

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT FORM

Guidance notes are available to support the completion of this Report and are available at <http://learning.cf.ac.uk/quality/review/external-examiners/reports/>.

	For completion by External Examiner:		
Name of External Examiner:	Professor Claire Williams		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	University of Reading		
Programme and / or Subjects Covered by this Report	BSC Psychology (Level 5) <i>BSc in Psychology / BSc in Psychology with Professional Placement / Graduate Diploma in Psychology</i>		
Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:	2015/16	Date of Report:	13/07/16

For completion by External Examiner in the spaces provided. Please extend spaces where necessary. **Please note this Form will be published online and should not make any reference to any individual students or members of staff.**

1. Programme Structure

I examined the nine Level 5 modules on the BSc Psychology course. Each module comprised of practical reports, coursework essays and exam essays. The modules examined were:

- 3 modules from Year 1 Semester 2
 - Social Psychology I, Biological Psychology, Language & Memory
- 3 modules from Year 2 Semester 1
 - Social Psychology II, Developmental Psychology, Research design
- 3 modules from Year 2 Semester 2
 - Abnormal & Clinical Psychology, Thinking & Consciousness, Perception, Attention & Action

2. Academic Standards

Overall I am happy with the marks awarded. From the samples of work I considered, I am happy that the marking standards are appropriate and calibrated with the rest of the sector.

3. The Assessment Process

A few general comments about the course:

- 1) Coursework: Feedback on essays and practical reports is detailed and useful to the student. I particularly like that students have to respond to the feedback they have previously received on their essays, feedback sheets for the practical reports are similarly detailed.
- 2) Exams: Questions are appropriate for the level of the students and a huge amount of material is covered in the essays. I do wonder whether students are actually being 'over-examined' at level 6 with students typically answering 3 essays/module for 5 modules- 15 essays total in the exam period. Is that a little too much both for them to revise and for academics to mark? Is there really appropriate differentiation between your students given the number of essays they have to prep for- could some different forms of assessment be used to give the good students an opportunity to shine?
- 3) Generic Exam Feedback: very useful for an EE to see what the lecturers actually thought of the essays received and what they were looking for in an answer. Interestingly though this identifies that the majority of students are simply regurgitating lecture material very well (i.e they are being taught to write a good 2:1 class lecture), but little synthesis of material to enable 1st class marks to be awarded [see below].
- 4) Moderation Reports: it's clear that moderation has been taking place but this has been documented with varied levels of description. I'm still of the opinion that a single moderator having an overview of the entire module would be more beneficial (this was done for PS2011 Developmental), and it would be good to see some descriptive statistics per question rather than just for the module as a whole.
- 5) Recapitulation of Lecture Material: the generic feedback on exams performance really emphasises that the students have a general tendency to give descriptive, factually-accurate answers based on lecture material, but there's little evidence of evaluation/critique of new material or independent thought. Students are clearly being taught to write good 2:1 essays based on regurgitation of lecture material but some thought needs to be given to how exam questions might be phrased to limit this approach and give those bright students opportunity to shine (and when they do, reward them appropriately using the full range of marks available at the top end of the scale).

4. Year-on-Year Comments

Use of the entire range of marks at the top-end of the scale: I've commented on this for the past couple of years and will repeat myself again. Marks at the very top end of the scale are not being used (a mark of 85 being the highest mark I saw, but this mark only appeared very rarely). You're making it really hard for your students to achieve a 1st class mark overall if you're asking them to write 3 essays in a module and giving out few marks above 80. I'm going to suggest again that you might wish to adopt a 'step-marking' system at the top-end (i.e 75 for low 1st class, 85 for mid 1st class and 95 for high 1st class marks) or perhaps consider dropping '72' as a mark.

5. Preparation / Induction Activity (for new External Examiners only)

N/A

6. Noteworthy Practice and Enhancement

I particularly like that students have to respond to/reflect on the feedback they have previously received on their essays and practicals. The generic exam feedback is also very useful.

