The information in this handbook is provided as a guide to the academic and research components of the Doctoral Programme in Educational Psychology. Details about the content of the programme are subject to change. The University calendar should be consulted for the formal regulations governing the award of this degree.
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Section 1 Introduction and Overview

The Doctoral Programme in Educational Psychology at the University of Southampton was established as an initial training Programme in 2006, accredited by the BPS as conferring eligibility for Chartered Educational Psychologist status, and recognised by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DfES) as enabling its graduates to work within Local Authority Children’s Services. From 2009 the programme was also approved as a practitioner training programme in psychology by the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), allowing fully qualified trainees to apply to join the register. In 2011, open-ended approval was given subject to major change.

The framework for the programme is closely linked to the requirements for professional training set by the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) and the British Psychological Society (BPS). The programme was unconditionally reaccredited in June 2011.

The programme is taught and assessed via diverse educational and placement opportunities that are supported via academic teaching from the University and learning placements supervised by educational psychologists working in the field. The different components of the programme are designed to provide an integrated and complementary experience for trainees to allow them to make strong associations between the research, academic and practical aspects of the doctorate. The programme is designed to encourage trainees to effectively utilise an academic and research base to foster the development and subsequent implementation of evidence based practice in the field.

Core Purpose

A major tenet of the philosophy of the programme in Southampton is the integration of theory and practice within the twin frameworks of evidence-based practice, and evidence-generating practice. This approach requires the trainee both to select methods of intervention at all levels based on a critical evaluation of the published research on effectiveness of the approach (evidence-based) and to see practice as an important means of extending that knowledge base (evidence-generating).

The core purposes of the Programme are:

- to train educational psychologists to work to the highest educational, professional and ethical standards of practice, enabling them to demonstrate the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) standards of proficiency (SOPs) and the BPS competencies (See Appendix 1).
- to promote an inclusive approach to professional practice and encourage trainees to identify and build on the strengths children, young people, and those who work with them, bring to the consultation.
- to equip trainees with the psychological and research skills needed to deliver a professional service and to contribute to the knowledge base of the profession.

Core Aims

The broad aim is to develop trainees’ knowledge, understanding and application of theory, using empirical evidence core to the practice of educational psychology in an environment in which there are frequent opportunities for critical reflection and personal review.

Specific aims are:
• to develop trainees’ ability to apply and evaluate core knowledge of psychological theory and research in a range of child, community and educational settings across the age range and level of presenting problem.
• to provide trainees with a knowledge of central theoretical and empirical approaches to educational psychology.
• to gain experience of the application of theoretical models and treatment approaches to psychological problems in the child, community or educational field.
• to acquire in-depth knowledge of specialist areas of interest.
• to develop competence as an applied psychologist with the critical skills and analytical abilities of a scientist practitioner.
• to develop trainees’ competence in research design in the field of child and educational psychology enabling them to work with key partners to conduct and disseminate robust evidence based research.
• to develop trainees’ ability to work independently and cooperatively as professionals in multi-disciplinary and multi-agency settings.
• to develop an understanding of professional issues associated with the practice of educational psychology.

The programme is structured to achieve its aims as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Knowledge and skill development through problem based learning and seminars at university</th>
<th>Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placement with a Field Tutor for 1.5 days a week for the year from October (60 days)</td>
<td>Independent study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A small scale research project commissioned by the Local Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Knowledge and skill sessions at university</th>
<th>Independent study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placement in local authority through our bursary scheme (130 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Knowledge and skill sessions at university</th>
<th>Independent study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placement in Local Authority through our bursary scheme (130 days).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research thesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The core purpose and philosophy of the Programme is regularly reviewed, through the Programme Board, with student representation; through its Advisory committee of local practitioners, and through the Academic Unit of Psychology Education Committee. The Programme is also subject to review by the HCPC, its approving body.

**Approach to Learning**


---

programme aims to give experience of applying the problem centred framework at a number of levels:

- at the level of an individual (approached either through direct contact, or through parents, carers or teachers, or in groups).
- at the level of parents, carers or teaching staff, for example in in-service training or advisory work
- at the level of the organisation, such as whole schools or agencies
- at the level of policy maker, in local authority services

The programme holds that the problems are very properly the concern of the client, and the psychologist is there to facilitate change rather than take responsibility for the problem.

**Staff Resources**

The programme team consists of the following individuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff member</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Wright</td>
<td>Programme Director</td>
<td>Overall management of programme</td>
<td><a href="mailto:S.F.Wright@soton.ac.uk">S.F.Wright@soton.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna Kovshoff</td>
<td>Research Director</td>
<td>Research planning and coordination, SSRP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:H.Kovshoff@soton.ac.uk">H.Kovshoff@soton.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Brignell</td>
<td>Research Tutor</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:C.Brignell@soton.ac.uk">C.Brignell@soton.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Cooke</td>
<td>Programme Tutor Year 1</td>
<td>Year 1 curriculum &amp; coordination</td>
<td><a href="mailto:T.Cooke@soton.ac.uk">T.Cooke@soton.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Woodcock</td>
<td>Programme Tutor Year 2</td>
<td>Year 2 curriculum coordination and Placement Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:C.Woodcock@soton.ac.uk">C.Woodcock@soton.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klair Norman</td>
<td>Programme Tutor Year 3</td>
<td>Year 3 curriculum &amp; coordination</td>
<td><a href="mailto:K.Norman@soton.ac.uk">K.Norman@soton.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Placement Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie Barrett</td>
<td>Field Tutor</td>
<td>Placement Year 1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:angie.barrett@southampton.gov.uk">angie.barrett@southampton.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Hobkirk</td>
<td>Field Tutor</td>
<td>Placement Year 1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lisa.hobkirk@hants.gov.uk">lisa.hobkirk@hants.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Manger</td>
<td>Field Tutor</td>
<td>Placement Year 1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lucy.manger@hants.gov.uk">lucy.manger@hants.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Coleman</td>
<td>Field Tutor</td>
<td>Placement Year 1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emma.coleman@portsmouthcc.gov.uk">emma.coleman@portsmouthcc.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Beaven</td>
<td>Field Tutor</td>
<td>Placement Year 1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alex.beaven@southampton.gov.uk">alex.beaven@southampton.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Goodall</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Programme administration</td>
<td><a href="mailto:A.Goodall@soton.ac.uk">A.Goodall@soton.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A strong feature of the programme is the role of the field tutors. These are educational psychologists employed in the local authority hosting the placement learning of trainees in year 1 in one or two named schools, typically a primary and a secondary school. The Academic and Professional Tutors are seconded educational psychologists with designated academic responsibilities to the programme.

Further research support (eg. thesis supervision) is provided by the academic and technical staff in the Academic Unit.
Physical Resources
The Programme is based within the Professional Training unit of the University’s Academic Unit, alongside the Clinical Psychology programme. The Programme’s accommodation includes:

- access to a teaching room
- office space for the Programme Administrators
- offices for the Director and other academic staff
- computer suites in the main Academic Unit building and elsewhere on the main campus.

Academic and Research Resources
The programme has excellent research facilities, including access to the Academic Unit’s graduate research training and the University of Southampton’s generic skills programme. There are further opportunities for trainees to conduct their research theses in conjunction with the work of a number of research teams in the Academic Unit. Further information on the Academic Unit’s research divisions is available through the Academic Unit website at: http://www.psychology.soton.ac.uk/research.php

Libraries, Computing and Office Facilities

The University of Southampton Library
Trainees and Programme staff have access to the University of Southampton libraries services and resources. The library webpage (www.library.soton.ac.uk) allows users to search its catalogue (WebCat), recall and reserve books, renew items on loan and check their own borrower record. The library makes available extensive electronic resources including Web of Science, Psyclit and several thousand electronic journal titles. The library also provides access to material not held at Southampton by means of an inter-library loan service. Training in related library usage is provided in induction and at key points in the programme.

The Academic Unit Test Library
The Programme holds a number of developmental, educational and psychometric tests and intervention material which are available for trainee use under supervision on placement, or for research. Trainees can also expect to use resources available on placement.

Further information about the Test Library can be obtained from the test administrator Paul Reynolds (P.Reynolds@soton.ac.uk)

Computing Facilities
As part of the Academic Unit, the programme staff and trainees have access to the University’s Information Support Service (ISS) and relevant support. These include computing facilities (e-mail, word processing, access to literature search facilities and online journals, qualitative and quantitative data analysis packages). Further technical equipment (video recording and editing equipment, tape recorders, etc.) is available through the Academic Unit. Additionally, trainees can obtain licensed copies of word-processing, database, spreadsheet and data analysis software packages for installation on their own computers (www.software.soton.ac.uk). Several laptop computers are also available for use from the Academic Unit.

Office Facilities
The Programme has use of a photocopier and fax machine housed within its Professional Training Unit. Trainee photocopying at the University is incorporated into the Programme budget and trainees are each given an individual code for use with the Programme photocopier.

**Resources on Placement**

The Programme aims to ensure that trainees have adequate facilities whilst they are on placement (please refer to Placement Handbook). The University iSolutions ensures home working is facilitated by a web based arrangement, and emails are also accessible by this route.

**Organisation and Structure**

**Accountability of the Programme and of the Director**

The Programme is administratively placed within the Academic Unit of Psychology at the University of Southampton; it is also subject to the approval as a practitioner training programme by the HCPC. In addition, it is reliant on the placement learning opportunities provided by local Educational Psychology Services who offer placements co-ordinated through the SEEL Consortium placement panel ([http://www.ucl.ac.uk/educational-psychology/decp psy/bursary_placements_2015.html](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/educational-psychology/decp psy/bursary_placements_2015.html)).

Accountability to the Academic Unit of Psychology is via the Head and the School Education Committee (SEC). Accountability to the local authorities is via the Programme’s Advisory Group. Finally, the Programme ensures that it meets national standards for Educational Psychology training through the appropriate external validation procedures involving our External Examiner.

**The Educational Psychology Programme Board**

The Programme Board is responsible for policy matters, whilst the Programme Team is responsible for the day-to-day operational management of the Programme. The Board ensures representation of all stakeholders’ views and interests. It receives via the programme director views from the Programme Advisory Group (see below); trainee educational psychologists (typically one or two per intake year); University (Head of Psychology or other members of Psychology as appropriate). The Programme Board also holds an Examination Board which meets at the end of each year.

The Programme Board meets three times each year and is concerned with quality issues, including student evaluation and curriculum development. Minutes of the Programme Board are sent to the AUPB.

The specific terms of reference of the programme board are:

- to review and advise on academic and curricular matters of the programme
- to consider student evaluation of the programme, and programme response
- to consider recruitment and selection matters, and student numbers
- to consider and advise on approval matters
- to receive commissions from and report to the Psychology AUPB
- to advise the Academic Unit and programme team on individual student matters

**Trainee Representation**
Each year identifies one or two year representatives who take responsibility for representing the cohort at Programme Board. The regular cohort team meetings give them the opportunity to ensure that they are able to represent their year group's views. As key stakeholders, their role is ensure that the views and interests of their respective year groups are represented. The expectation is that matters which could usefully have been first raised with the module lead, APT or Programme Director should have been shared prior to being raised at Programme Board.

**Programme Exam Board**

This meets at the end of each academic year in July and is the formal mechanism by which it is ensured that all trainees in Year 3 have successfully completed all course requirements. It is also where any issues arising from external examiner comments can be addressed. It is also the responsibility of the exam board to address any special considerations.

The final award is awarded by the Awards Committee on the recommendation of the Programme Exam Board to candidates who have satisfactorily completed the course and have satisfied all the assessment requirements.

**Programme Advisory Group**

The role of the Programme Advisory Group (PAG) is to provide support and challenge to the programme and help ensure that the training programme continues to prepare trainees for placement and employment. It exists to represent the interests of placement providers involved in delivering the programme, to maintain good working relationships between those parties, and to provide a forum to exchange ideas, strengthen skills and share examples of good practice. It also exists to identify, and discuss any issues of common concern. These aims will be achieved in and between meetings through formal and informal contact.

Membership of the group is open to anyone offering a placement to a Southampton trainee. If the Principal Educational Psychologist is not able to attend, a senior member of staff can deputise.

Meetings are held yearly with agenda items sent to the Programme Director/Administrator.

**Geographical Boundaries**

The programme at the University of Southampton currently operates as a national resource, with potential applicants from the UK. As part of the SEEL (South East, East and London) Consortium, which has been contracted by the National College of Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) it is intended to meet the workforce requirements of Local Authorities in the three government offices in the South East, East and London regions. All placement learning takes place in Year 1 in Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton, and in Years 2/3 within the SEEL consortium.

**Programme Funding**

Funding for trainees in Year 1 is determined nationally by the NCTL. Trainees are expected to sign contracts with the NCTL. In Years 2 and 3 trainees across the SEEL consortium are allocated placements by the Placement Panel. Criteria for the allocation of placement include: place of residence/distance from placement base/estimated travel time; TEP additional needs; family circumstances eg. dependent children. Taking up a placement will be contingent on the successful completion of year one of the course and good attendance.

Trainees can express preferences for particular placements by selecting and rank ordering indicating distance from placement/estimated travel time and any other personal circumstances relating to the criteria. While every effort will be made by the panel to place
TEPs in one of their preferred placements, this cannot be guaranteed. The panel reserves the right to make the final decision in the interests of all TEPs.

**Monitoring of programme performance**

In addition to the monitoring of teaching and learning at the level of the programme Board, within the University, teaching programmes are formally reviewed regularly via a five yearly Programme Review, coordinated by Psychology and carried out by both programme staff and external representatives. The last review, undertaken in conjunction with the HCPC and the BPS was in June 2011. The programme received no conditions and a number of commendations.

As an additional measure of programme performance, employment outcomes for trainees are also monitored. Since 2009 all the trainees graduating from the course successfully secured employment.

**Selection and Registration**

Nationally there are currently 130 funded places to study educational psychology in England. The annual intake at Southampton for 2015 is 11 funded trainees. We do not accept self-funding trainees. As a minimum, applicants are considered for the Doctorate in Educational Psychology programme at Southampton if applicants:

- have attained at least a 2:1 in psychology (or equivalent) and Graduate Basis for Chartered membership (GBC) with the BPS at the time of application.
- have provided evidence that you have kept psychology as an on-going interest and a regular part of your CPD.
- have provided strong evidence of the application of psychology in working with children and young people.
- have sustained and relevant work with children in education, childcare, or community settings. A minimum of one year’s full time (or equivalent part-time) at the time of application. This can be all paid employment or at least nine month’s full time paid and 3 months voluntary relevant experience. This experience should enable you to demonstrate acquisition of the Common Core of Skills and Knowledge for the Children and Young People’s Workforce (CWDC 2010):
  - Effective communication and engagement with children, young people and families
  - Child and young person development
  - Safeguarding and promoting the welfare of the child or young person
  - Supporting transitions
  - Multi-agency and integrated working
  - Information sharing

Applicants must be able to demonstrate a good command of English. If English is not your first language you must be able to evidence a good standard of written and spoken English (100 for internet-based TOEFL, 250 for computer-based TOEFL, 600 for paper-based TOEFL or 7.0 for IELTS with no element below 6.5).

Trainees are short-listed based on the evidence in their application which addresses the above criteria, as well as their personal statement and supplied references.
Selection for the Doctorate in Educational Psychology is undertaken in collaboration with educational psychology service managers from neighbouring local authorities who participate in the short-listing and interview process. Usually 36 applicants are invited to the University to one of four days. The process aims to explore applicants’ academic, research and practical application of psychology as well inter-personal and communication skills.

The attention of potential applicants is drawn to the requirement that trainees are expected to maintain their health and well-being throughout the duration of the programme and in line with the HCPC’s guidance on conduct and ethics, to let the Programme Director know if their health status changes.

The programme welcomes applications from people with disabilities and from ethnic minority communities.

Applicants offered a place are required to complete the University Postgraduate Application form before they start on the programme. This application form contains a question about criminal convictions and all successful applicants are required to apply for an enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. Further information can be obtained from the DBS website: https://www.gov.uk/disclosure-barring-service-check/overview

Disclosure of criminal convictions will be assessed on an individual basis according to the University student convictions policy http://www.calendar.soton.ac.uk/sectionIV/student-convictions.html and the Academic Unit Fitness to Practise policy.

Once on the course, trainees are directed to the HCPC Guidance on Conduct and Ethics for Students which require them to tell their education provider if they are convicted of, or cautioned for, any offence. In the case of a trainee disclosing a conviction or caution this would be dealt with on a case by case basis.

The University Postgraduate Application pack also asks about additional needs. Potential trainees are encouraged to declare any health condition and detail any adjustments that may be needed. Following an academic assessment of the application, the University’s Disability service may then invite a trainee to discuss particular requirements. Trainees do not have to declare any health conditions. Disclosure of health needs is assessed according to the Academic Unit fitness to study and fitness to practice policies. All reasonable adjustments in line with equality and diversity law will be made, supported by a range of University services.

Once on the programme, it is the trainee’s responsibility, in line with the HCPC Guidance on Conduct and ethics for students, to maintain their health and well-being and to let the programme know if there is any change. Changes in health or well-being would then be considered in the light of the Academic Unit Fitness to Practice policy on a case by case basis.

