author	Approved by
May 2019	2	Updated to include table for mid-year review of action plan	Academic Partnerships	Academic Partnerships