

**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S ANNUAL REPORT
ON POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES OF STUDY
2021-22**

Name of external examiner	Dr Maddie Groom
Institution	University of Nottingham
Programme(s) being examined (e.g. MA Drama)	MSc Mental Health Sciences
Examination board(s) attended (e.g. PG Drama SEB, 19/10/21)	SEB 22/06/2022 (summer board), SEB 03/10/2022 (final board)

Your completed report should be submitted by e-mail to Alice de Havillan, Academic Quality and Standards Officer, at a.l.dehavillan@qmul.ac.uk within 30 days of the main examination board meeting.

If you prefer, you may post your report in hard copy. If completing this by hand, you may need to enlarge the text boxes before printing. Please send any hard copy reports to:

Academic Secretariat (External Examiners)
ARCS, Queens E10
Queen Mary University of London
Mile End Road, London, E1 4NS

Your report is intended for internal use only and will contribute towards aspects of Queen Mary's annual reporting procedures. Your report will be read widely, and will be made available to students; **please do not include personal information (such as your home address) or identify individual students.**

If you would like to raise any issues of a sensitive nature directly with the Principal, please feel free to do so. The address is Principal, Queen Mary University of London, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS. Please do NOT use this form for this purpose.

This template is updated annually; the most recent version is available at:
<http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality-assurance/external-examiners/external-examiners-resources/>

1. Programme structure

Please comment upon:

- any particular strengths and weaknesses of the programme;
- the balance and content of the degree programme(s) followed by students;
- the coherence of programmes, and the appropriateness of the core/compulsory modules in relation to the aims and intended learning outcomes;
- the suitability of methods and the adequacy of teaching as reflected by the standards achieved by the candidates.

The programme is exceptionally well-designed to provide students with an understanding of the mental health conditions, including their aetiology, and the principles underpinning their assessment and treatment. Students are also provided with teaching in advanced research methods enabling them to design and conduct research studies within the field of mental health. The MSc also provides students with an opportunity to conduct an independent piece of research under supervision, in the form of the 60-credit research dissertation. The projects offered are examples of 'real-world' research in the supervisor's area of interest. The programme also includes the development of transferable skills, including those needed to apply for future employment or doctoral study.

Together, the modules on the programme enable students to achieve the programme learning outcomes.

The taught materials and the structure of each module support student learning, although greater consistency in how the marking criteria proforma are designed and applied to students' work, and how feedback is shared with the students, may enable them to reflect on their performance in greater depth.

2. Standard of student performance

- 2.1 *In your view, are the standards of student performance comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK higher education institutions with which you are familiar?*

YES (if 'no', please state the reasons they fall short)

- 2.2 *Are there any other points on student performance that you wish to raise?*

Students' performance covered the full range with some producing work of very high quality. The students on this programme are diverse and come from a range of backgrounds, from both the UK and overseas. The programme provides them with an opportunity to demonstrate their learning in a variety of ways. This is beneficial as it ensures the programme is not focused exclusively on academic writing, which some students may struggle with. This approach to programme and assessment design is commendable.

3. Assessment Process

3.1 *In your view, are the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards sound and fairly conducted?*

YES (if 'no', please state the reasons they fall short)

--

3.2 *Please also comment for Queen Mary on:*

- *strengths and weaknesses in the assessment process;*
- *the appropriateness of the assessment methods (i.e. examinations, essays, dissertations etc.) to the learning outcomes for the programme, and the balance between them;*
- *the marking scheme, and the scheme for the award of honours (including weighting in final assessment between years of the programme and in relation to the number of modules completed);*
- *the quality and achievements of the candidates.*

There is an appropriate balance between different methods of assessment, including science communication, oral presentations, in-class practical workshop assessments, data analysis, exams and essay questions. This range and diversity of assessments provides students with an opportunity to reflect their learning through different formats and ensures that assessments are appropriate for the taught content, and relevant to skills needed for future career progression.

The assessments are moderated or double marked independently. Feedback is provided to students.

Marking criteria are specific to each assessment, which is exemplary and provides students with an understanding of the core features needed for each assessment. Greater consistency between modules in the way that marking criteria are applied to students' work could be useful in aiding their understanding of the mark awarded, and in their progression from one assessment to the next.

The majority of candidates performed well with most gaining a mark in the merit or distinction range. The top-performing candidates achieved marks in the distinction range across almost all module assessments, suggesting there is consistency and parity between assessment methods. Those performing at the lower end of the range were slightly more variable in their marks between modules, indicating that they were able to reflect their learning more readily under some methods of assessment. This is expected in students at the lower end of the performance range. The average mark across the cohort was slightly higher than expected on modules PSY703P and PSY705P, but not unduly so.

4. Other Issues of Quality

If the answer is 'no' for any of the following questions, please give details in the comment box at the end of this section.

Examination papers		Delete as applicable
4.1	Were you satisfied with the arrangements for consulting you on the structure and content of the examination paper(s)?	Yes
4.2	Were your comments on the examination paper(s) properly taken into account?	Yes
Marking and Moderation		Delete as applicable

4.3	Were you satisfied with the arrangements for your moderation of assignments?	Yes
4.4	Did you have sufficient information on the marking scheme(s)?	Yes
4.5	Did you feel that you could fairly assess the quality and consistency of the marking?	Yes
4.6	Was the quality of the marking satisfactory?	Yes
4.7	Were you satisfied that all scripts were double-marked internally (where required)?	Yes
4.8	Were you satisfied with the arrangements to review any practical work?	NA
4.9	Were you happy with the arrangements for conducting oral examinations/ presentations (where used as part of the assessment for a module)?	Yes
The Examination Board(s)		Delete as applicable
4.10	Were you satisfied with the arrangements for, and conduct of, the examination board meeting?	Yes
4.11	Were you satisfied with the decisions and recommendations of the examination board meeting?	Yes
Assessment		Delete as applicable
4.12	Was the standard of assessment consistent with that of the national university system, so far as you could tell?	Yes
4.13	Were you satisfied with the assessment arrangements for associate students (if applicable)?	NA
<p><i>Please detail any concerns regarding 4.1 – 4.13.</i></p> <p>On module PSY701P I was unable to watch a sample of the oral presentations which form 20% of the module assessment. I was able to view the powerpoint slides and this gave me reasonable insight into the marking of this assessment. The programme director has confirmed that a sample of presentations will be made available next year.</p>		

5. Issues of Procedure

If applicable, how did procedures/arrangements compare this year with previous years? Were suggestions that you made last year acted upon? (if not applicable, please go to question 6).

N/A (first year)

6. General Comments

6.1 *In your view, are the standards set for the awards appropriate for qualifications at this level in this subject?*

YES *(if 'no', please state the reasons they fall short)*

6.2 *Are there any other points that you wish to raise? In particular, Queen Mary would welcome your comments on any aspects of exemplary practice in the subject area for which you act as external examiner.*

The module PSY702P was very well-organised, including the availability of session information and resources on QM+. The module convenor received very positive ratings from the students. This is not

an easy subject to teach and so the convenor is to be commended for her thorough, diligent approach to guiding the students through the module.

6.3 *If appropriate, please provide a short statement or bullet points of any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes.*

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. J. Green', is centered within a light gray rectangular box.

Signed:

Date: 10/10/2022

Thank you for completing this report and for your contribution to assuring standards and quality at Queen Mary University of London. Please return your report to the address/e-mail address given on the front page of this pro-forma. You will receive acknowledgement of the receipt of your report from the Academic Secretariat.