All trainees are registered full-time with the University of Southampton. It is expected that candidates complete the Programme within the three year duration of the Programme. In exceptional circumstances, candidates may complete all parts of the examination within five years of first registering. Performance is reviewed throughout the programme. Unsatisfactory performance in academic, research or practical work may lead to termination of registration.
Section 2 Educational Experience

Overview

The programme at Southampton is designed to enable trainees to work in partnership with a diverse population of children, young people, their families and services in a range of contexts and settings. Successful trainees will demonstrate the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) as outlined by the HCPC (www.hpc-uk.org/publications).

The research requirement of the programme is integrally linked to the placement and academic components and culminates in the preparation of a thesis that aims to address an issue relevant to the psychological development of children and young people in an educational psychology context. While access to participants is often derived from placements, supervision of the research thesis remains with the Academic Unit.

In accordance with the University’s Code of Practice for Research Candidature and Supervision, the taught element of the programme in Year 1 is assessed at Masters’ level. All components of Year 2 and 3 are assessed at Doctoral level. The placement component of these years combines the learning requirements of the HCPC with the opportunity for trainees to demonstrate the advanced scholarship and reflection.

Academic Requirements

Consistent with the National Qualifications Framework, the doctoral level of the programme requires trainees to demonstrate a systematic acquisition and understanding of the substantial body of knowledge which is at the forefront of professional practice in educational psychology, and that reflects the creation of new knowledge through original research and enquiry to inform the discipline’s practice.

Through a range of academic and practical assignments trainees will be required to make informed judgements on complex issues in the field, and to communicate their ideas and conclusions clearly and effectively to clients, colleagues and academics. At the end of the three year programme successful trainees will have the qualities and skills necessary for entry to the profession, requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and independent initiative.

QAA Masters and Doctoral Level Descriptors

The transition from Masters to doctoral level at the end of Year 1 as outlined by the QAA qualification descriptors in the framework for higher education includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masters degree</th>
<th>Doctoral degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trainees should be able to demonstrate:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Trainees should be able to demonstrate:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A systematic understanding of knowledge, including a critical awareness at the forefront of a discipline</td>
<td>- A systematic understanding of a substantial body of knowledge, including a critical awareness at the forefront of a discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An understanding of techniques applicable to research</td>
<td>- A detailed understanding of research techniques and academic enquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Originality in the application of knowledge and an understanding of how research can create and allow an interpretation or</td>
<td>- An ability to think through, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The creation and interpretation of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation of new knowledge</td>
<td>new knowledge (via original research) that extends the discipline and merits publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trainees should be able to:**
- Systematically deal with complex issues (sometimes without complete data)
- Show problem solving skills that reflect self-direction and originality
- Continue to develop further skills linked to the continuous advancement of knowledge

**Trainees should be able to:**
- Make informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields (sometimes without complete data) and communicate ideas effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences.
- Continue to undertake research at a high level

**Trainees will be able to show transferable skills necessary for employment related to:**
- Taking initiative and personal responsibility to make decisions in complex environments
- A learning ethos to allow for CPD

**Trainees will be able to show transferable skills necessary for employment related to:**
- Taking largely autonomous initiative and personal responsibility in complex and unpredictable professional (and equivalent) environments

These are taken from the QAA (2008) and described in full at: [http://www.qaa.ac.uk/](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/)

**Programme Structure and Curriculum**

The curriculum is based on the standards of proficiency specified by the HCPC and the core competencies outlined by the BPS. The programme content is arranged overall in 17 modules which in total attract the 540 credit points required for Doctoral (D) level study in Higher Education (see Appendix 2). Each module has a separate credit rating which indicates the notional amount of study effort required through attendance at University teaching sessions, on related placement activity or in independent study. The level of assessment is indicated by M (Master’s) or D (Doctoral), with D level implying that a higher level of original work, advanced scholarship, critical analysis and reflection will be expected. Doctoral trainees must demonstrate that they have acquired and understood the systematic knowledge base of the profession, and that they have developed relevant skills to carry out research which will generate relevant new knowledge.

The programme is organised over three full time years and trainees are expected to complete all elements. There is no exit award. In terms of student effort the three years each anticipate an average of 180 credit points (1800 hours). Timetabling is designed to provide basic theoretical and practical knowledge in Year 1, required for the closely supervised practice in Year 2, which then leads to increasingly independent practice in Year 3. Each year the programme aims to provide a balance of theory and practice that is integrated in assignments and collaborative activity and consolidated by placements outside the University. Topics will be returned to at deeper levels across the three years.
**Vertical Curriculum Strands**

Running across the teaching and learning over all three years are a number of core professional practice skills which are critical to professional development in this field. These are embedded core to our teaching and learning activities, congruent with the HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs) and reflected in the learning objectives in the module descriptors (see Appendix 3 onwards).

- Ethical considerations in community practice
- Multicultural and diversity issues
- Inclusion and access
- Contextual factors including school and local authority structures
- Principles and practice of multi-agency and inter-professional work

**Placement learning across the three years**

The Programme includes practice placements across the three years of training that are designed to develop skills and competencies in working as an educational psychologist. In Year 1 trainees are linked in pairs to a designated Field Tutor, a practitioner from the field who works with trainees to coach and model the requisite skills and to observe practice, following the University based curriculum. Trainees are introduced to casework with individual pupils, with the aim of achieving initial casework competence in preparation for placements in Years 2 and 3. Shadowing opportunities with other educational psychologists are also provided in Year 1 to allow trainees to experience a range of approaches and develop a greater awareness of the breadth of the role of an educational psychologist.

For Years 2 and 3 collaborating educational psychology services identify a supervision coordinator (Year 2) or supervisor (Year 3), for each trainee who organises agreed placement activities at all levels of practice and provides advice, guidance and feedback.

A total of 60 placement days is provided in Year 1. In Years 2 and 3 trainees undertake placement activities for 130 days in each year. The number of placement days reflects the BPS requirement for at least 300 days experience of the generic work of an educational psychologist. It is consistent with the HCPC requirement that the “number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to support delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes” (p10; Standards of Education and Training).

The Placement Coordinator has responsibility for ensuring that each placement provides the appropriate experience of practice for the trainee to meet assessment requirements and to demonstrate the required learning outcomes. In year 1 the academic and professional tutor for Year 1 meets regularly with field tutors to ensure that the learning experiences are appropriate for each trainee and are in line with the curriculum delivery at the University.

In Years 2 and 3 placements are monitored through two triangular reviews each year that include the trainee, supervision coordinator or supervisor and personal tutor. Reports of these reviews are sent to the placement coordinator who will raise any concerns with the programme director. The reports are also discussed at Programme Board.

In Year 2 academic input focuses on low-incidence needs such as sensory impairment, language difficulty, cognitive limitations, physical or neurological impairment, emotional dysfunction or challenging behaviour. Placement activities complement this University based learning. In Year 3 trainees are expected to develop independent approaches within a supervision framework, increasingly mirroring autonomous professional practice.
Research across the three years
Research is the basis for practice in Educational Psychology. Learning to select appropriately, judge critically and use relevant aspects of psychological research is an integral part of training and is one of the profession's key strengths. The Southampton Programme was developed to provide trainees with the necessary research and other generic skills to allow them to read research reports with critical understanding and to conduct innovative research relevant to childcare, community and educational settings.

The objectives of the research training programme are:

- to familiarise trainees with the research base of the profession
- to facilitate the development of skills of critical analysis of the research base
- to acquire competence in core aspects of research design and statistical analysis
- to enable trainees to independently develop, design and execute research in relevant settings
- to teach trainees skills to communicate research findings for different audiences (e.g. presentations, writing papers, press releases).

In the first year core research skills are provided in conjunction with other postgraduate research trainees in the Academic Unit. Trainees are expected to use the skills they develop in all aspects of their training and related assessments across the three years.

Data Analysis: Training and Facilities
Trainees have access to computing facilities provided by the Programme and by the Academic Unit (including site licences for SPSS, for use at home or on placement).

Research Co-ordination
A member of the academic staff is responsible for coordinating the research activity of trainees, from first choice of topic, through the monitoring of research training and the organisation of supervision. Trainees are encouraged to approach members of the programme team early for research advice/support, particularly if the trainee is conducting a study in their specialist field. Early advice from the field is important when the proposal is likely to require a large number of participants from schools or the local community.

Ethical Issues in Research
All research projects carried out in the Academic Unit should meet the BPS requirements for ethical research. No project may be carried out without formal approval from the relevant ethics committee(s); these include the Academic Unit Ethics’ Committee, Research Governance and, if appropriate, a Local Research Ethics’ NHS Committee (LREC).

Ethical issues in research are introduced to trainees applied research methods training in Year 1 and further guidance can be found in the Code of Ethics and Conduct published by the British Psychological Society. Prior to conducting any research, trainees are required to submit online ethics’ committee and research governance applications which must be approved before the research can start. All forms related to ethics’ applications can be accessed through efolio at: http://www.ergo.soton.ac.uk/

Research Governance
Once an ethical application has been approved by the Academic Unit, it will be sent to the Research Governance office (RGO). The aim of the RGO is to provide researchers with sponsorship and insurance for their research projects. The University of Southampton stipulates that any member of the university should not carry out research without having
received confirmation from the RGO of their sponsorship and insurance. Further details can be found at:

http://www.southampton.ac.uk/corporateservices/rgo/index.html

**DBS Check**

Trainees may need to attach a copy of your DBS check to your ethics application(s) and there is a question on the ethics form asking if you have been checked.

**Risk Assessment**

For every ethics application submitted to the Academic Unit trainees are asked to enclose a Risk Assessment form. This form should outline potential risks to researchers and participants. British Psychology Society (BPS) Ethical guidelines and support can be found at:

http://www.bps.org.uk/the-society/code-of-conduct/code-of-conduct_home.cfm

**Local Research Ethics’ Committees (LRECs)**

If research involves participants or resources linked to the NHS then in addition to going through internal ethics and research governance procedures a further application to the local LREC is needed. An LREC application must be submitted if the proposed research participants fall into one of the following categories:

1. They are patients or users of the NHS.
2. They are individuals who have some relationship to users of the NHS (such as carers of patients).
3. They have access to past or current information about NHS patients (including “data, organs or other bodily material, foetal material and IVF”).
4. They have recently died on NHS premises.

Or if the research involves:

1. Using NHS facilities or premises.
2. Using NHS staff.

**Teaching and Learning**

In order to meet the required programme learning outcomes trainees will effectively be engaged in active learning and research through individually negotiated programmes of study. They will also undertake a number of collaborative projects, both benefiting from the group learning and the development of key skills of team working appropriate to practice. All trainees are therefore encouraged to explore and develop an independent working style to be adapted to their eventual place of work. They will also be encouraged to identify knowledge and skill requirements to be pursued through continuing professional development (CPD) opportunities, once they enter full employment with a psychological service. The HCPC sets standards for CPD which need to be met to maintain in order to renew registration, and the programme will encourage the level of self-reflection required for this.

Different types of learning outcome pursued by the programme are each associated with particular teaching/learning and assessment activities.

---

2 This information was taken from United Bristol Healthcare NHS.
Knowledge and Understanding

Knowledge and understanding is developed through problem based learning where learning is driven by challenging, open-ended problems with students working in collaborative groups. Tutors take on the role as “facilitators" and trainees are encouraged to take responsibility for their group and organize and direct their learning. They are also required to present their findings using a range of approaches which will serve to inform the ways in which they may later work with parents, teachers and children.

Learning is also based on seminars from a range of academic and practitioner psychologists, using problem-based learning activities including school and service based project work, supported by reading suggestions and other activities. Assessment is by essays and reports of practical activity.

Trainees will also develop subject specific intellectual skills, with learning implicit in the reading, discussion and reflection expected during the programme, as well as through the coaching and feedback supplied in tutorials and supervision.

Trainees will also be expected to develop subject specific practical skills. In this case, learning is largely derived from supervised practice on professional placements, supplemented by specific teaching input on problem-solving, consultation and appropriate interventions. Here, assessment is by the compilation of reports of casework activity (ROCs) which document casework based on professional placements (with due reflection on process) and by a work file of practical assignments undertaken in all years.

Research and Enquiry Skills

Trainees will also be supported in developing key knowledge of research design, data collection and analysis appropriate to producing an evidence base to guide professional practice. The skills gained will also inform practice through the fostering of critical thinking in relation to empirical findings. In addition to the development of the research thesis, these skills are used in the different assessments across the programme (eg. Essays, ROCs, Academic Critiques).

Generic or Transferable Skills

These are demonstrated where skills of general utility beyond the specific professional focus are acquired, through experiential requirements and formative feedback. They are implicitly assessed in the written assignments and practical experiences prescribed in the programme and include, for example, the development of interpersonal communication, conciliation and negotiation, verbal and written presentation, project work and report writing.

Generic Skills Training: The Researcher Development and Graduate Centre (RDGC)

It represents a comprehensive programme of workshops that enable graduate students across the University to increase their research and personal development skills. Its specific aims are summarised to:

- Enhance the research-centred learning and personal development of postgraduate students, through promotion of shared opportunities for learning and generic skills training, to meet current needs and prepare for future careers;
- Foster best practice and to provide a focus for dissemination, debate and engagement in local, national and international developments in postgraduate research.
Training opportunities within the RDGC fit within four key themes that link to the Researcher Development Framework (RDF) \(^3\). The RDF represents a new UK approach to the development of research skills that focuses on expanding the research base for graduate students leading to the development of “world class” researchers. Working within the RDF framework to identify what makes an excellent researcher, the RDGC highlights a comprehensive set of opportunities to develop skills related to:

- Knowledge, Intellectual Abilities, Techniques
- Personal Effectiveness
- Research Governance & Organisation
- Engagement, Influence & Impact

**Relevance to the Educational Psychology Doctorate Programme**

Trainees are expected to sign up for courses through the online booking service: at Gradbook - [www.gradbook.soton.ac.uk/](http://www.gradbook.soton.ac.uk/). Other courses may be provided on the training programme timetable, but trainees in all years are encouraged to sign up for any extra sessions which they feel would be of benefit at [www.southampton.ac.uk/gradschools/](http://www.southampton.ac.uk/gradschools/), timetable permitting.

**Curriculum overview in Year 1**

There are 10 modules in Year 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module Code</th>
<th>Module Name</th>
<th>Module Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 6070</td>
<td>Learning and Development</td>
<td>Tim Cooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 6071</td>
<td>Emotional and Behavioural Development</td>
<td>Tim Cooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 6072</td>
<td>Placement Learning</td>
<td>Tim Cooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 6073</td>
<td>Casework</td>
<td>Tim Cooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 8021</td>
<td>Small Scale Research Project</td>
<td>Hanna Kovshoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 6127</td>
<td>Evidence Based Practice</td>
<td>Hanna Kovshoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESM 6009</td>
<td>Qualitative Methods</td>
<td>Felicity Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESM 6010</td>
<td>Group Comparisons</td>
<td>Catherine Brignell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESM 6011</td>
<td>Correlational Methods</td>
<td>Sarah Kirby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESM 6012</td>
<td>Designing Research</td>
<td>Catherine Brignell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic Modules**

There are two core academic modules in Year 1 (PSYC 6070 and PSYC 6071). The academic focus in Year 1 is on biological, cognitive and behavioural perspectives in child development and learning. Trainees are encouraged to explore, for example, physical, linguistic, emotional and social development in children including the contextual and environmental impacts on typical development and family, organisational or wider system responses. The academic modules link to trainees’ placement learning where they are encouraged to utilise their understanding of child development and learning in the context of learning and teaching, and related mainstream educational practice. As part of this agenda, they will look at basic approaches to assessment and intervention and undertake work on the BPS Certificate of Competence in Educational Testing (CCET).

Learning outcomes for these modules are described in Appendix 3. These modules are assessed via two 4,000 words essays (see assessment section below).

Research Modules
In addition to the academic and placement learning in Year 1 trainees also take 6 research-related modules. The aim of these modules is to facilitate the development of research skills that allow trainees to conduct research during the doctorate and beyond as a practising educational psychologist that is of high quality and which allows trainees to exercise evidence based practice, i.e., to integrate their own judgement in relation to individual children with knowledge of research findings to facilitate decision making processes as an educational psychologist.

Applied Research Methods
The RESM modules are taken with other PGR trainees within Psychology and cover applied research methods. These modules expose trainees to a wide variety of research methodologies (e.g. qualitative, correlational and experimental designs) and are designed to give trainees hands-on experience with diverse data analytic techniques, including the use of statistical software. Each session will consist of a lecture and some active group work (e.g. carrying out a short interview or focus group session, hands-on computer-based exercises in data analysis). These sessions are designed to provide trainees with a conceptual understanding of research methods, as well as practical experience. Within each module trainees are asked to complete computer-based learning exercises (e.g. statistics revision exercises).

Learning outcomes are assessed through four assignments, enabling trainees to gain experience in the use of a range of methodologies and related analyses.

