

The University of Edinburgh
The Moray House School of Education
School Postgraduate Studies Committee

28 January 2015

Response to report on Programme Review of MSc Performance Psychology

Brief description of the paper

Following the programme review held on 11 April 2013 the Performance Psychology Programme Team prepared the attached response for consideration at the meeting of SPGSC on 25 September 2013. However, the response was not included on the agenda and its omission not noticed until recently. It is therefore included in the documents for this meeting in order to ensure that the review process has been duly followed.

Action requested

For approval by SPGSC

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? Refer to attached paper

Risk assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? Refer to attached paper

Equality and diversity

Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? No

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Any other relevant information

None

Originators of the paper

Paper: Hugh Richards (former) Director Post-Graduate Programme in Performance Psychology
Sept 2013
Cover Sheet: Lesley Rowand, January 2015

The University of Edinburgh
The Moray House School of Education
School Postgraduate Studies Committee

25 September 2013

**Teaching Team response to report on Programme Review of MSc Performance
Psychology**

Brief description of the paper

Following the programme review held on 11 April 2013 the Panel prepared a report containing conditions and recommendations. This document provides a systematic summary of the teaching team response to this, indicating action taken, ongoing or pending where appropriate.

Action requested

The teaching team request SPGSC approve this considered response which would enable us to formally respond to the Panel members and 'close the loop' on this phase of the quality assurance and enhancement process.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? Potentially

Risk assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? The paper discusses risk to recruitment through competitor programmes which is probably not the 'risk' referred to by this question.

Equality and diversity

Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? No

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Any other relevant information

None

Originators of the paper

Hugh Richards
(former) Director Post-Graduate Programmes in Performance Psychology
Sept 2013

The following table summarises the teaching team response to the panel report on the programme review conducted for the Performance Psychology PGDip and MSc.

	Conditions	Response (Action, Comment, Clarification)	Staff lead	Completion status / Progress
1	The review documentation should include full and comprehensive course descriptors.	“Agree & Action”: The full course outline held on the University records (EUCLID) will be added to the Appendices for each course.	HR	Completed included in Appendices
2	The review documentation should be revised to include reference to the introduction from 2013/14 of the Personal Tutor system. and how this will contribute to student support on the programme.	“Agree & Action”: A summary outlining how the Personal Tutor system has been implemented on the programme and evaluating how it contributes to student support will be written towards the end of first semester following roll-out. This will be added as an Appendix item with a link to section 1.4.	AMac & HR	To be completed by Jan 2014
3	The programme team should prepare a detailed report covering the last five years: a) student applications – number, nationality, entry qualifications b) conversion of applications and uptake of places c) progress/success rate and number of distinctions d) graduates’ career destinations	“Agree & Action”: the available data from the PG Office (a & b), Exam Board minutes (c), and the Careers Service (d) will be requested, summarised and added as an Appendix to augment the specific descriptions of students who have taken the programme covered in section 2.1 on Recruitment (a & b), and section 1.5 on Student Perspective (c & d)	AM	Data relating to this has been obtained and is currently being analysed to provide a succinct summary of this information. Expected completion date 20-9-13
4	The Programme Director and Deputy Director of the Graduate School to work together to raise to the School Executive level serious concerns regarding inadequate provision for students with disabilities.	“Agree & Action”: A short summary of relevant issues and suggested remedial actions will be written and sent to the HoS with a request that it be discussed at the School Executive and a formal response made.	HR & PA	Completed. Short paper sent to the School

	These issues, both teaching and learning and health and safety related, had already been raised but many of the issues remained unresolved.			Executive summarising issues / and suggesting action
5	The team should reflect on the future direction of the programme over the next 5 years and how it might adapt and grow in order to remain current and viable. The reviewers considered that such a future strategy was important and may include the creation of a professionally accredited route but that this was a decision to be made by the programme team.	“Partial Agree & Action”: there is no uniform consensus within the team about what a projected plan for the programme might be across this length of time. There are however a number of possible pathways which include additional developments (e.g. seeking accreditation, different degree pathways) as well as more conservative plans (increase steady recruitment to 20-25, and continue to refine, update and maintain quality delivery). A short document summarising immediate plans, and outlining possible longer term development options will be developed to inform discussions between the team and managerial level staff within the Institute and the School. This will ensure actions to be taken will have been considered in terms of pragmatic cost-benefit analysis, will be supported and resourced, and that the intended aims will be in line with wider strategic objectives.	AMac	A discussion document outlining our perceived status as a course has been prepared. It contains three proposals as to a) how the course could evolve, or b) under what conditions the course could stay the same. This will form the basis for a discussion to be held with the teaching team and Hol in Oct-Nov 2013.