7. Comments on the Examination of Master's Dissertations (External Examiners for postgraduate Master's Programmes only, see also 9.23-9.29 below)

N/A

8. Appointment Overview (for retiring External Examiners only)

N/A

9. Annual Report Checklist

Please include appropriate comments within Sections 1-8 above for any answer of 'No'.

		Yes (Y)	No (N)	N/A (N/A)
Programme/Course Information				
9.1	Did you receive sufficient information about the Programme and its contents, learning outcomes and assessments?	Y		
9.2	Were you asked to comment on any changes to the assessment of the Programme?		N	
Draft Examination Question Papers				
9.3	Were you asked to approve all examination papers contributing to the final award?	Y		
9.4	Were the nature, spread and level of the questions appropriate?	Y		
9.5	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	Y		
Marking Examination Scripts				
9.6	Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?	Y		
9.7	Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	Y		
9.8	Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?	Y		
9.9	Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the internal examiners?	Y		
9.10	In your judgement, did you have the opportunity to examine a sufficient cross-section of candidates' work contributing to the final assessment?	Y		
Coursework and Practical Assessments				
9.11	Was the choice of subjects for coursework and / or practical assessments appropriate?	Y		
9.12	Were you afforded access to an appropriate sample of coursework and / or practical assessments?	Y		
9.13	Was the method and general standard of assessment appropriate?	Y		
9.14	Is sufficient feedback provided to students on their assessed work?	Y		
Clinical Examinations (if applicable)				
9.15	Were satisfactory arrangements made for the conduct of clinical assessments?			N/A
Sampling of Work				
9.16	Were you afforded sufficient time to consider samples of assessed work?	Y		
Examining Board Meeting				

		Yes (Y)	No (N)	N/A (N/A)
9.17	Were you able to attend the Examining Board meeting?	Y		
9.18	Was the Examining Board conducted properly, in accordance with established procedures and to your satisfaction?	Y		
9.19	Cardiff University recognises the productive contribution of External Examiners to the assessment process and, in particular, to the work of the Examining Board. Have you had adequate opportunities to discuss the Programme and any outstanding concerns with the Examining Board or its officers?	Y		
Joint Examining Board Meeting (if applicable)				N/A
9.20	Did you attend a Composite Examining Board, i.e. one convened to consider the award of Joint Honours degrees?			
9.21	If so, were you made aware of the procedures and conventions for the award of Joint Honours degrees?			
9.22	Was the Composite Examining Board conducted according to its rules?			
Examination of Master's Dissertations (if applicable)				N/A
9.23	Did you receive a sufficient number of Dissertations to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?			
9.24	Was the sample in accordance with the University's sampling guidelines (guidelines provided below)?			
9.25	Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the Internal Examiners?			
9.26	Were you able to attend the Master's Degree (Dissertation) Stage Examining Board?			
9.27	If so, was the Examining Board conducted properly and in accordance with established procedures?			
9.28	Were the schemes for marking and classification correctly applied?			
9.29	Were the standards of the awards recommended appropriate?			

Please return this Report, preferably in a Microsoft Word format, by email to:

ExternalExaminers@cf.ac.uk

Your fee and expenses claim form and receipts, should be sent electronically to the above email address or in hard copy to:

External Examiners, Registry, Cardiff University, McKenzie House, 30-36 Newport Road, Cardiff, CF24 0DE

SAMPLING OF TAUGHT MASTER'S DISSERTATIONS BY EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

External Examiners shall be expected to see prescribed numbers and ranges of Dissertations, but not to mark them, on the following basis:

At least 10% of Dissertations for a postgraduate taught Master's Programme, or a minimum of 10 (whichever is the higher figure) must be seen by the External Examiner(s). Where the total number is less than 10, all Dissertations must be seen by the External Examiner(s) #.

Dissertations seen by External Examiners should include examples from across the whole range of achievement (i.e. Pass with Distinction, Pass, Fail).

External Examiners will retain the right to see other Dissertations at random.

Where more than one External Examiner is appointed on a Programme, at least 10% of Dissertations, or a minimum of 10 (whichever is the higher figure), should be seen collectively by the External Examiners.