The module information for the RESM modules can be accessed online by following the links below:

**RESM6012 – ARM: planning and designing research**  
[http://www.southampton.ac.uk/socsci/postgraduate/taught_modules/resm6012_arm_planning_and_designing_research.page](http://www.southampton.ac.uk/socsci/postgraduate/taught_modules/resm6012_arm_planning_and_designing_research.page)

**RESM 6009 - ARM: qualitative methods**  
[http://www.southampton.ac.uk/socsci/postgraduate/taught_modules/resm6009_arm_qualitative_methods.page#overview](http://www.southampton.ac.uk/socsci/postgraduate/taught_modules/resm6009_arm_qualitative_methods.page#overview)

**RESM6011 - ARM: correlational methods**  
[http://www.southampton.ac.uk/socsci/postgraduate/taught_modules/resm6011_arm_correlational_methods.page](http://www.southampton.ac.uk/socsci/postgraduate/taught_modules/resm6011_arm_correlational_methods.page)

**RESM6010 - ARM: group differences**  
[http://www.southampton.ac.uk/socsci/postgraduate/taught_modules/resm6010_arm_statistical_analysis_of_comparisons_and_group_differences.page](http://www.southampton.ac.uk/socsci/postgraduate/taught_modules/resm6010_arm_statistical_analysis_of_comparisons_and_group_differences.page)

Small Scale Research Project (SSRP) and Proposal (RESM 6012)
Trainees are also given the opportunity in Year 1 to utilise the research skills acquired in the core research methods modules to develop a project with practising Educational Psychologists. This experience is made up of a Research Proposal which is submitted as the assessment for RESM 6012 (see above) and a project write-up (4,000 words).

The proposal is marked following the university M level marking criteria; marked out of 100 where:
70 and over  Distinction
60 – 69  Merit
50 – 59  Pass

Once feedback has been received trainees can submit an ethics application. Trainees are strongly advised to ensure that their application and the subsequent write up of the project take account of this feedback. All proposals which receive a mark below 50 will have to be revised and resubmitted or rewritten.

The SSRP is marked using the standard Edpsych categories: Fail, Low Pass, Pass and Distinction. The assessment criteria and feedback sheet for the proposal and the project are in Appendix 4.

The module coordinator is Dr Hanna Kovshoff (H.Kovshoff@soton.ac.uk)

**Thesis**

Trainees will all meet with the Research Director in June/July at the end of their first year to start to think about a possible research topic and supervisor.

**Working in Groups**

Trainees work in small groups for the SSRP, to think through the research design, methods, collect data and analysis, but are required to work independently to write up the project.

**Placement Learning**

Field tutors seconded from Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton Educational Psychology Services play a key role in facilitating the placement learning of trainees in year 1. Trainees are linked to these field practitioners who organise school and service experiences to complement the academic teaching and provide opportunities for research activity in a practice environment. The approach allows for a graduated progression to fluent and adaptive practice which is especially suitable for trainees who may have little experience of schools settings for professional practice. Trainees maintain a practical work file, completing the log of evidence for BPS competencies linked to SOPs and write two casework reports.
Summary of Year 1 Modules and assessment deadlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Deadline (4pm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placement PSYC (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6072</td>
<td>Placement Learning</td>
<td>Practical Work file</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6073</td>
<td>Casework</td>
<td>Two Reports of Casework</td>
<td>5,500 each</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic PSYC (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6070</td>
<td>Learning &amp; Development</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6071</td>
<td>Emotion and Behaviour</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research RESM (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6012</td>
<td>Designing Research</td>
<td>Research Proposal</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6009</td>
<td>Qualitative Methods</td>
<td>Qualitative project</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6011</td>
<td>Correlational Methods</td>
<td>Data Analysis and report</td>
<td></td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6010</td>
<td>Group Comparisons</td>
<td>Data analysis and report</td>
<td></td>
<td>27&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSYC (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8021</td>
<td>Small Scale Research Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6127</td>
<td>Evidence Based Practice</td>
<td>Journal Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>27&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; June 2016 (tbc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum overview in Year 2

During this year there will be an increasing requirement for trainees to reflect critically both on their practice, and how it has been informed by the research literature. In particular the casework model derived from a consultation/problem-solving stance permits a form of causal modelling and formulation consistent with high quality casework. The assessment criteria here includes the doctoral level elements of the creation and interpretation of new knowledge, through original research or other advanced scholarship, and the systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice.

Year 2 includes six modules.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 8040 Emotional and Behavioural difficulties</td>
<td>Colin Woodcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 8041 Learning difficulties</td>
<td>Colin Woodcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 8022 Research Proposal&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Hanna Kovshoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 8038 Casework 2</td>
<td>Colin Woodcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 8025 Placement learning 2</td>
<td>Colin Woodcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 8039 Dissemination and User Engagement</td>
<td>Hanna Kovshoff and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catherine Brignell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>4</sup> The Small Scale Research Project is submitted at the beginning of Year 2 and is assessed at Doctoral level

<sup>5</sup> This module spans two years as it includes the thesis completed in Year 3
Academic Modules

The focus of the academic input in PSYC 8040 and PSYC 8041 in Year 2 is on atypical development in children, and the educational settings and provision designed to meet their needs. Topics include, for example, low incidence areas such as language impairment, sensory impairment, physical disability, severe, profound and multiple learning difficulties; emotional, social communication and attention regulation difficulties. The academic content is complemented by exploration of local authority provision for children with complex needs. The learning outcomes for the two core academic modules in Year 2 are assessed with two Academic Critiques.

Research Thesis

Trainees will also start to think about, and formulate, a question for their research thesis towards the end of the 1st year. Trainees are asked to identify a potential research topic for their thesis and a supervisor(s) from the Academic Unit. For some projects it can be helpful for trainees to receive support from a co-supervisor who can bring individual expertise to the project. At least one supervisor should be a member of the academic staff in Psychology. Co-supervisors can include additional members of staff or appropriately qualified individuals who are external to the university (eg. staff from other institutions or educational psychologists). Trainees will start to consolidate this process by writing (with their supervisor) a research proposal. The proposal and supervisory arrangements are reviewed by the Research Director.

In Year 2, trainees develop their thinking in terms of their thesis area and start to formulate a question for their thesis. Supervisors are identified, one, at least, being from the Academic Unit.

The research thesis represents an opportunity for trainees to pull together the research skills developed in the first and second years of training. It consists of two sections: a systematic review and an empirical paper. Trainees work with a research supervisor to develop a set of research questions. They will then have the opportunity to place these questions within a clear theoretical framework in the systematic review. The empirical paper involves working closely with supervisors to design and implement a study, using appropriate data-analysis techniques.

The research thesis represents a more substantial piece of work than the SSRP. It must make an original contribution to knowledge in the field of child and educational psychology. Research design, execution, analysis, and interpretation should be of a high standard and appropriate to the research problem.

On completion of the thesis, trainees should be able to:

- demonstrate skills involved in formulating a research question
- place a research question clearly within a broad theoretical and empirical psychological literature
- think through appropriate methodologies to test a research question
- collect, analyse, and interpret data for the generation of new knowledge
- disseminate results through the production of a clear and concise empirical paper to extend the discipline
Guidelines on the preparation and submission of the Thesis Proposal

Submission process

The Dissertation Research Proposal must be submitted electronically through eAssignment by the candidate by the specified submission deadline. The proposal will be read by the Research Director in order to help ensure that it represents a relevant, practicable and appropriate project to pursue for the award of the doctoral degree. They may request a second review of the proposal. This usually occurs when there is concern that the proposal will require major amendments.

Please ensure that your Supervisor(s) have provided a comment on your proposal prior to submission, and that they have approved the research rationale, aims/hypotheses and methodology by completing the supervisor proposal checklist before the proposal is submitted (In the Appendices: Dissertation Proposal Feedback Form for Primary Supervisors).

Content

The proposal must provide the reviewer with sufficient information to make a reasonable judgement about the relevance and appropriateness of the project. The proposal must not exceed 3,000 words and must clearly articulate the purpose, design, measures, participant group(s), data management, ethical issues and theoretical/clinical relevance of the project. Note the word limit is a word limit and should not be considered a word target. There is no minimum word limit although a proposal less than 1500 words is unlikely to provide the required information in sufficient detail. A recommended outline follows, with suggestions and guidelines for inclusion in each section.

Title: State the working title of the proposed study.

Programme: DEdPsych

Date: Submission date.

Investigator: Candidate's full name.

Research Supervisor(s): Name and position held of supervisor(s).

Background: Briefly describe the background to the proposed investigation (psychological theory and research findings). Present the rationale for conducting the research that makes a logical link with the hypotheses or research questions.

Hypotheses/Research Questions: Clearly state the main hypotheses or research questions to be investigated.

Design: Give a brief outline of the type of design to be used and the rationale behind its use. Where appropriate, describe the design in terms of independent (IV) and dependent (DV) variables.

Participants: Describe the proposed participant group(s) in terms of recruitment, selection and sample size.

It is crucial that you estimate the effect of participants dropping out of your study, and/or of difficulties in recruitment. You should consider this when planning your research. It is not
uncommon to achieve only 20-25% successful recruitment of those participants identified as suitable and approached. While some trainees have been more successful, it is very important that you consider that the number of participants who either consent or are suitable for your study may be considerably lower than anticipated.

**Measures:** List all assessment measures to be used, accompanied by a brief statement of the rationale behind each measure. State whether the measures to be used are published and/or in standardised format, briefly noting their statistical properties for validity and reliability. Describe any other materials or apparatus to be used.

Any interview schedules must be attached to the Research Proposal. Enclose one copy of any unpublished measure or questionnaire with your proposal.

We do not usually require you to include standardised tests or copyright materials. However, you should ensure that you deal with the issue of conceptual overlap when using multiple questionnaires. For example, if you want to assess the relationship between ‘depression’ and ‘adjustment to disability’, ensure that you deal with potential item overlap within the scales you choose to measure these two factors. This is because a measure of ‘adjustment’ may include items which relate to depression, such as feeling content with one’s life, feelings of regret or sadness. However, people who are depressed also tend to feel unable to cope with many aspects of life, and they find it difficult to feel that they can have a fulfilling life; so that such items would be common in a measure of depression. As a result, there will be, almost inevitably, a relationship between your measure of adjustment and your measure of depression. Such a finding is not very informative if the items in your scales are measuring similar things. If this appears to be an issue in your research, please include the questionnaires, note any items that seem problematic and discuss how you might deal with this issue.

**Procedure:** Give a brief description of the procedure planned, for example, how questionnaires will be administered (by hand, post, etc.) and completed (anonymously by each participant, read out by experimenter, etc.). Details should be given on how consent will be obtained. Evidence should be supplied to show that the suggested procedure is practicable (candidates should consider the time required for data collection, the availability of participants, etc.). Candidates must include a statement showing that there is agreement within the clinical/educational setting for the piece of work (i.e. confirmation from supervisors, management agreement).

**Data Management:** A brief outline of the method(s) of analysis which are to be used should be given. Be sure to describe the analysis you will use for each hypothesis or research question identified. If specialised advice will be required in analysing your study, please indicate the sources of support you have negotiated to provide this specialised help.

**Contribution to knowledge and implications for educational psychology:** Briefly outline the potential benefits and the original contribution to clinical/educational psychology which the research will make.

**Cost:** All proposals must be accompanied with completed research budget form which has been approved by your supervisor. These costs might include funds to pay participants, to order materials or tests or to attend specialist training courses that are essential to your research project. Please set out briefly in your proposal the rationale for these costs and what will need to be provided. You must indicate the total cost for the project and your proposal cannot be approved without this. Travel expenses for you to visit participants need not be itemised in the proposal as these can be claimed in the normal way.
Ethics: Provide a brief statement about the ethics committee approval procedure(s) to be followed. Following the panel’s written feedback, a completed University Ethics Committee application form must be submitted for review by members of the Psychology ethics committee and University Research Governance office. NHS Ethics Committee and Trust R&D/Governance approval may also be required. Candidates should be mindful of the time taken to achieve this.

Following consultation with their supervisor(s), trainees should decide whether or not they believe their research requires NHS ethical approval. This decision should be explained in the proposal. If a detailed case needs presenting, please add this as an Appendix to the proposal. If trainees do not feel they can come to a conclusion, then they should indicate what steps they are taking to gain advice. Advice may be sought from Trust Audit Offices, R&D Departments, Trust Data Protection officers, University Research Governance Office and members of the Research Team and from local NHS ethics committees themselves.

You are not required to submit copies of your information sheet(s) and consent form(s) or de-briefing statements with the proposal. You will, however, need to make sure that these are checked with your supervisor before submitting them to any Ethics Committee. Please remember that written material for the public must be word perfect and of the highest standard in terms of written English.

Collaboration

Occasionally trainees collaborate in data collection with another researcher. Be aware that you will be constrained by the other researcher who may not be working to your timetable and this could affect your ability to meet deadlines. You should negotiate a time-table with the other researcher, involving your supervisor. You should meet regularly with the other researcher to review progress, and solicit your supervisor’s assistance at the earliest possible moment, if a problem begins to arise in data collection.

Approval process for dissertation proposals

Your proposal will be returned with one of four categories of feedback:

1. Approved
2. Approved conditional on addressing the issues raised
3. Re-submission with major amendments
4. Unfeasible

Approved

Your proposal has been approved without the need for amendments. You may go ahead and submit an Ethics Committee application to the University Psychology Ethics Committee.

Approved conditional on addressing the issues raised

If your proposal is assigned to this category it means that the research team has provisionally approved your project and that you may proceed with the study, but that there are minor problems which will be detailed in the feedback from the reviewer.

You must discuss the feedback with your supervisor and decide how you will respond to the suggestions and comments that have been made. You do not necessarily need to make all the changes that are suggested, but you do need to consider any suggestions carefully. If
you decide not to make some of the changes, you need to be able to explain why you have decided not to do so.

You may apply for Ethics Committee approval following provisional approval. However, you would be advised to ensure that the proposal you send to the Ethics Committee with your application takes account of the concerns raised by the reviewer.

You should do the following:

- Submit a brief summary of how you propose to respond to the criticisms and suggestions that have been made within 3 weeks of receiving this feedback. You do not need to revise the proposal.
- Put your name and project title on the comments and resubmit it electronically in eAssignment.

The reviewer will check that they are satisfied with the amendments and then you will receive notification from the Research Secretary that full approval has been awarded.

**Re-submission with major amendments**

If your project is graded in this category it means that the Programme has serious concerns about one or more aspects of the project. These concerns will be specified in the feedback together with suggestions on how to resolve the difficulties.

You must consult your supervisor and address the problems. If your project falls in this category you will have to re-submit your research proposal by a date that will be communicated to you (usually 6 weeks following written feedback from the team). You may submit earlier, and are encouraged to do so whenever possible.

If you need to discuss the project after you have consulted your supervisor, please arrange to meet with the Research Director.

When you re-submit your proposal please ensure that:

- You submit a brief summary of how you propose to respond to the criticisms and suggestions that have been made within 6 weeks of receiving this feedback;
- You include the reviewer’s comments with this summary;
- You put your name, project title and the date on your summary and resubmit it electronically in eAssignment.
- You mark the re-submitted proposal with the new date of submission and the words “re-submission”;

Your re-submitted proposal will be reviewed. Do not submit to the Psychology Ethics Committee until your amended proposal has received either full approval or conditional approval. Only after receiving Ethics Committee approval may you submit for NHS ethical approval, if required to do so.

**Unfeasible**

If your project is graded in this category it means that the Programme believe your study is not feasible in its present form and that you need either to choose a new project or to make very substantial alterations.
In either case you must submit a new proposal by a date that will be communicated to you (usually 8 weeks following written feedback from the team).

**Ethics Committee approval**

You will require Psychology Ethics Committee approval and may require approval from the NHS and R&D Directorate for the region in which you plan to conduct your research.

Although you may wish to draft your Ethics application forms, you should not send them to either of these committees until you have received approval, or provisional approval of your proposal from the Programme, since you may be required to modify your study design, and hence your Ethics application forms.

Though you are permitted to submit ethics applications to Psychology and NHS panels at the same time, we strongly recommend that you allow time to submit your application first to the Psychology panel, and following approval from Psychology then to the NHS ethics panel (any substantial amendments requested by the NHS panel can then be resubmitted to the Psychology panel).

- Please send copies of all approval letters that are required before you commence your study (eg. University of Southampton Research Governance, NHS ethics) to your supervisor.

**Research budget**

As postgraduate research students, trainees are allocated a sum of money (currently £1,200) to support research related activities. Most trainees use their funding to support work related to their research thesis. It can also be used to attend research conferences where a trainee is presenting work. The research proposal should include a full outline of the thesis costs (eg. questionnaires, travel to and from schools, programming etc.). The research proposal will not be approved without this information.

**Postgraduate research supervisor agreement**

Support for the thesis supervision process is formulated through a postgraduate research supervisor agreement (see Appendix 3). This agreement outlines the aims and objectives of supervision, as well as the responsibilities of trainees and their supervisors. In addition, it goes through what steps will be taken in the event of illness and provides an outline for authorship and publication of joint work.

**Placement learning**

Links between the academic content and placement learning in Year 2 is facilitated via supervision coordinators. Supervision coordinators organise and monitor placements within their own services, in accordance with the HCPC guidelines and the programme’s stipulations for content and supervision arrangements.