	Recommendation	Response (Action, Comment, Clarification)	Staff lead	Completion status / Progress
1	Clarify the main aims of the degree programme and the literature upon which the programme draws. Currently the documentation did not sufficiently reflect the programme's inclusion of Positive Psychology and Coaching Psychology as well as Sports Psychology.	“Comment & Action: “ The Performance Psychology programme does not exactly include positive psychology and coaching psychology though research and practice form both of these areas and sport psychology inform the content of parts of the course. However all of these areas share in part a similar focus on the application of psychology in terms of enhancing performance. The section about the background to the programme has been adjusted to explain this more clearly	HR	Done
2	Investigate how to build links with other parts of the University such as Psychology. This may give rise to opportunities for joint supervision at MSc dissertation and PhD level.	Action: A meeting has been held to explore potential work interactions and collaboration with members of the Psychology Department. This represents just the first step in potentially developing. Further to this, contact with a Professor in medicine currently researching in the same field as one of the staff team has been contacted with a view to sharing ideas and developing collaboration.	AM	Started and ongoing
3	Investigate how to increase the recruitment of international students from a wider range of countries. The College Marketing Officer with responsibility for the School of Education will be able to provide advice on strategies for this.	“Agree & Action”: work with CMO to identify recruitment strategy targeting International students (esp North America) optimally timed to support recruitment to 2014-2015 cohort. Consider local (UK) recruitment targeting graduates of Sport Science UG programmes.	PD	This was not prioritised for action because it would not have affected 2013 entry. Action pending.
4	Consider the introduction of option courses. Option courses may enhance the appeal of the programme and also encourage more collaboration with colleagues elsewhere in the School.	“Considered & Disagree”: The team considered this item. There are noted advantages for students to have options in programmes of study (especially at UG level) but these also need to be considered along with the disadvantages and potential threat to educational integrity and coherence of a programme of study noted in the recent Kings-Warwick report ⁽¹⁾ . This programme, which has a very small number of total contact hours (120 hours, plus supervision in research project), has been developed as an intact curriculum, designed to offer a balanced coverage of psychology topics relevant to the named award, to adequately	n/a	n/a

		<p>address the development of graduate attributes and to progressively develop and build skills towards high quality research capability. The introduction of an option is not a simple exchange of an internal course for another from outside because this may then result in the student missing development of knowledge, skills or adequate preparation. Furthermore introducing options across disciplines does not address the idealised goal of 'interdisciplinary teaching', but only provides students with a patchwork of unconnected learning experiences (multi- rather than inter-disciplinary). The programme team would be keen to see how genuine interdisciplinary teaching opportunities may emerge with colleagues in other parts of the University. But as the Kings-Warwick report makes clear, this is likely to emerge from the ground up, from staff interactions, possibly initiating as collaborative research (or Knowledge Exchange) projects. Action following Recommendation 2 may be the pre-cursor to innovative and quality teaching developments in this area.</p>		
5	<p>Review the dissertation course descriptor and consider whether continuing the current practice of allowing students to choose between a traditional thesis or the 3 part project is desirable.</p>	<p>"Agree & Action". The course descriptor and assessment outline and relevant guides will be modified to take effect from 2013-2014 academic year</p>	AN	<p>Completed with new course outline adopting this advice</p>
6	<p>Seek alternative sources of funding for specialist software to enhance the learning experience of MSc Performance Psychology students.</p>	<p>"Agree & Action". The team would like to investigate opportunities to enhance the facilities for psychological research. Securing a visit to the Psychology Department and discussing both equipment and on-going technical support will help to identify realistic plans and costs for the Institute's support for teaching and research in psychology area. Once this is established funding options can be realistically pursued.</p>	AM	<p>Ongoing. Through discussion with colleagues across the Institute and with Psychology, we are developing a picture of the equipment/software costs that could enhance research capability most effectively.</p>

7	<p>Explore possible collaboration for specific aspects of research methods courses. The review team appreciated there was a strong argument why the School's generic Research Methods courses were not appropriate for the MSc Performance Psychology cohort. However, it advised that there were elements of research methods training which Performance Psychology students could be taught in a generic way and which would enhance the quality of dissertation preparations e.g. design of questionnaires, interview protocol etc.</p>	<p>"Rebut". The team considered this option but feel that there would be no quality enhancement through adopting this. Conventional approaches for data collection in scientific research in Psychology are not necessarily common with other disciplines such as Education. The current training by specialist psychology staff ensures students are best prepared to conduct good quality research in terms of the expectations of the discipline. This has particular advantages when considered in terms of developing work for conference presentation, and publications (see Appendix 13 of Review doc) or as pre-cursor to PhD.</p>	n/a	n/a
8	<p>Seek opportunities to make use of colleagues outside the MSc Performance Psychology teaching team to act as supervisors for MSc dissertations as is common practice across the school.</p>	<p>"Comment & Action": There are staff in the University, beyond the teaching team, who have background and qualifications in psychology who may be able to assist in this. However the issue of managing individual workloads is a Head of Institute/Department matter. Therefore finding staff that have both qualifications and availability is difficult from a programme level. Staff without psychology qualifications are not considered suitable supervisors for many studies such as intervention studies and some quasi-experimental studies where ethical issues are salient and discipline specific (e.g. manipulation of stress and anxiety, or emotional disturbance). Relevant knowledge of literature and research methods pertinent to performance psychology is essential for supervisors. Students allocated supervisors without this expertise may be unfairly disadvantaged in comparison to their peer group. All research conducted on the programme adheres to the British Psychological Society code of ethics and conduct and staff should be appropriately qualified and experienced to supervise. This issue will be raised via email to the Head and Deputy Head of Institute to consider identifying availability of suitable staff.</p>	HR	Done

9	Monitor the impact of the fee increase from academic year 2013/14 with a view to highlighting to the School and College leadership if it affects the viability of the programme.	“Agree & Action”: Inevitably this will feature as an agenda item within the School Post-Graduate Studies Committee (SPGSC) meetings once the student recruitment is confirmed (after Sept 2013). Concern from across the School about the fee changes noted in SPGSC	PD	To be completed after week 3 of 2013-2014 year.
---	--	--	----	---

(1) [http://kingslearning.info/kwp/attachments/134 KWP-Creating a 21st Century Curriculum Final Report.pdf.pdf](http://kingslearning.info/kwp/attachments/134_KWP-Creating_a_21st_Century_Curriculum_Final_Report.pdf.pdf)

Staff lead: Hugh Richards (HR), Ailsa Niven (AN), Amanda Martindale (AM), Alan MacPherson (AMac), Programme Director (PD)