In Year 2, at a time agreed between the LA and the trainee, trainees have the opportunity (9 days – over 3 weeks) to pursue an area of specialist interest addressing one or more aspects of diversity by undertaking a specialist diversity placement. This placement will be negotiated taking account of opportunities that are available within the local authority and the trainee’s areas of interest and previous experience. The placement aims to:

- to aid the trainee in developing further their awareness and values that enable effective work with diverse client populations through a clear
understanding of communities including the influence of culture, gender ethnicity low socio-economic status and other factors including social exclusion.

- to enable the trainee to demonstrate understanding of the impact of difference, diversity and disability on life opportunities, and thus the implications for promoting equal opportunities and ethical applied psychology practice.

Trainees will be visited by a member of the programme team whilst undertaking this placement and will complete a report on this placement.

Placement learning is recorded in trainees' practical work files and in two 5,000 words ROCs. Trainees also undertake four role-played professional scenarios at the university, each relating to an aspect of working within the post-16 age range. This assessment forms part of your placement assessment but is not graded pass/fail rather the focus is on identifying areas of strength at this point in your training and areas for further development.

The aims and objectives for Year 2 modules, along with indicative syllabus, key skills and specified learning outcomes and related assessments are summarised below and outlined in Appendix 4.

Summary of Year 2 Modules and assessment deadlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Deadline (4pm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placement PSYC (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8025 Placement Learning</td>
<td>Practical Work file</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>25th July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8038 Casework</td>
<td>Two Reports of Casework</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>18th April 2016&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 25th July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic PSYC (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8041 Learning &amp; Development</td>
<td>Academic Critique</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>14th January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8040 Emotion and Behaviour</td>
<td>Academic Critique</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>23rd May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8039 Dissemination and User Engagement</td>
<td>Publication/Poster</td>
<td></td>
<td>22nd February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8022 Research Proposal</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>11th December 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum overview in Year 3

Research in Year 3

Year 3 trainees will continue to work towards the completion of their research thesis. In order to achieve this goal two days each week are set aside for trainees to focus on their thesis work. They also attend the University for 8 days across the year.

The progress trainees make on their doctoral thesis is monitored through the programme via the completion of two progress reports (2<sup>nd</sup> November 2015 and 8<sup>th</sup> February 2016). Trainees and their supervisors are both asked to comment on progress (see Appendix 3). It is likely that trainees and supervisors will have agreed a date for submission of a first draft of their literature review. Past trainees have found this helpful in terms of meeting the final

---

<sup>7</sup> One ROC is to be submitted on the **18th April 2016**, with the second on **25th July 2016**. This will enable trainees to receive summative feedback on the first submission before completing the second.
deadline in June, if this is before Christmas. This is not formally submitted but given to individual supervisors.

**Thesis Format**

Notes to candidates on the production, submission and examination of Theses for postgraduate research degrees can be found at:

[http://www.southampton.ac.uk/quality/pgr/research_degree_candidature/completion.page](http://www.southampton.ac.uk/quality/pgr/research_degree_candidature/completion.page)

Please follow the guidelines outlined in the link above re: title page/format of your thesis/binding. As of this year, all PGR theses are to be presented in the order outlined below i.e. you should just include a single thesis abstract and a single list of references. In a single bound volume, thesis material should be arranged in the following sequence:

- Title and subtitle
- Abstract
- List of contents
- List of tables, illustrations etc.
- List of accompanying material, if any
- Author’s declaration
- Acknowledgements
- Definitions, abbreviations used
- Text, divided into chapters, sections etc.
- Appendices
- Glossary
- List of references
- Bibliography
- Index

**Two** soft bound versions and one electronic version (submitted via eAssignment) of the thesis are to be submitted by the deadline, with the final hard bound and one e-copy submission required post viva, and subject to the approval of any required corrections. In addition please note the following:

- The word limit for your thesis is 20000 words; approximately 10000 words for the literature review and 10000 words for the empirical project. This word limit does not include tables, figures, quotes (as in qualitative studies) nor Appendices.
- Citations, references, headings etc. should follow the specification outlined in the 6th version of the APA Publication Manual.
- You can use your research budget to cover the costs of binding (if you have unused funds).
- The electronic copy of your thesis will be submitted to Turnitin via eAssignment.

**Research Thesis and the oral examination**

Trainees submit their Research Thesis on 13th June 2016. Part of the assessment of this piece of work involves an oral examination or viva involving an internal and an external
Examiners are asked to comment on the thesis and the candidate’s performance in the viva in relation to whether he or she has demonstrated (“yes”, “partially” “no”):

- the creation and interpretation of new knowledge through original research or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, extend the forefront of the discipline and merit publication
- a systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or an area of professional practice
- the general ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge, applications or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the project design in the light of unforeseen problems
- a detailed understanding of applicable techniques for research and advanced academic enquiry

Examiners’ recommendations (shown in Appendix 3) are based jointly on the thesis and the viva performance. A candidate who fails to submit a corrected or revised thesis by the date set by the examiners shall typically be regarded as having failed the examination and the recommendations of the examiners shall lapse.

**Research coordination and the research thesis**

Teaching in this module is made up from individual meetings with trainees and their research supervisor. The supervisor plays an important role in the successful completion of both the systematic review and empirical paper. It is important that trainees meet with supervisors frequently, at least during the early stages of the research process and it is their responsibility to arrange these meetings. In conjunction with their supervisor, trainees should complete the Postgraduate Research Supervision Agreement (see Appendix 3).

**Placement learning**

Year 3 focuses on interventions to address increasingly complex issues, in both the learning and behaviour domains, in a different local authority service, where learning and therapeutic programmes can be trialled over time. Trainees demonstrate greater autonomy in practice and work towards demonstrating mastery of all the standards of proficiency. As part of their placement trainees are expected to undertake longer term project work at organisational or policy level including collaborative work with other educational psychologists.

This continuing professional development is assessed in Year 3 through University based sessions in which trainees focus on the BPS competencies, and HCPC Standards of Proficiency, particularly, SOPs 1a and 1b.

The aims and objectives for Year 3 modules, along with indicative syllabus, key skills and specified learning outcomes and related assessments are summarised below.
Summary of Year 3 Modules and assessment deadlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placement PSYC (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8024 Placement Learning</td>
<td>Practical Work file</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8th July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Casework Viva</td>
<td></td>
<td>w/b 4th July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research PSYC (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thesis Progress Report 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thesis Progress Report 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8th February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8022 Research Thesis</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>13th June 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment

The Academic Unit is committed to the use of assessment methods that properly assess the intended learning outcomes of each of the modules across the programme. It further aims to ensure that its assessment methods map on appropriately to the key skills that it would like trainees to acquire.

The general principles that guide specific policies and practices specify that assessment should:

- represent an integral part of the curriculum design and development
- provide an opportunity to assess student learning throughout all elements of their programme
- be made explicit in each module and map onto expected learning outcomes
- measure not only what has been taught, but also what has been learned
- be incremental and sufficiently demanding across the programme
- be reliable (ie. yield consistent results) and valid (ie. reflect intellectual attainment)
- afford all trainees an equal opportunity to perform well
- be monitored to capture innovative change
- be associated with timely feedback
- change and develop appropriately to reflect student comments

Assessment outcome

Assessments are used across the programme that reflect the learning outcomes and the development of key skills within each module. All academic and research assessment in Years 1 and 2 are given one of four categories (See Appendix 4 for the criteria):

- Fail
- Low Pass
- Pass
- Distinction

The categories used in the assessment of the practical work file are:

- Fail: where the work fails to meet the criteria for a significant number of the criteria (see Appendix 3).
- Conditional Pass: This category is used where the report or file is basically sound but where further work of a relatively minor nature is needed before it can be
considered a pass. This would include, but is not limited to, cases where there is an unacceptable degree of syntax, spelling, referencing inaccuracies or breaches in confidentiality. If may also include cases where minor amendments to section(s) of the report would result in the report being considered a pass.

- **Pass**: where the work meets all of the criteria detailed on the marking sheet.

In the event of a trainee failing any assessed piece of work, the trainee is required to liaise with the first marker and submit either, a substantially revised (with changes highlighted), or a new piece of work. Following this liaison meeting with the first marker, an additional tutorial can be arranged with someone, other than the first marker, from the programme team. Resubmission is within an agreed timescale, usually with a six week limit. Trainees can only re-submit a piece of work once, and resubmitted work is capped at a low pass. Resubmitted work should be sent to the programme administrator. Following resubmission feedback will confirm whether or not the resubmission has met the resubmission criteria (see Appendix x for the standard form).

### Rules of progression and programme failure

In order to progress formally from one year to the next, trainees are expected to have received a pass mark (low pass, pass, distinction) in every module. A progression board meeting of programme staff is held in November to formally record that work from the previous academic year has been completed.

The Faculty will normally deem a candidate to have failed the programme on any part of the examination without the right of re-entry, on one or more of the following grounds:

- failure to complete successfully all parts of the examination within five years of first registration, or by such a date as will have been agreed by the Board.
- failure of a practical placement if there has been no successful corrective action of the failure.
- failure on five elements of assessed work
  - Note that up to four failures of assessed work during the programme may be redeemed, but a fifth failure will result in Programme failure.
- only one re-submission is normally allowed for any one piece of work
- a candidate receiving three fails must attend a Formal Review with the Programme Director
- in exceptional circumstances, such as gross misconduct or a serious breach of the Code of Conduct of the British Psychological Society, or if the Children’s Service placement is terminated or suspended after disciplinary action, the Board reserves the right to fail a candidate without permitting re-entry.

All circumstances of discontinuation will be discussed at the Examination Board where extenuating circumstances may be taken into account. Further information on University guidelines for appeals and complaints can be found at:

[http://www.southampton.ac.uk/studentadmin/appeals/forstudents.html](http://www.southampton.ac.uk/studentadmin/appeals/forstudents.html)

### Feedback

Feedback on coursework can take several forms. For example, it can be verbal (eg. explained aloud by a member of the programme team) or written (eg. written as comments or ratings). In addition, it can be individual (ie. about your own work) or collective (ie. about
the work of the group as a whole). Furthermore, it can be specific (e.g. pointing out one particular error or misunderstanding) or general (e.g. pointing out a tendency towards making unsupported assertions).

Trainees receive feedback for all assessment components. The aim of feedback is to enable trainees to think through and monitor their learning across different modules. It should also enable them to identify their own strengths and weakness, and clearly indicate points for improvement. In order to provide timely and comprehensive feedback, the Academic Unit encourages the use of feedback sheets for written coursework (e.g. essays and research reports). The advantage of feedback sheets is that performance in terms of particular assessment criteria can be clearly and quickly indicated. Feedback sheets used on the doctorate programme were designed to reflect the assessment criteria for different forms of assessment.

Feedback, with the exception of the ROCs and the Practical Work file is given to trainees online via eAssignment. In general, the Academic Unit aims to return all coursework with feedback within four weeks of the submission date. All programme tutors will be informed of individual trainee marks for assessed pieces of work via the moderation report; trainees may choose to share feedback with tutors if they wish.

**Academic Assessment descriptions**

In keeping with the overall course aim to integrate theory and practice, all academic work should also address any practical/professional implications. In addition, all written work will be considered in the light of the Health and Care Professions Council’s (HCPC) requirement to be able to demonstrate effective and appropriate skills in communicating information.

**Assessment criteria for Essays**

In Year 1 trainees write two 4,000 word essays linked to the two core academic modules PSYC 6070 and PSYC 6071. Essays represent an opportunity for trainees to demonstrate their knowledge about specialised topics within educational psychology in relation to relevant theoretical frameworks, research and application.

The assessment criteria for essays are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• the essay succinctly presents a clear rationale for discussion of the topic, demonstrating with the use of relevant literature an awareness of all the current key ideas in the area under consideration and explaining the value of the essay’s proposed synthesis of its materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the essay identifies and accurately defines all of its key terminology including concepts, theories, methods and methodological issues that are relevant to its topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the essay has a coherent structure including an overview, a strong narrative and a concluding section that addresses its title and the issues raised in its introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• logical arguments and conclusions are always informed by the author’s systematic evaluation of primary source material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• in all sections of the essay there is evidence of independent critical thinking with an appropriate balance between material that is supported and rejected through critical analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the essay successfully integrates material from a variety of sources, demonstrating an awareness of the varying degrees of relevance of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Different material to the topic under discussion</strong></td>
<td>The essay demonstrates an awareness of wider applications of its conclusions to applied settings, including identifying gaps in the research that subsequent work could address.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pass</strong></th>
<th>The essay presents a clear rationale for discussion of the topic, demonstrating with the use of relevant literature an awareness of the key ideas in the area under consideration and the value of the essay’s proposed synthesis of its materials.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Pass</strong></td>
<td>The essay presents a rationale for discussion of the topic which is not well supported by references to the literature and/or demonstrates gaps in the author’s awareness of some of the key ideas in the area under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fail</strong></td>
<td>The essay has no coherent rationale for the approach it takes to the topic and/or the author’s position suggests they have misunderstood fundamental ideas or key questions in this area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
conclusions of other authors are accepted uncritically, there is insufficient evidence of independent thinking and there is evidence of unsubstantiated and subjective judgements

- the source material for the essay reflects a superficial understanding of the topic and/or reading that has not gone significantly beyond indicative material that might be suggested by programme staff

- the essay gives no consideration to application of its conclusions or makes suggestions that lack credibility

Essays will also be awarded a simple Pass/Fail grade for: basic written expression, including spelling, grammar and punctuation; cohesion, adherence to APA writing guidelines; and accurate and complete presentation of references. The marking/feedback sheet for essays is shown in Appendix 4.

### Assessment criteria for Academic Critiques

Year 2 trainees complete two 3,000 word academic critiques linked to the two core academic modules PSYC 8040 and PSYC 8041. The academic critique requires trainees to extend their ability to demonstrate their knowledge about specific interventions within educational psychology. Trainees are expected to consider the evidence base for a particular intervention and to evaluate the literature critically. They are also required to consider how any conclusions they draw may impact on advice they give to other professionals in a variety of settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>the critique succinctly presents a clear rationale for use of the intervention in question, where applicable this will also include a succinct introduction to the presenting case.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in all sections of the critique there is evidence of independent critical thinking with an appropriate balance between material that is supported and rejected through critical analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the critique successfully integrates material from a variety of sources, demonstrating an awareness of the varying degrees of relevance of different material to the intervention under discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the critique demonstrates an awareness of wider applications of its conclusions to professional practice, and discussion of how these conclusions should impact on professional advice in a variety of settings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Pass | the critique presents a clear rationale for use of the intervention in question, where applicable this will also include an introduction to the presenting case. |
|      | there is evidence of critical thinking and material that is supported and rejected through critical analysis |
|      | the critique successfully integrates material from a variety of sources |
|      | the critique demonstrates an awareness of wider applications of its conclusions to professional practice. |

| Low Pass | the critique presents an incomplete rationale for use of the intervention in question, where applicable, this will also include an incomplete introduction to the presenting case. |
|          | there is some evidence of critical thinking but conclusions of other authors are sometimes accepted uncritically, there is over-reliance on material that supports only a single line of argument |
| Fail | the critique presents no rationale for use of the intervention in question, where applicable, there is poor/little introduction to the presenting case. |
| Fail | conclusions of other authors are accepted uncritically, there is insufficient evidence of independent thinking and there is evidence of unsubstantiated and subjective judgements |
| Fail | the source material for the critique reflects a superficial understanding of the intervention in question. |
| Fail | the critique gives no consideration to application of its conclusions or makes suggestions that lack credibility |

Critiques will also be awarded a simple Pass/Fail grade for: basic written expression, including spelling, grammar and punctuation; cohesion, adherence to APA writing guidelines; and accurate and complete presentation of references. The marking/feedback sheet for academic critique is shown in Appendix 4.

**Research Assessment Descriptions**

**Assessment criteria for the SSRP**

In addition to the assessed pieces of work linked to the Research Methods courses (RESM 6009, 6010, 6011, 6012), trainees in Year 1 complete an SSRP (PSYC 8021).

The assessment criteria for the SSRP are:

**Classification Criteria**

**Distinction**
- the report fully explores the relevant research question(s), and offers substantial evidence of the trainees own insight and analysis
- the report is presented with a coherent structure, and with a clear rationale
- the important issues, theories, findings relevant to the research questions are comprehensively and critically evaluated
- the report draws on and comprehensively integrates material from a variety of sources
- conclusions are drawn that effectively summarise the issues investigated and the arguments developed; and they are well supported by carefully evaluated empirical evidence
- there is evidence of independent thought and deduction
- *the report outlines clearly its novelty and relevance to the creation of new knowledge
- *the report is of a sufficient standard to potentially merit publication

**Pass**
- the report explores the relevant research questions and shows evidence of a questioning and analytic approach
- it is presented with a coherent structure
- it shows an ability to appreciate an extensive body of knowledge relevant to the research question
it presents a comprehensive and balanced discussion
*it shows some awareness of how the findings extend knowledge in the field

**Low Pass**
- the report contains some substantive information but does not adequately address the relevant research questions
- it lack a coherent structure
- *It makes little or no effort to demonstrate the significance of the findings.

**Fail**
- the report reveals a failure to understand the issues under investigation
- it contains superficial or subjective statements without supporting evidence
- material presented reflects little knowledge beyond that which might be obtained by common experience of reading eg. newspapers
- *there is no attempt to highlight the importance of the findings

Note: * indicates additional criteria designed to address additional learning outcomes associated with doctoral level work.

The SSRP will also be assessed in terms of basic written expression, including spelling, grammar and punctuation; cohesion, adherence to APA writing guidelines; and accurate and complete presentation of references. The feedback sheet is shown in Appendix 4.
# Placement and Casework Assessment descriptions

## Placement learning and the practical work file

The practical work file is a product of the trainees’ placement learning. It aims to assess the BPS Competencies (with reference to the HCPC SOPs) that guide trainee learning and professional development. The work files form a report of activity relevant to the acquisition of practitioner competencies. It aims to assess trainee competence against the HCPC standards of proficiency with reference to the BPS competencies. Across each year, trainees may use examples from placement and their academic work to provide evidence of competency attainment (e.g. appraisal, peer feedback, tutor feedback, reports of casework, project work etc.). Trainees should identify and reference sources of evidence and provide a reflective comment. The practical work file contains:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Assessment Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. A short written account (suggested 2000-2500 words) of the placement experience. Please use the prompts in the right hand column to guide your writing. | All Years
1. A brief overview of the placement: context, size of service, model of service delivery etc.
2. Casework – the overview of casework is covered by the casework table. However you may want to focus on a case or activity of which you are particularly proud; consider how it shaped your practice.
3. Give consideration to any work beyond the individual CYP. This might include group work with CYP or adults; training; audits; project work. In essence, it includes any work aimed at lasting change in the environments in which CYP live and learn. In Year 1 this could be discussion with your field tutor regarding the ways in which s/he is currently working or would like to work with schools beyond the level of the individual child.
4. What area of your practice has seen the most development? Can you evidence this?
5. What aspect(s) of your university based training has/have stood out as something you have been able to apply successfully in practice?
6. Reflect on the support and supervision you have received and how you have used this.
7. Identify future areas for your development over the next year (Year 3 see point (2) below) |

**Year 3 only**

1. Please include a critical appraisal of your Year 2 and Year 3 placements. Useful
areas to consider might include the similarities/differences in working model adopted by the placement authority. For example, in what ways does the working practice specifically represent the needs of the community that it serves and the lead given by local politicians? Does the funding model of the service lead to any particular opportunities or challenges? To what degree is the service integrated within the wider local authority, and what are the implications of this? How does the service interpret the phrase “evidence-informed practice”? How do existing structures or systems within the LA placement act as either psychological practice in schools or with CYP themselves?

2. Are there any areas of particular interest that are emerging for you? How much you progress these?

3. How will you continue to progress your learning as a qualified practitioner? This will also be discussed in your final appraisal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Casework Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2 only</strong> - low incidence and experience record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casework overview: a brief anonymised summary of casework with which there has been involvement (see Placement Handbook Appendix 11 for Casework table). Details should include gender, ethnicity and severity of need.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Log of BPS Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 3 only</strong> – please could you add the following signed and dated statement to the front page of your BPS Log of Competencies: I confirm that I have met all the HCPC SOPS during the course of my 3 year training and that I have provided evidence of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An overview of your experience of low incidence casework and provisions. Examples of this can be found in Appendix 1 of The Placement Handbook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Supporting evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This should include evidence for each competency, a reflective comment, and Field Tutor or Supervisor comments. Please include any additional material related to placement activity or university input which provides evidence of your developing competencies eg. using ERS (Evidence Recording sheets) or IEF (individual evaluation forms – see Placement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accountability

In order to have evidence of both the number of days spent on placement and the activities undertaken the following elements are also required – the following accountability data is also required for all years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days on placement</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Years 2/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signed weekly logs – and a summary document (see Placement Handbook Appendix 4) showing how you have achieved the 60 placement days</td>
<td>Signed daily logs – and a summary document (see Placement Handbook Appendix 4) showing how you have achieved the 130 placement days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Years 2/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signed supervision diaries (Phase 3 only)</td>
<td>Signed supervision diaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of performance Review</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Years 2/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See Appendix 3 for the relevant form</td>
<td>See Appendix 3 for the relevant form Summative Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of observation by supervisor</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Years 2/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed records</td>
<td>Completed records (eg. ERS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the Year 1 Practical Work file will contain a report of a teaching programme in line with one of the learning outcomes of PSYC 6070 to “set up and monitor a targeted teaching programme, eg. precision teaching”. The trainee does not need to deliver the programme directly, but should be involved in its implementation, perhaps by helping train those that deliver it, or by helping design the objectives, and how they will be taught. It is acceptable for trainees to work together on the teaching programme, but reports should be written individually. Trainees should include their report in their practical work file. The report need not be extensive (approximately 500 words) but should cover:

- A brief summary of the design of the teaching programme (what it is, and why the pupil(s) were identified as likely to benefit from this particular programme)
- The teaching objectives of the programme (i.e. the objectives on which each pupil was working)
- Information on how the objectives were:
  - Identified
  - Taught and
  - Monitored
- Timetable and summary of the nature of TEP involvement
- Summary of lessons learned as a result of this intervention

In addition, the Year 2 Practical Work file will contain a write-up of the ‘diversity placement’ – the 9 days in May spent working with a vulnerable population. Through this write-up trainees will need to:

7 The programme need not necessarily be precision training, but precision training does lend itself well to this task due to its clarity of objectives and short intervention period.
• demonstrate knowledge and understanding of their selected area
• show an awareness and understanding of the demographic characteristics of this particular group
• demonstrate an understanding of the impact of difference, diversity and disability on life opportunities, and the implications for promoting equal opportunities and ethical applied educational psychology practice.

It is against these criteria that the write-up will be assessed. It is likely that the write-up will follow the following general format.

• A general introduction with details of the placement and rationale for work in this
• Discussion of the impact of difference, diversity and disability on life opportunities, and the implications for promoting equal opportunities and ethical applied educational psychology practice
• Reflection on what has been learnt, a conclusion, and any necessary appendices.

During the diversity placement, trainees should also aim to become involved in a small project which is useful to the placement organisation and facilitates immersion within the service.

Copies of the Diversity Placement Report should be sent to the service with which the trainee was placed and the host educational psychology service. A third copy should be added to the trainee’s practical work file.

In addition the Year 3 Work file will contain the three reports on which the casework viva is based.

The assessment criteria for all Practical work files

• A table of contents
• An account of the placement with all the required elements.
• A clear rationale for each piece of evidence and a link to the competencies being addressed (in Year 3 this should include detailed reflection on the SOPs).
• Fully anonymised. All information in the work file must be written in a manner that does not compromise data protection and confidentiality. All references to people or organisations including your host placement must be anonymised (either to refer to “Pupil X” or to a replaced name), and the work file should make clear that names have been replaced. The best way to do this is through a statement at the front of the file that makes clear “Names of children, young people and schools and any other information that could identify a particular child or young person have been changed throughout this document”. It is not acceptable to just use initials.
• All accountability records: eg. supervision records, evidence of supervisor observation, weekly/daily log of evidence, interim reviews, appraisals and summative reports as appropriate.
• Evidence of consistency between the account of the placement; reflections and the other presented evidence.
Clear presentation and indexing of all documentation, hole-punched, or placed individually in plastic wallets.

Practical work files are not returned to trainees so it is important that you do not include masters of documents eg. certificates, you may subsequently require.

**Reports of Casework (ROCs)**

Reports of Casework (ROCs) provide trainees with the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of a systemic psychological problem solving model of service delivery (eg. problem analysis, Monsen & Frederickson, 2008; Monsen, Graham, Frederickson, & Cameron, 1998). In Year 1, ROCs are made up of two 5,500 word reports linked to casework - one based on a primary school case, the other on a secondary school case. In Year 2, trainees are required to write up two of the cases that they have undertaken whilst on placement throughout the year as ROCs. One of these is written up and submitted in April in order that trainees can receive summative feedback before they complete the remaining one. The word count for these is 5,000 words each.

Trainees are required to embed their ROCs in psychological literature to support any recommendations related to individual cases (eg. assessment or intervention). Casework should reflect that non-discriminatory and non-oppressive considerations have been addressed in decisions around assessment and communication with key stakeholders.

**Selection of Cases**

Trainees should select pieces of casework to write up that enable them to demonstrate the casework they have carried out in each year. This should therefore reflect a mix of different ages and referring questions as well as, where possible, a mix of gender, ethnic group and school attended. Casework that has involved a one-off piece of work with no follow-up or review is unlikely to be a good example to choose to write up as a ROC as it is difficult to demonstrate that all stages in the psychological problem solving process have been followed in sufficient detail.

**Joint Work**

Casework can be submitted where there was joint work and where the TEP took the leading role. Casework where the TEP took a subsidiary role should not be submitted.

Where joint work has been carried out, it should be made explicit which elements of the casework were carried out by the TEP submitting the ROC, and which by the collaborator. Any joint work submitted should be accompanied by a signed statement from a third party (eg. Placement Supervisor) attesting to the differential contributions of all parties involved.

**Structure of ROCs**

ROCs should be written to reflect the problem solving model. Chronological dates and assessment tools are generally not helpful as ways of structuring a ROC as the emphasis should be on making explicit the thinking process behind any actions that were taken in order to provide professional accountability, rather than simply listing what happened and when.

It is not necessary to include any service reports written by the TEP as part of the casework on behalf of the Local Authority with which they are on placement. This is because the ROC is intended to articulate the thinking behind the casework not the casework itself. TEPs
should not include copies of published materials such as tests/scales for which there is copyright, but instead they should make sure they have described these in sufficient detail in the body of the ROC. Generally it is better to include Interactive Factors Frameworks in the body of the report.

**Anonymity**

ROCs must be written in a manner that does not compromise data protection and confidentiality. All references to people or organisations must be anonymised (either to refer to “Pupil X”, or to be a replaced name, and the ROC should make clear that names have been replaced). The best way to do this is at the first mention of the young person’s name, with a footnote or similar statement along the lines of “Names of children and schools and any other information that could identify the child have been changed throughout this document.” It is not acceptable to just use initials.

**Word Count**

ROCs should not exceed 5,500 words (Year 1) and 5,000 words (Year 2) (excluding any contents page, tables, IFFs, references and appendices). Tables should generally not contain large blocks of text, but should instead be supplementary to the main content of the ROC. If core information is presented in tabular form, then it will be counted within the general word count. The ROC should be able to be read without constant reference to the appendices. A word count for each ROC must be included. If the stipulated length is exceeded the trainee will only be assessed on the portion of work that falls within the word limit, which may result in a lowered mark.

**Marking of ROCs**

Feedback on ROCs is provided in two ways:

1. judgements against specific criteria and
2. formative feedback related to key areas of the ROC

**ROC marking criteria**

Each ROC is assigned a “met/not met” judgement against each of the criteria below. In order for the ROC to pass, all criteria must be met.

The ROC:

- Demonstrates a collaborative approach to casework that involves other people connected to the case
- Shows an awareness of the context in which the casework takes place including relevant environmental factors and the different perspectives of people involved in the casework
- Shows how and why hypotheses have been developed and explored
- Uses a variety of approaches and sources of evidence to explore hypotheses
- Shows how (a) the exploration process and (b) interventions are informed by relevant literature and psychological theory
- Includes a review of progress achieved over time, and considers the implications of this progress
- Considers ethical issues related to the casework
- Includes a reflection on the casework and identifies implications for the TEP’s future practice
• Is presented in a manner consistent with the Health and Care Professions Council’s (HCPC) requirement to be able to demonstrate effective and appropriate skills in communicating information.

**Formative feedback**

Formative feedback is provided to the trainee in each of the following areas, based around the five phase problem solving model (Woolfson, Whaling, Stewart, & Monsen, 2003):

**Establishing roles and expectations**

How has the TEP identified the priority problem to be addressed? Is it clear from whom the request for EP involvement came, how the “problem owner” has been identified and how the request has been clarified? Is the TEP’s role appropriate within ethical principles, service expectations and existing constraints? If the supervision coordinator was involved in negotiating the initial request, how has the TEP been actively involved in this process?

**Guiding hypotheses and information gathering**

Have initial guiding hypotheses been formulated, and is it clear how these are based around initial information gathering, eg. initial discussion with a school’s SENCO? Has an IFF been used to illustrate the guiding hypotheses (Frederickson & Cline, 2009; Morton & Frith, 1995)? Is there evidence of specific action being taken that is linked to the initial guiding hypotheses? Is it clear, for example, why a particular assessment tool was selected (rather than any possible alternatives), why any observation took place within a particular context (i.e. why observe during a maths lesson rather than an unstructured session etc.), and why further information was gathered from any particular source.

Does the ROC show how information has been gathered from a variety of sources eg. information gathered from direct work with the child/young person, discussion with the parents, school staff etc., observations, curriculum-based assessment, standardised assessment tools etc.

Does the ROC show how the TEP has taken an interactionist and whole child perspective, for example by considering the context in which the casework takes place, and by taking account of a range of perspectives (eg. including those of the child/young person, parent and school etc.)?

**Problem Analysis**

Does the ROC show how initial understanding has been developed and synthesised around particular problem dimensions? Is there an integrating statement that makes clear how the problem dimensions are interconnected? Does the ROC make clear why certain areas have been selected as priority areas for intervention?

**Joint action plan and implementation**

Does the ROC show how any interventions identified as part of the casework were developed in consultation with the problem owner(s) as a direct result of the problem solving process?

Does the ROC include an action plan that records the agreed interventions? (These actions may have been carried out directly by the TEP, or they may have been implemented by
another professional as a result of the involvement of the TEP in the casework. The important point here is that the ROC should make clear why any particular interventions have been identified or recommended as a result of the psychological problem solving process that has been carried out.)

**Evaluation, reflection and monitoring**

Does the ROC present evidence that the TEP has reviewed the outcome of their involvement using a range of qualitative and quantitative measures? Does the review refer back to the original problem identified and the original role negotiated by the TEP? Does the review consider the difference that the TEP involvement has made for the child/young person and/or what differences have been brought about for the problem owner?

Is there a critical problem review and evaluation of the casework? Is there a personal evaluation and reflection on the process, how the TEP felt and thought about this piece of work, any issues that the casework raised (personal, ethical etc.), how this piece of work relates to other work undertaken etc? Does the TEP identify what they would do differently were they to repeat this piece of casework and what learning they have taken from it? Does the ROC include any feedback received by the TEP about their role in this piece of casework (eg. feedback from the school, parent etc.) along with the TEP’s reflection on this feedback?

Does the ROC make clear how the TEP has been involved over time? This could, for example, take the form of an initial consultation and planning meeting, information gathering and assessment that has been carried out on subsequent occasions, followed by a further consultation and action planning meeting on a third occasion, and finally a review meeting to discuss the outcomes of any interventions that have been implemented.

**Evidence informed and ethical practice**

Does the ROC show a clear link between practice and theory, ie. through reference to research and published material? This should occur throughout the ROC in addition to the references section. There should be a reference section at the end of the ROC which includes full references for any research and published materials referred to in the body of the report (eg. any assessment tools used, psychological theories referred to etc.).

Does the TEP explicitly acknowledge that the ROC is written in an anonymous manner to protect the identity of the young person? Is anonymity maintained throughout the document?

Does the ROC have due regard to ethical issues and is the casework described carried out with the BPS principles of respect, competence, responsibility and integrity in mind? Does the self-reflection and critical evaluation section include a discussion of how the trainee’s casework was directly influenced by these principles and any specific dilemmas arising?

**Presentation and formatting**

Is the ROC presented in a manner that makes the process of hypothesis investigation clear? For example, in order to make explicit the rationale behind any assessments undertaken, it is generally more helpful to use initial guiding hypotheses as sub-headings to structure the report, rather than using methods of assessment as the section headings. Is the general standard of writing consistent with that expected in formal professional and academic work?
Masters/Doctorate Level

ROC's completed during the second year should be written at Doctoral Level. For this reason, feedback will be provided in the context of the following elements that are characteristic of work at Doctoral Level:

- showing systematic understanding of a substantial body of knowledge
- making informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields (sometimes without complete data) and communicate ideas effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences
- taking largely autonomous initiative (in the context of supervised practice) and personal responsibility in complex and unpredictable professional (and equivalent) environments

Failure

In the event of a candidate failing a ROC, the trainee will be required to re-write the report, or submit a new report within a specified time frame. Rewritten reports should show clearly where alterations have been made according to feedback received

ROC Assessment Criteria in Year 3

By the end of Year 3 trainees will be expected to have become familiar with the process of casework exploration through the application of the problem solving approach. The casework viva gives trainees the chance to demonstrate their fluency with this model and to evidence an understanding of the wider and broader ethical framework in which they practice, and which should inform all casework decisions.

Prior to the viva, trainees will be asked to provide 3 casework reports and their casework table (complete to that point) as this will set the context for casework discussion. During the viva, over a forty-five minute period, trainees will be expected to demonstrate that psychology has informed their thinking, and that they have given consideration to:

- The legal and ethical boundaries of Educational Psychology
- Non-discriminatory practice
- Confidentiality
- Informed consent
- Professional duty of care
- Effective self-management and resources
- Working in partnership with other professional support staff service users and their families
- Effective communication
- Outcomes for children and young people
- Their role as a psychologist
- The impact of their work

Trainees will also need to demonstrate that psychology has informed their thinking. Trainees should provide 3 pieces of casework which they can use as a basis to inform their discussion of the above issues. These should be included in the practical work file.

Trainees will be asked to wait at the end of the oral examination in order to give the examiners time to confer and produce a written feedback summary (see Appendix 4).
Outcomes, in line with the marking categories for the written RoCs, will be one of the following:

- **Pass**: the trainee meets all the specified requirements to the examiners' satisfaction.
- **Conditional Pass**: there are minor aspects of the trainee's ability to explain their work and justify their thinking that the examiners feel could be improved. The trainee will be given detailed written feedback and asked to present one of their four cases again for oral examination within two weeks.
- **Fail**: the trainee has not satisfied the examiners of their ability to explain and justify their work at an appropriate level in a majority of the required areas. The trainee will be given detailed written feedback and asked to present all four of their cases again for oral examination at a date to be negotiated with the Practice Director, not later than 6 weeks from the date of the first examination.

Feedback should also be included in the Practical Work file.

**Objective Standardised Professional Assessments (OSPAs)**

In June Year 2 undertake four role-played professional scenarios at the university, each relating to an aspect of working within the post-16 age range. Performance on each of these is assessed by two observers, usually comprised of a member of the programme team and a practising educational psychologist from a local authority in which trainees are placed by the course. This assessment forms part of your placement assessment but is **not** graded pass/fail rather the focus is on identifying areas of strength at this point in your training and areas for further development to take forward into Year 3. Further information about these will be given in detailed preparation sessions prior to this. There is also further information on the development of this assessment available at [http://www.ucl.ac.uk/ospa-project/](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/ospa-project/)

**Marking**

All marks trainees receive are provisional until they are confirmed by the Examination Board, which meets on 12\textsuperscript{th} July 2016.

Prior to the exam board meeting, the following will have occurred:

- Every module is internally moderated. This means that another member of the programme team, checks a sample of work for a module, including one piece of work in every marking category.
- Second, every module is also externally moderated. An external examiner, from an independent university, inspects a sample of marking categories.

Trainees do **not** have the right to have their work remarked, even if they receive a mark that they do not expect. The procedures above are considered sufficient to ensure a satisfactory outcome. Trainees may formally appeal the decision of the Examination Board. Note, however, that disagreement with the academic judgment of the Board is not considered legitimate grounds for appeal.
**Moderation**

Moderation involves an independent academic scrutiny of marks awarded, on a sample basis, to verify that the marks awarded are appropriate and consistent in relation to the relevant assessment criteria.

Moderation of all fails, and a 5% sample of each class in the remainder is undertaken for each module. For those modules with very small numbers, a sample greater than 5% should be used to cover all classifications awarded. The marks of individual students included in the sample are adjusted as a result of moderation. If the moderator has concerns about the marking standards of the sample, arrangements should be made for the marks for all the work for the specific assessment item to be reviewed. Where this occurs the outcome should be documented and communicated to the Board of Examiners.

**Special Considerations**

A student may apply for Special Considerations if (s)he can prove that there were exceptional circumstances outside of his/her control; and these have, or will negatively affect his/her performance in an upcoming assessment, or ability to meet a deadline for submission of an assessment. Extensions now also fall under the Special Considerations policy.

The following is a non-exhaustive list of examples that the university would commonly regard as falling with the definition of special considerations ie. exceptional circumstances outside of the student’s control that may have a negative effect upon performance or ability to meet a deadline:

- Bereavement – death of close relative/friend/significant other
- Serious short-term illness or accident
- Significant adverse personal/family circumstances
- Significant disruption of an examination
- Severe adverse weather conditions
- A significant failure of due process by the University
- Other significant exceptional factors for which there is evidence of stress caused

If a request is made after the deadline for an assignment has passed a student must submit a Special Considerations form and evidence to Dr Tammy Menneer (psy-support-pg@soton.ac.uk) with a copy to the Programme Director normally not more than five working days after any assessment or deadline may have been affected by exceptional circumstances.

If a request is made before the deadline for an assignment has passed. A student must submit a Special Considerations form and evidence to the programme Director, Sarah Wright (sfw1@soton.ac.uk)

Further information, with examples of the kinds of requests which fall into this category can be found at:

http://www.southampton.ac.uk/quality/assessment/special_considerations.page

In addition, students can obtain free, independent and confidential advice about special considerations and extensions from the SUSU Advice Centre http://www.susu.org/advice-centre
**Appeals**

There is an appeals mechanism for:

- academic work - following University of Southampton Guidelines (A full set of guidelines for the University Appeals Procedure can be found at [http://www.calendar.soton.ac.uk/sectionIV/student-appeals.html](http://www.calendar.soton.ac.uk/sectionIV/student-appeals.html))
- supervised professional practice - following Academic Unit Guidelines.

**Academic Conventions**

**Formatting your coursework**

Please use the following guidelines when submitting coursework.

- Title page: all work should only include a title page with a student number, the intake year, the programme title, title of the work, the relevant module title, followed by the type of work (e.g., Essay, Report of Casework) the date and the word count and confirmation that you are happy for this work to be shared with fellow trainees.
  - I agree that this assignment can be made available (anonymised) to students (signature).
  - a quick guide to APA style, with further references, can be found here: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/APA_style](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/APA_style)
  - a quick guide to the latest style updated (6th Edition) can be found here: [http://www.people.vcu.edu/~jldavis/resources/apa/](http://www.people.vcu.edu/~jldavis/resources/apa/)
- Figures and tables: these should be placed in the text of the reports (rather than at the end of the work).
- Appendices: these need to only include additional information that has direct relevance to the piece of work. Please ensure that work can be read without constant reference to the appendices.

**Coursework length**

Each assessment within the programme is allocated a word limit. The word count should be declared on every piece of submitted work. If the stipulated length is exceeded the trainee will only be assessed on the portion of work that falls within the word limit, which may result in a lowered mark.

All assessed written work is submitted electronically through eAssignment: [http://www.assignments.soton.ac.uk](http://www.assignments.soton.ac.uk). Practical work files are submitted to the programme administrator. With the exception of the practical work files, paper copies are not required.

**Late Submission**

A delay in submitting coursework (without a valid reason or authorised extension) for up to five days beyond the agreed deadline will result in the overall mark being capped at a Low Pass. Work submitted more than five days late will automatically receive a Fail.

**Extension requests and fitness to study**
Please note that trainees can request a limited number of deadline extensions without their fitness to study undergoing review (further detail can be found in the QAA handbook: http://www.calendar.soton.ac.uk/sectionIV/fitness-study.html and the possibility of some consideration of voluntary or involuntary degree suspension or termination following sympathetic consultation with the Programme Director. A broad guideline would be: no more than three requests for an extension for the same reason, and no more than six for any reason, in the same year.

For more information on University of Southampton regulations on attendance and interruptions please see the following links:
http://www.calendar.soton.ac.uk/sectionIV/attendance.html
http://www.calendar.soton.ac.uk/sectionIV/interruption.html

**Attendance**

**Absence from compulsory sessions**

All local educational authority placements and university taught sessions are compulsory. Trainees will be required to sign in for university sessions. If a trainee is unable to make a compulsory session then they should use the following guidelines:

- For university sessions inform both the module coordinator and personal tutor or Programme Director in writing (ie. in the same email) of your request for an absence from a compulsory session. You should preferably do so before the compulsory session (or as soon as possible afterwards)
- For absence from placement please inform your supervisor and adhere to any placement specific requirements
- For both complete and submit the relevant form to the Programme Administrator

This form is available in Appendix 3. Documentation to support the reasons given for absence from a compulsory session should normally be attached with the form, or be pending. The programme administrator keeps a record of all university and placement absence.

Only a limited number of absences from compulsory sessions can be authorised without the student’s fitness to study undergoing review, and the possibility of voluntary or involuntary degree suspension or termination being considered, following sympathetic consultation with the Programme Director. This would include, for example, no more than three requests for absences from a compulsory session for the same reason, and no more than six for any reason, in the same year.

Attendance across the year will be reviewed in appraisals. The expectation is that any leave you wish to take should be booked within the school holidays, and only in very exceptional circumstances will holidays booked in term time be considered.

**Trainee Expectations**

Full attendance at all timetabled University sessions and Placement times throughout the Course and completion of all required assessed Course components to a Doctoral standard to ensure progression through the years to qualification is expected.

Trainees are expected to contribute equitably to all activities across the three years of training.
To achieve this the Course is set up to provide a balance between understanding theoretical perspectives and the acquisition of practical skills. The balance of activity will shift over the three years from intense academic and professional learning in year one towards an increasing time spent on Placement, in years two and three in an Educational Psychology Service. Emphasis in year three will be on the successful completion of all Placement Competencies and the Research components of the Course.

**Academic Integrity**

Scientific fraud is a threat to the academic integrity of any discipline. It is the responsibility of all researchers to behave to the highest ethical standards, to engage in good scientific practice and to refrain from deliberate misconduct. The two ways that researchers may deliberately or accidentally engage in behaviour that might be considered fraudulent is to plagiarise or deliberately misrepresent their data. The university regulations explicitly state that this behaviour is unacceptable. This is conduct which could bring the university into disrepute; therefore this behaviour will not be tolerated and will invoke the application of the University's disciplinary procedures. You should be aware that these procedures apply to draft versions of your work as well as to the final version that is submitted for examination. Finally, students who have been caught cheating usually feel that their reputation with their tutors and fellow students has been damaged and find it hard to put the incident behind them, so please don’t do it!

Further details can be found in the postgraduate handbook at:

http://www.southampton.ac.uk/quality/assessment/academic_integrity.page

The programme uses TurnitinUK anti-plagiarism software. For more information please see www.southampton.ac.uk/isolutions/computing/elearn/blackboard/esub/turnitinuk.html

**Complaints**

If a trainee has a concern or a complaint about any aspect of the programme they are encouraged to raise this with the Programme Director in the first instance, or a member of the programme team. Further guidance is available in the common postgraduate handbook. https://www.efolio.soton.ac.uk/blog/handbook-jw-dedpsych/postgraduate-handbook-introduction-common/

**Section 3**

**Private study**

Trainees in Year 1 are allocated an average of a day per week for private study throughout the programme. In addition, they have further blocks of time to enable them to plan their own placement and academic commitments. In Year 2 trainees have a day a week for thesis preparation and private study. In Year 3 this increases to two days a week.

**Team Meetings**

Cohort team meetings will be held each month in Years 1 and 2, and in Year 3 each of the 8 sessions will incorporate a short team meeting. This is a chance for the cohort to discuss any aspects of the course, give, or seek information from the group or year tutor. These will also provide opportunities for the year representatives to identify any themes or issues to take to programme board.
**Appraisal**

The Programme has a formal system appraisal.

Interim appraisals are held in February for Year 1

Year 1 Trainee, Field Tutor and Year 1 APT

End of year appraisals are held in July for all Years.

Year 1 Trainee, Field Tutor and Year 1 APT
Year 2 Trainee, Year APT and Programme Director
Year 3 Trainee and Year APT or Programme Director

All aspects of the trainee's progress are covered in the appraisal, including both academic and practical assignments and attendance. It is a programme requirement that satisfactory progress is made before progression to the next year. Supervisor input to these appraisals is in the form of the summative placement report. Prior to both appraisals, trainees are required to complete sections of an appraisal form (on Blackboard under General Information/Forms). Targets are aimed at helping trainees work towards achieving SOPS, and will build on strengths, as well as highlighting areas of development. These will be jointly discussed by all those present at the review. The targets set at the final appraisal in July in Year 1 and 2 will be reviewed at the 1st interim review in the following November.

**Tutorials**

A personal and academic tutor is allocated to each trainee and tutorial appointments offered in all years. Tutorials provide a progress check on programme work requirements and an opportunity for general discussion. Tutorials also provide an important forum to reflect on professional and personal growth and to encourage the development of trainees’ self-reflection. Trainees are required to complete a tutorial planning sheet (see Appendix 4) in advance of the meeting. As far as is possible the course aims for the trainee to have the same personal tutor throughout the 3 years. In addition to tutorials, the personal and academic tutor will also visit their trainees on placement thereby providing a valued sense of continuity.

**Buddy System**

There is an informal buddy system, arranged by the Year One tutor, which pairs incoming Year Ones with outgoing Year Ones. This arrangement is not intended in any way to replace the formal tutorial process, but is designed instead to allow new entrants to the course to gain a peer perspective. The frequency and amount of contact is at the discretion of the buddied pair, but pairs are encouraged to make contact before the course begins and to link up on the first day of the course, at the welcome campus tour and tea.

**Support on placement**

In Years 2 and 3, interim review meetings are held twice a year on placement, with the personal and academic tutor and supervision coordinator (Year 2) / supervisor (Year 3).

---

8 There are no interim appraisals in Years 2 & 3 as trainees have interim reviews on placement
Support from the Academic Unit
Trainees in difficulty can ask for further support from their field tutor (or supervision coordinator in Years 2 and 3) or from Dr Nick Maguire, Director of Programmes (Nick.Maguire@soton.ac.uk). Trainees can also seek support and advice from Dr Hedwig Eisenbarth or Dr Tammy Menneer (psy-support-pg@soton.ac.uk).

Trainee feedback on teaching
The Academic Unit is keen to ensure that evaluation by trainees is both sought and that a response is given. The Programme Board and Academic Unit Programme Board oversee this process. Trainees are asked to complete end of year programme evaluations, which will be presented to Programme Board Meetings to which one or two trainee representatives from each year are invited. Trainees are also asked to complete module evaluations at the end of the year, which will be collated and shared with trainees in the following years.

The module evaluations are presented in an Annual Report to the AUPB for approval. This overview is used to raise broader issues regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum and to demonstrate the programme’s response. It is a University requirement that trainees should be informed of the results of their feedback.

More immediately teaching sessions are evaluated by trainees and feedback passed both to the presenter and to the programme tutors. In addition, tutors share certain teaching sessions to enable peer review to take place.

Personal support and welfare
Support for Student Learning
In the Academic Unit support is provided by:

- A Programme Director (Sarah Wright) who has the main responsibility for the coordination of learning and teaching and who retains an overview of all aspects of the programme
- A Placement Coordinator (Colin Woodcock) who has responsibility for local authority placements.
- Professional and Academic Tutors (seconded from Local Authorities) who take responsibility for programme components and pastoral support work with nominated students
- Field Tutors who provide modelling and feedback on early skills performance and initial casework, and review professional development in Years 1, 2 and 3.
- A member of the Academic Unit staff who is designated as Research Director (Hanna Kovshoff) across all years of the programme, and additional members of the academic staff who support research (eg. Catherine Brignell).
- Supervision Coordinators/Supervisors from local services to coordinate and provide support for all professional placement learning in Years 2 and 3.
- the Academic Unit’s learning and teaching resources, including access to photocopying, phone, computer, email and internet facilities

Equal opportunities
In keeping with the University’s Equal Opportunities policy, support is available through the Learning Differences Centre for study skills, and through Assistive Technology for those with more complex needs. Support is also available from University counselling staff where other problems threaten to interfere with successful learning.
More information can be found on the website http://www.southampton.ac.uk/edusupport/

**Academic Unit Computing Services**

Postgraduate computer needs are met in a variety of ways according to principles agreed by Policy & Resources Committee. The Academic Unit has a large Interactive Research Laboratory seating 70 people, equipped with 70 computers. These machines are equipped with advanced teaching and experimental packages to support research methods teaching and all practical classes. They are integrated with a multimedia audio-visual suite. Although prioritised to teaching, these computers are available to undergraduate and postgraduate students on a walk-in basis at other times. Whilst being used on a walk-in basis they are configured to work in an identical manner to the public machines (see below). There are two further public clusters in the Shackleton Building (rooms 1061 and 1063 which are accessible via the North side of the building and not the main entrance). The iSolutions website details them all: http://www.southampton.ac.uk/isolutions/

The Academic Unit has also opened an informal learning environment called i-Zone which is designed to foster team and collaborative learning and to also provide a structure which helps staff-student interaction. It provides a comfortable work environment, facilities for refreshments, and a wireless ‘hot-spot’.

**University Computer Services**

iSolutions provides over 1,400 computers for learning and teaching purposes. They are located in rooms on all major campuses and in most halls of residence. Many of these rooms are open evenings and weekends with some offering 24 hour opening. Please contact the iSolutions Service Line with enquiries about the facilities (phone 25656 internal, 023 8059 5656 external, or email serviceline@soton.ac.uk

As a student of the University you are entitled to use ISS facilities and you are bound by the regulations for their use. When using email, you are advised to treat correspondence with the same care as you would when using paper. Details of the ISS regulations may be found on the ISS web pages described above.

**Academic Unit Technical Support**

There is a team of 9 people who provide experimental, technical and web operation support directly to the Academic Unit. The team augment the support provided centrally by other Professional Services such as Information System Services (ISS) and the Library. Where necessary, they setup and run extra services which are needed specifically by Psychologists.

Your contact with the team will be through a variety of routes. You will meet the team when using facilities such as the teaching laboratory or i-Zone. Additionally, all teaching rooms within the Academic Unit are equipped with data-projection and other multimedia equipment. The Academic Unit's intranet plays an important part in keeping you up to date with developments within the Academic Unit. Much of your taught material will be distributed through this medium.

To make the best use of innovative teaching technologies, the intranet links you directly to your personal 'portal' which is a configurable interface to all the Academic Unit and University information and systems that you will require during your stay with us. Depending on your personal research interests in your final year of study you may require software to be written, or an experiment generator configured, to enable you to collect and/or analyse data. This could be, for example, a game simulator which is driven by psychological principles, a web-based questionnaire, or a series of stimuli which are designed to evoke physiological responses to be recorded by other laboratory equipment.
Between them, the team have skills in:

- web programming & design
- software development
- hardware maintenance
- electronic design and construction
- mechanical construction
- systems engineering
- digital media production

If you need help, the Academic Unit’s intranet is the first resource for answering frequently-asked-questions. It has a KnowledgeBase and a NewsFeed which between them can normally provide the answer to any problem which is affecting a large number of people. If the help you require cannot be found there, there is a Technical Help Point (ext. 28528) which is staffed during teaching hours.

In the wider University you can expect:

- Library facilities - and an early induction to the library and its facilities. A small subject specific library is also maintained within the Academic Unit.
- Blackboard, a web based medium accessible from all computer points on the campus and, by arrangement, from homes to support learning
- Sports and recreational facilities that are open to all registered trainees.

Health and Safety

The University guidelines should be noted. Staff and trainees have a duty to co-operate to enable the University to comply with the law and to ensure that the workplace is safe for everyone. They must consider health and safety in all of their activities and use the control measures identified by risk assessments. In particular, all reasonable steps must be taken to ensure personal health and safety, as well as that of others. During the course of their work, if any member of the University becomes aware of any hazard, or any situation arises for which they have not been trained, they should inform their manager or supervisor so that appropriate corrective action can be taken.

Trainees should ensure that they have followed the guidance provided by their placement local authority and health and safety guidance given by schools. Trainees have a duty to inform their placement provider of any health and safety issues of which they made need to be aware and for which a risk assessment may need to be undertaken.

**NB:** In particular, direct work with children and visits to clients’ homes, needs special attention, and the advice and guidance of local authorities should be sought during placement learning.

The University statement of Health and Safety Policy Statement and Management System, which defines commitment, governance, responsibilities and management of health and safety is available here:

[http://www.southampton.ac.uk/healthandsafety/hsms/](http://www.southampton.ac.uk/healthandsafety/hsms/)

The Faculty’s Health and Safety Local Arrangements document is available at

Trainees are responsible for the safety of all equipment bought to the University. In particular, all electrical items, e.g., computers, laptops, mobile phone chargers, etc., must be safe to use in the UK. Electrical equipment should be checked regularly for any obvious sign of damage, and not used if it is damaged. Obvious examples of damage are cracked cases/plug tops and cuts to electrical leads. If further advice on the safety of equipment is needed, please contact your tutor or supervisor, or Faculty Safety Officer, in the first instance.

Appendix 1: Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC)

Introduction

In July 2009, the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) became the statutory regulator for practitioner psychologists in the UK. The HCPC is an independent regulator governed by the Health Professions Order (2001). Psychologists regulated by the HCPC are those who use their psychological expertise to offer services to the public and who are entitled to use one of the seven adjectival titles.

Since 2009 the HCPC Education Department has been carrying out approval visits to education providers and programmes of professional training throughout the UK. Approval by the HCPC ensures that each programme meets the standards of education (SETs) and successful trainees are able to meet the standards of proficiency for practitioner psychologists (SOPs).

The Doctorate in Educational Psychology at Southampton was granted open ended approval in June 11th 2011. Once a programme has been granted open-ended approval, it is subject to annual monitoring processes to ensure that it continues to meet the SETs.

Standards of Education and Training (SETs)

The SETS are written for education providers. As part of the HCPC approval and monitoring process, programmes are assessed against the SETs to ensure that all trainees meet the SOPs.

Standards of Proficiency (SOPs)

SOPs are the standards produced by the HCPC which are regarded as the minimum they consider necessary for safe and effective practice of the professions they regulate. They include both generic elements (which all practitioner psychologists must meet) and subject-specific elements.

They fall under the following headings:

- Professional autonomy and accountability knowledge, understanding and skills.
- Professional relationships
- Identification and assessment of health and social care needs
- Formulation and delivery of plans and strategies for meeting health and social care needs
- Critical evaluation of the impact of, or response to, the registrant’s actions
• Knowledge, understanding and skills

More information can be found in the booklet Standards of Proficiency: Practitioner Psychologists (2015). A copy can be obtained from http://www.HCPC-uk.org/publications.

The role of the British Psychology Society (BPS)

Accreditation through partnership is the Society’s model of engagement with education providers which has been in place from September 2010. This has been described by the BPS as:

“It is the process by which The Society works with education providers to ensure that quality standards in psychology education and training are met by all programmes on an ongoing basis. It aims to facilitate quality enhancement and to promote a constructive dialogue that allows space for both exploration and development. It focuses on working collaboratively with education providers and their stakeholders, and includes an interactive approach to planning visit agendas”.

http://www.bps.org.uk/careers-education-training/accredited-courses-training-programmes/useful-accreditation-documents/educational-psychology/england-

The Doctorate in Educational Psychology at Southampton was most recently accredited through partnership in June 11th 2011 and is due its next accreditation towards the end of 2016.
Appendix 2: Programme Summary

Year 1

PSYC 6072 Placement Learning 1 (60 days)
PSYC 6073 Casework 1
Assessment: Practical Work file and 2 Reports of Casework 60 CATS (M)
HCPC principle focus SOPs: 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b
PSYC 6127 Evidence Based Practice

PSYC 6070 Learning and Development
Assessment: 4,000 word essay 20 CATS (M)
HCPC principle focus SOP: 3

RESM 6012 Designing Research
RESM 6009 Qualitative Methods
20 CATS
HCPC principle focus SOP: 2b

PSYC 6071 Emotional/Behavioural Development
Assessment: 4,000 word essay 20 CATS (M)
HCPC principle focus SOP: 3

RESM 6010, 6011 Correlational Methods and Group Comparisons
20 CATS
HCPC principle focus SOP: 2b

PSYC 8021
Small Scale Research Proposal
Small Scale Research Project (40 CATS) (D)
HCPC principle focus SOP: 2b

Year 2

Placement Learning 2 (130 days)
PSYC 8036 Casework 2
90 CATS (D)
Assessment: Practical Work file, 2 Reports of Casework, OSPAs
HCPC principle focus SOPs: 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b

PSYC 8041 Learning Difficulties
10 CATS (D)
Assessment: Academic Critique
HCPC principle focus SOP: 3

PSYC 8040 Emotional/Behavioural Difficulties
10 CATS (D)
Assessment: Academic Critique
HCPC principle focus SOP: 3

PSYC 8039 Dissemination and User Engagement
PSYC 8022 Thesis proposal (30 CATS) – this module spans 2 years
HCPC principle focus SOP: 2b

Year 3
Appendix 3: University of Southampton Academic Conventions

1. Postgraduate research supervision agreement
2. Doctoral Thesis research budget sheet
3. Doctoral Thesis progress form
4. Doctoral Examiners’ Joint Report and recommendation
5. Teaching session absence form
6. Evidence of performance review
7. Tutorial Planner
8. Resubmission Feedback Form
Postgraduate Research Supervision Agreement

Purpose
Research at postgraduate level should possess certain qualities. It should show innovation, novelty, timeliness of contribution, and should enable the student to demonstrate learning and progression towards independence in the research process. Progress towards these goals relies on a good working relationship between student and supervisory team. The purpose of this learning agreement is to highlight areas when student and supervisor(s) should agree working practices. This agreement then represents the commitment of each party to work closely together in order to meet these goals.

This learning agreement should be read in conjunction with the Code of Practice (paras 40-48) and the Student Entitlement, and Student Guidance documents and the Academic Unit Student and Supervisors handbook. Trainees and supervisors agree to the spirit of these documents. In particular, issues are highlighted for discussion and agreement:

Aims and Goals of Supervision
Agreement on the primary aims of supervision is critical to the success of supervision. Please identify your goals here. These might include the following:

Your Goals for Supervision:
- Development of Skills in Research Design and Methodologies
- Development of Understanding
- Critical Evaluation of Relevant Literatures
- Development of Statistical and Analytical Skills
- Development of Scholarly Writing and Presentation
- Progress towards Publication
- Other (please specify) ………………………………………………………………

Contents of Supervision
Within a supervisory team, various aspects of supervision may be provided by different members of the team. Please identify the main areas of expertise provided by each member of the team, including the student. Examples are provided but please discuss and tailor these.

Student Responsibilities:
- Scheduling of Meetings
- Minuting of Meetings
- Appropriate Preparation for Meetings
- Active Engagement in Research Process
- Appropriate Consideration of Advice
- Provision of Reports in a Timely Fashion
- Raising of Concerns without Delay
- Other (please specify) ………………………………………………………………

Supervisory responsibilities (please provide name if more than one supervisor):
- Advice on background literature
Advice on Design and Methodology
Advice on Analysis
Provision of honest feedback on written reports and presentations
Support with preparation for assessments
Provision of honest progress reports
Other (please specify) ………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

Practicalities
It is acknowledged that supervisors and trainees may sometimes be unavailable for scheduled meetings through illness, holiday, leave, etc. Supervisors and trainees should highlight predicted absences in advance, and should endeavour to notify in the case of other unavoidable absences. It is helpful to note that supervisory activities are not necessarily restricted to meetings, but also extend to telephone and email communication, and other related work which occurs in addition to face-to-face contact.

Please ensure that you know how to contact one another:

Student details:
Email:……………………………………………… Tel:……………………

Supervisor(s) details:
Email:……………………………………………… Tel:……………………
Email:……………………………………………… Tel:……………………
Email:……………………………………………… Tel:……………………

Supervisor Absence
In the event that a supervisor is absent for a period of time, the following procedures will be used:

Supervisor Absence through Research Leave:

At the outset of research leave, all supervisory responsibilities will be considered and provision put in place. This may involve the following:

☐ Retention of supervision with contact through email, telephone or videoconference.

☐ Substitution of supervision through involvement of an additional supervisor who will provide cover during the primary supervisor’s period of absence.

Supervisor Absence through illness:

Where the supervisor is absent through illness lasting more than a month, alternative supervisory arrangement will be made, involving either the appointment of a temporary supervisor who will provide cover, or the transfer to an alternative supervisor.

Student Absence
In the event that the student is absent for a period of time, the following procedures will be used:

Student Absence through illness:

Illness of short duration (less than 1 week) should be documented with self-certification. Illness of longer duration (over 1 week) should be documented through a doctor’s note.
Significant needs related to illness should be discussed as early as possible with the supervisor(s) and consideration should be given to the process of suspension.

**Authorship**

It is University policy that a record of all research output is made available in the online University research repository ([eprints.soton.ac.uk](http://eprints.soton.ac.uk)).

Researchers benefit through wider (and more rapid) dissemination of their work, resulting in more "research impact", the University benefits from a higher profile by making all output publicly (and freely) available as well as by having a comprehensive, managed and preserved record of its research output. It is also expected that, where copyright permits, the post-peer reviewed, pre-copy edit, full paper version of research outputs are added.

Please indicate that you have discussed and considered the use of ePrints for your work.

**Publication**

It is generally desirable for post-graduate research trainees to act as first author on publications which arise from their thesis (this is normal practice for PhD trainees). However, there are ethical and scientific guidelines which influence authorship decisions, and which need to be taken into account (there are various sources of information which provide useful guidelines on this, eg. Fine & Kurdeck, 1993). It is recommended that issues which relate to authorship decisions should be discussed early on in the supervisory relationship, and reviewed as necessary, in order to avoid misunderstanding and disagreement.

Have the guidelines been considered: Yes □ No □

Has this issue has been discussed?: Yes □ No □

Has a working agreement been reached?: Yes □ No □

Comments: ……………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

What to do if things break down

Details of the complaints and appeals procedures are provided within the Academic Unit Handbook for Trainees and Supervisors. Please raise concerns with your supervisor, or your advisor, in the first instance.

This ‘Supervision Agreement’ is agreed between:

Student ...................................................         Date.............

Supervisor(s)  ..............................................         Date ..........
..................................................................................         Date ..........
..................................................................................         Date ..........
# Doctoral Thesis Research Budget Sheet

## Academic Unit
### Postgraduate Research Costing

This must be completed by all PG students undertaking research within the Academic Unit, irrespective of Programme. This form will not be approved unless signed by student, supervisor (and technical team if required).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Price Details</td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT DETAILS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full/Part time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDING DETAILS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL COSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery Pack</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone costs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying costs</td>
<td>25 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNAL TRAINING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist stats courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist methods courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIFIC RESEARCH COSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery @5p per household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing/copying @ 5p per page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage 35p per item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone surveys (40p per call)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreters/Guides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel for data collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road mileage, first 50 mile @ 40p. All other miles 23p. Total =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other travel, lowest cost (rail etc.)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking costs/Taxis etc.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PARTICIPANT PAYMENTS

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SMALL EQUIPMENT ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Itemise requirements below</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; insert figure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER COSTS (NOT LISTED ABOVE)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grant Total for Academic Year

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Student's signature

Date

Supervisor’s signature

Date
Doctoral Thesis Progress Form

NAME
THESIS TITLE: 
SUPERVISOR(S)

(1) PROGRESS OVERVIEW
Please answer the following questions and comment if necessary (e.g. if you have to answer no to a question, then it would be helpful to provide details of any problems that you have encountered and an indication of when the particular task is likely to be completed):

- Has your proposal received final approval?
- Have you received Ethics Committee approval to proceed? (Specify whether this is School approval and /or REC Approval. If you need to get REC approval, please indicate whether you have notified the relevant Trust R&D department, obtained indemnity forms, honorary contract etc.)
- Have you obtained all necessary equipment and materials (e.g. tests, computer programs, stimuli, questionnaire packs etc)? If not, please give details of how and when you are planning to get them.
- Have you booked a room/lab if necessary or made arrangements for somewhere to collect data in clinical or other settings?
- Have you piloted your study (if necessary)?
- Have you advertised your study (e.g. on Psychobook)? If yes, please specify how.
- Have you started collecting data? (If yes, please specify what and how much. If no, please specify when you plan to begin collecting data)
- What is your estimated date for completing data collection?
- Please indicate how much work you have completed on your literature review (e.g. all references collected and read, draft literature review completed etc)

(2) PLAN FOR THE RESEARCH THESIS
Please give details of how you plan to use your time over the next few months (it is useful if you do this in point form). Indicate how and when you intend to utilise your additional research time. It is important for you to discuss your plan with your supervisor before you complete this form. Please indicate specific goals for the placement eg. finishing data collection, writing complete draft of the literature review, method, review statistical methods required to prepare and analyse data, enter data on SPSS spread sheet etc.

(3) SUPERVISOR’S REPORT (This should be completed by the main supervisor. Additional supervisors should also be given the opportunity to comment if they wish to do so)
Please comment on the trainee’s progress and on his/her plans for the research placement. Please indicate any potential problems.

NAME(S) 
SIGNATURE(S) 
TRAINEE: 
SUPERVISOR(S):
Doctoral Examiners’ Joint Report and Recommendation

For return to: Graduate School Office, FSHS, Room 2111, Building 58.

Candidate: Viva Examination date:

Title of thesis:

Examiners will have made their independent reports on the basis of the thesis alone, prior to the viva examination.

This joint report form should be completed following the viva examination and should record the agreed views of both examiners in relation to the core outcomes of a DEdpsych (listed below) and their recommendation on the award of the degree, based on both the thesis and the candidate’s performance at the viva.

The outcome criteria indicated below are intended to permit a clear record of the candidate’s performance (combination of thesis and viva) and to enhance consistency in the examination process, whilst allowing for differences between disciplines.

**NB:** if the answer to any of the sections below is **NO**, the candidate cannot be awarded the degree without further work/amendments and, if appropriate, a repeat viva. If the answer to any section is **PARTIALLY**, the extent to which the criteria are not met should be discussed further in the report, with reference to remedial actions and required amendments. At the end of the examination process, the examiners need to certify that they are satisfied that the criteria have been met in full.

Are you satisfied that the candidate has demonstrated the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the creation and interpretation of new knowledge through original research or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, extend the forefront of the discipline and merit publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or an area of professional practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the general ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge, applications or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the project design in the light of unforeseen problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a detailed understanding of applicable techniques for research and advanced academic enquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_University of Southampton, Code of Practice for Research Candidature and Supervision, paragraphs 5 and 11_

Candidate: Viva Examination date:

**EXAMINERS’ JOINT REPORT:** Please type where possible and insert additional pages if required. In addition to the above criteria you may wish to comment on evidence of appropriate research and generic/communication skills. Please provide clear details of any amendments which the candidate
is required to make in order to demonstrate at the end of the examination process that the criteria set out on page 1 above have been met in full.

Please note that the candidate should be given a copy of this report.

EXAMINERS’ JOINT RECOMMENDATION:

☐ That the degree of Doctor of Educational Psychology (DEdpsych) be awarded subject to satisfactory completion of the taught element of the programme.

☐ * That the degree of DEdpsych be awarded, subject to certification of minor amendments to the thesis and/or abstract by ¹  ........................................................................................... (to be signed off by the internal examiner) and subject to satisfactory completion of the taught element of the programme.

☐ * That the degree of DEdpsych be awarded, subject to certification of modest amendments to the thesis (and abstract if applicable) by²  .......................................................................................................................... (to be signed off by both the internal and external examiner) and subject to satisfactory completion of the taught element of the programme.

☐ #That the candidate be required to attend for a further oral examination

☐ #That the candidate be permitted to submit a revised thesis by³ ........................................ for re-examination for the degree of DEdPsych (NB: resubmission fee payable, Fees Office to be advised)

☐ That the degree be not awarded, and that re-submission of the thesis be not permitted

# Outcomes 4 and 5 are not available if the candidate is being re-examined in accordance with paragraph 19e of the University’s Regulations for Research degrees with a Major Taught Component

* We, the internal and external examiners, understand that the DEdpsych will be awarded provided all amendments requested (whether minor or modest) are fulfilled to our satisfaction so that all criteria set out on page 1 have been met.

External Examiner ...................................................  Signature ............................................................

Internal Examiner ...................................................  Signature ............................................................

Date ........................................................................................................................................

Footnote: expected deadlines for amendments and revisions - ¹ one month; ² six months; ³ twelve months

Non-examining signatories required

Main supervisor: Name ...................................................

Signature………………………….. Date………………………

Head of Faculty Graduate School Name ...................................................

Signature………………………….. Date…………………………
Teaching Session Absence Form

Name: 
ID: 

Today’s date: Programme Module: 

Session/s missed: 

Reason For Absence: (Please circle)

Reason: (Please circle)

1. Severe acute illness

Private: Yes No 
Documentation: Yes No 

Description (if No): 

Staff signature (if No): 

2. Severe personal difficulty

Private: Yes No 
Documentation: Yes No 

Description (if No): 

Staff signature (if No): 

3. Severe family difficulty

Private: Yes No 
Documentation: Yes No 

Description (if No): 

Staff signature (if No): 

4. Other

Private: Yes No 
Documentation: Yes No 

Description (if No): 

Staff signature (if No): 

Authentication: (Please circle)

Staff member: 
Programme Director: 
Personal Tutor: 
Supervisor/Placement Supervisor: 
Academic Professional Tutor: 
Research Director: 

Trainee signature: 
Staff signature: 

Once completed please email to Angela Goodall at edpsych@soton.ac.uk
Evidence of performance review for work file

Please ensure that all relevant performance review documents have been completed by the date of your work file submission. Then ask your personal tutor or the programme director to sign this off for the work file, and submit this completed form in your work file.

**Year One**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Trainee signature</th>
<th>Staff signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interim appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Years Two and Three**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Trainee signature</th>
<th>Staff signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim review (October/November)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim review (February/March)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative report of placement from placement supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casework viva feedback (Year Three only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tutorial Planner

During this tutorial we will be talking about:

- Any feedback you have received (e.g. essays, critiques, placement observations etc.)
- Time management
- Any approaching deadlines

Please could you also have thought about and come prepared to talk about:

- Your most significant learning experience since your last tutorial.
- Your current concerns.
Resubmission Feedback Form

Module:

Assessment:

Candidate Number:

Required Amendments:

Date amendments required:

Date amendments received:

I confirm that the candidate

- Has met the requirements for a Low Pass\(^9\)
- Has not met the requirements

\[^9\text{All resubmissions are capped at a Low Pass and only one re-submission is normally allowed for any one piece of work}\]
Appendix 4: Assessment feedback forms

CONTENTS

1. Essay Feedback
2. Reports of Casework Feedback
3. Casework Viva Feedback
4. Academic Critique Feedback
5. Small Scale Research Project Proposal
6. Small Scale Research Project Feedback
7. Quantitative Dissertation Proposal Feedback Sheet for Primary Supervisor
8. Qualitative Dissertation Proposal Feedback Sheet for Primary Supervisory
## Essay Feedback Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Grade:</th>
<th>Candidate Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Low Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction &amp; rationale, key ideas introduced &amp; references</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key terminology &amp; concepts identified and defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherent structure, including overview &amp; conclusion addressing the title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical arguments and conclusions based on evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking including independent thought &amp; evidence of accepting &amp; rejecting ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth of material, including awareness of varying relevance to topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to applied setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar &amp; punctuation - Ensure your writing is easy to read, through the use of good structure and cohesion. Make connections within sentences, within paragraphs, between paragraphs, and between sections. Ensure ideas flow together smoothly and logically</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References - accuracy and completeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marker's comments:**
## ROC Feedback Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment criterion:</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The ROC…</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a collaborative approach to casework that involves other people connected to the case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows an awareness of the context in which the casework takes place including relevant environmental factors and the different perspectives of people involved in the casework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows how and why hypotheses have been developed and explored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a variety of approaches and sources of evidence to explore hypotheses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows how (a) the exploration process and (b) interventions are informed by relevant literature and psychological theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes a review of progress achieved over time, and considers the implications of this progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers ethical issues related to the casework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes a reflection on the casework and identifies implications for the TEP’s future practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is presented in a manner consistent with the Health and Care Professions Council’s (HCPC) requirement to be able to demonstrate effective and appropriate skills in communicating information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing roles and expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding hypothesis and information gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint action plan and implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation, reflection and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence informed and ethical practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation and formatting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON DOCTORAL PROGRAMME IN EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

**Casework VIVA Feedback Form (Year 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID:</th>
<th>Cohort Year: 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examiners:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome/Recommendations:** PASS  CONDITIONAL PASS  FAIL

Signed: .................................................................  Signed: .................................................................
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON DOCTORAL PROGRAMME IN EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Academic Critique Feedback Form (Year 2)

Overall Grade: | Candidate:
---|---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Low Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction - including rationale for use of the intervention and, where appropriate, a brief introduction to the case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking including independent thought &amp; evidence of accepting &amp; rejecting ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth of material, a comprehensive evaluation of the theoretical issues arising from the literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to professional practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar and punctuation - Ensure your writing is easy to read, through the use of good structure and cohesion. Make connections within sentences, within paragraphs, between paragraphs, and between sections. Ensure ideas flow together smoothly and logically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References - accuracy and completeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marker's comments:
# Small Scale Research Project Proposal Feedback Form (Year 1)

**Programme Module:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>More information required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Background (topic or problem area)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Is the project addressing an important area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Does it fit into the existing literature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Is there a theoretical framework? Is it appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Is the project original?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Does the project contribute to our knowledge of the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Research questions</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>More information required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Are they clearly formulated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Are they appropriately limited in number?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Do they follow on logically from the broad aim and purpose of the study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Hypotheses</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>More information required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Are the hypotheses clearly stated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2. Are the hypotheses limited in number?

### 3.3. Do the hypotheses contain testable predictions?

### 3.3. Do the hypotheses follow logically from the research questions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Design</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>More information required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1. Is the design appropriate to test the hypotheses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Participants</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>More information required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1. Is it clear who they are and are they the right target population?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2. Are there enough participants to test the hypotheses adequately?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3. Is this appropriately justified (e.g. by a sample size calculation)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4. Is the recruitment feasible in the given time frame?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5. Are there appropriate inclusion and exclusion criteria?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Measures</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>More information required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1. Do they measure the appropriate construct?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2. In the case of multiple measures: are they measuring distinct things?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3. Are the measures valid and reliable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4. If measures are designed: is validity and reliability appropriately tested?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Do the measures provide an adequate test of the hypotheses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Are the measures acceptable to the participants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Procedure</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Is the procedure of recruitment clear and specific?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Is the test protocol clear and appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Is there sufficient time for obtaining equipment &amp; experimental tasks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>If appropriate: is the piloting of the procedure clear?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Is there sufficient time for obtaining equipment &amp; experimental tasks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Data analysis</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Are the tests appropriate for the design and hypotheses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Are there enough participants to use these tests eg. multiple regression, factor analysis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Educational Implications</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Does the outcome of the study contribute to the existing body of knowledge?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Does the outcome have educational implications?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.3. Are the potential educational implications reasonable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Cost estimation&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>More information required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Is the cost estimation well justified and appropriate

**Presentation**

The work is presented in a manner consistent with professional practice<sup>11</sup>.

Use of APA conventions

References complete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>☐ ☐</th>
<th>Low Pass</th>
<th>☐ ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marker's comments**

---

<sup>10</sup> Note that costs only relate to thesis proposals and not to SSRP proposals

<sup>11</sup> Ensure your writing is easy to read, through the use of good structure and cohesion. Make connections within sentences, within paragraphs, between paragraphs, and between sections. Ensure ideas flow together smoothly and logically
### UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON DOCTORAL PROGRAMME IN EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

**Small Scale Research Project feedback**

**Programme Module:**

**Overall Grade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Description</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Low pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abstract</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background literature</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues, theories, evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions of the research question(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Its relevance to the creation of new knowledge is made clear</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method and results</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions allow a full replication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate choice (eg. participants, design)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods for data handling (eg. analysis, presentation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of findings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relate to relevant theories/models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation of implications/application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coherence of the report</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytical and critical capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Novelty and originality in contribution</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>the report is of a sufficient standard to potentially merit publication</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Presentation

| The work is presented in a manner consistent with professional practice. | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------| | | |
| Use of APA conventions | | | |
| References complete | | | |

*Note:* * indicates additional criteria designed to address additional learning outcomes associated with a doctoral degree (see Appendix 3).

**Marker’s comments:**

---

12 Ensure your writing is easy to read, through the use of good structure and cohesion. Make connections within sentences, within paragraphs, between paragraphs, and between sections. Ensure ideas flow together smoothly and logically.
Quantitative Dissertation Proposal Feedback Sheet for Primary Supervisor

Name of trainee:

Title of the proposed study:

Name of primary supervisor:

Dear Supervisor: Please answer the following questions by ticking the appropriate box. If you would like to specify any issue further or give additional comments please use the field for free verbal feedback at the bottom of this form. Please also give general feedback if the project is approved or not by ticking the relevant box. If you have ticked no for any item, then it is essential to provide feedback about the nature of the problem and to provide suggestions for its resolution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>I. Feedback on sections of the dissertation proposal</strong></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Not enough information given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Background (topic or problem area)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Is the project addressing an important area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Does it fit into the existing literature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Is there a theoretical framework? Is it appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Is the project original?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Does the project contribute to our knowledge of the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Research questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Are they clearly formulated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Are they appropriately limited in number?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.</td>
<td>Do they follow on logically from the broad aim and purpose of the study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.</td>
<td>Are the hypotheses clearly stated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.</td>
<td>Are the hypotheses limited in number?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.</td>
<td>Do the hypotheses contain testable predictions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.</td>
<td>Do the hypotheses follow logically from the research questions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.</td>
<td>Is the design appropriate to test the hypotheses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.</td>
<td>Does the design address questions of internal and external validity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.</td>
<td>Is it clear who they are and are they the right target population?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.</td>
<td>Are there enough participants to test the hypotheses adequately?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.</td>
<td>Is this appropriately justified (eg. by a sample size calculation)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.</td>
<td>Is the recruitment feasible in the given time frame?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.</td>
<td>Are there appropriate inclusion and exclusion criteria?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1. Do they measure the appropriate construct?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2. In the case of multiple measures: are they measuring distinct things?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3. Are the measures valid and reliable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4. If measures are designed: is validity and reliability appropriately tested?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5. Do the measures provide an adequate test of the hypotheses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6. Are the measures acceptable to the participants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Procedure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Not enough information given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1. Is the procedure of recruitment clear and specific?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2. Is the test protocol clear and appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3. Is there sufficient time for obtaining equipment &amp; experimental tasks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3. If appropriate: is the piloting of the procedure clear?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4. Is the length of testing time appropriate and acceptable for each participant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the overall duration of the study realistic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Data analysis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Not enough information given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1. Are the tests appropriate for the design and hypotheses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2. Are there enough participants to use these tests eg. multiple regression, factor analysis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not enough information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Clinical Implications  | Yes | No | Partially | given |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1. Does the outcome of the study contribute to the existing body of knowledge?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2. Does the outcome have clinical implications?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3. Are the potential clinical implications reasonable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Cost estimation  | Yes | No | Partially | Not enough information given |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1. Is the cost estimation justified and appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Please add any comments or additional feedback below if you wish. Please use reference (i.e. “under 3.3. it is necessary to…..”).
Qualitative Dissertation Proposal Feedback Sheet for Primary Supervisor

Name of trainee:

Title of the proposed study:

Name of primary supervisor:

Dear Supervisor: Please answer the following questions by ticking the appropriate box. If you would like to specify any issue further or give additional comments please use the field for free verbal feedback at the bottom of this form. If you have ticked ‘No’ for any item, then please provide feedback about the nature of the problem.

I. Feedback on sections of the dissertation proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Not enough information given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Background (topic or problem area)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Is the project addressing an important area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Does it fit into the existing literature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Is the project original?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Does the project contribute to our knowledge of the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Research question(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Are research question(s) clearly formulated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Are research question(s) appropriately limited in number?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Do they follow on logically from the broad aim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and purpose of the study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Are research question(s) suitable for qualitative methods?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Objectives</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Not enough information given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Are objectives clearly specified??</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Are the objectives limited in number?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. Do the objectives follow logically from the research question(s)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4. Are the objectives suitable for qualitative methods?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Design</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Not enough information given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1. Is the design appropriate to address the research question(s) and objective(s)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Is there an appropriate epistemological framework (e.g. critical realism, social constructionism)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Is there an appropriate methodological framework (e.g. grounded theory, phenomenology)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participants</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Not enough information given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1. Is it clear who they are and are they the right target population?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2. Is an appropriate sampling strategy planned? (e.g. purposive, snowball, convenience)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3. Is the likely sample size estimated and appropriately justified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4. Is the recruitment feasible in the given time frame?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5. Are there appropriate inclusion and exclusion criteria?

5.6 Is the relationship between the researcher and the participants adequately considered? (e.g. power, status)

5.7 Are there plans to collect data to adequately describe the participants (e.g. demographics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Data Collection</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Not enough information given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1. Are data collection method(s) appropriate to the research question/objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2. Are the data collection tool(s) appropriate? (e.g. interview topic guide, participant observation guide use open questions etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3. Are data capture approaches appropriate? (e.g. audio-recording, video-recording)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4. Are contextual aspects of data collection attended to? (e.g. through making field notes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5. Is the location of data collection appropriate? (e.g. home, school, clinic, telephone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6. Are the data collection tool(s) acceptable to the participants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7 Are the data collection method(s) likely to yield sufficiently rich data to address the research question/objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8 Are any plans for transcription of data appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Procedure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Not enough information given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1. Is the procedure of recruitment clear and specific?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Not enough information given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2. Is there sufficient time for obtaining equipment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3. If appropriate: is the piloting of the procedure clear?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4. Is the duration of involvement appropriate and acceptable for each participant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Is the overall duration of the study realistic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Data analysis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Not enough information given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1. Are the plans for analysis consistent with the design, research question(s) and objective(s)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2. Is there a clear indication of how the data will be analysed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Are appropriate techniques planned to enhance the credibility of the analysis? (e.g. coding manual, obtaining feedback on coding, analytic diary, member checks, reflexivity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Is the mode of analysis described (manual / software e.g. NVivo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Depending on the guiding framework, is an appropriately iterative process of data collection and analysis planned?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Implications</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Not enough information given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1. Does the outcome of the study contribute to the existing body of knowledge?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2. Does the outcome have clinical/educational implications?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3. Are the potential clinical/educational implications reasonable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not enough information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cost estimation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1. Is the cost estimation justified and appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II. Please add any comments or additional feedback below if you wish. Please use reference (i.e. “under 3.3. it is necessary to.....”). Attach additional sheet if required.**
**Dissertation Proposal Feedback Sheet: Programme Review**

*Name of trainee:*  
*Title of the proposed study:*

*Name of reviewer:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications for clinical or educational psychology</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not enough information given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost estimation / Budget approval</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not enough information given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional comments on the submitted proposal**

---

**The project is:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved conditional on addressing the issues raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please submit a response letter that outlines how you will address the issues raised within 3 weeks. You do not need to resubmit your proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resubmission with major amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Programme has significant concerns about one or more aspects of the project. Please resubmit your research proposal and cover letter outlining how you have addressed the issues raised by ……………………..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unfeasible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Programme believe your study is not feasible in its present form and that you need either to choose a new project or to make very substantial alterations. Please submit a new research proposal by…………………..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>