RESEARCH HANDBOOK

(PSYD044)

RESEARCH METHODS IN CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY
# TABLE OF CONTENT

1. MEET THE PROGRAMME TEAM FOR RESEARCH

2. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

3. TIME ALLOCATION AND THE RESEARCH MODULE STRUCTURE
   3.1. Time Allocation for Research
   3.2. Programme Requirements and Assessment
   3.3. Module Description

4. RESEARCH SUPPORT AND FACILITIES

5. GUIDELINES FOR THE COMPLETION OF RESEARCH WORK
   5.1. General guideline
   5.2. Guidelines for written work
   5.3. Guidelines for Presentations
   5.4. Administrative Issues
   5.5. Extenuating Circumstances

6. SPECIFIC GUIDELINES AND MARKING CRITERIA
   6.1. The Research Competency Log
   6.2. Problem-Based Learning (PBL) Exercise:
       6.2.1. Guidelines for a good PBL report
   6.3 Small-scale Service Related Research Project (SSRP)
       6.3.1 Guidelines for a good SSRP report
   6.4 Major Research Project
       6.4.1 Choice of topic, supervisor(s) and the supervision process:
       6.4.2 Research Proposal
           6.4.2.1 How to get best support for writing the Research Proposal?
           6.4.2.2 Procedures for the Assessment of the Research Proposal
           6.4.2.3 Guidelines for a good Research Proposal
       6.4.3 Dissertation (Partial research portfolio)
           6.4.3.1 Literature Review
           6.4.3.2 Research Paper
           6.4.3.3 Ethical approval and research governance
           6.4.3.4 Dissemination Statement
       6.4.4 Viva
       6.4.5 Procedures for the Assessment of the Major Research Project
           6.4.5.1 Guidelines for a good Literature Review
           6.4.5.2 Guidelines for a good Research Paper

7. REFERENCES
1. MEET THE PROGRAMME TEAM FOR RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr. Heather O’Mahen</th>
<th>Emma Woodcock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Director</strong></td>
<td><strong>Administrator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail</td>
<td>e-mail:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.o’<a href="mailto:mahen@exeter.ac.uk">mahen@exeter.ac.uk</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:e.j.woodcock@exeter.ac.uk">e.j.woodcock@exeter.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heather’s research and clinical interest is in depression, particularly antenatal and postnatal depression. In particular, she is doing research into two different, complementary streams: (1) treatment development research, primarily using Behavioural Activation (BA) approaches, and (2) emotion regulation processes (e.g., rumination) in mothers and the impact of these processes on their infants. She is also involved in research investigating factors impacting women’s use of psychotherapy (E.g., stigma). Heather is currently conducting a Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT) of a BA treatment for postnatal depression delivered online through Netmums.co.uk and supported by low-intensity therapists. She is also collaborating with Dr. Kim Wright on a study of group BA for depression, Professor Tom Lynch on an HTA EME funded trial of DBT for recurrent depression, and Dr. Anke Karl on a group treatment of comorbid PTSD and depression using CBT and IPT. Heather uses experimental, correlational, and RCT methodologies. Although her approach is primarily quantitative, she has also conducted qualitative research using thematic analysis. Her research has been funded by the National Institute for Mental Health (NIMH, U.S.), NIHR research for patient benefit (RFPB), and PENCiLARCH.
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Nick is a psychologist interested in motivation and goal processes in relation to affect, emotion and mood disorders, particularly depression. He is interested in quantitative investigations of motivation and goal processes at both the between-person and within-person levels. For example, although depressed people are often described as being less motivated, evidence suggests that they invest as much value in their personal goals as non-depressed people, although they hold pessimistic appraisals about attaining these goals and are more likely to pursue them for avoidance-based reasons (rather than approach-based reasons or because goal pursuit is intrinsically enjoyable). Nick is also interested in the psychological processes and mechanisms that differentiate depressed and non-

Janet is a qualitative social psychology researcher. She has worked on a variety of national and European funded research projects. Her main research interests include gender and discourse, work-life practices and policies, life course transitions, qualitative methodologies, internet-mediated discourse and communication. Besides teaching on the d.clin.psy course she is carrying out research on mediation and alternative dispute resolution, and on older people's user of the internet for wellbeing. Recent research projects include a study of online support sites for young people who self harm, a study of online professional-service user interaction, and a qualitative meta-synthesis of studies of cancer and alternative medicine.
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Anke’s research and clinical interest is in posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD). In particular, she is doing research into risk and protective mechanisms that affect recovery from trauma and enhance treatment success. She is interested in mechanisms of self-compassion and secure attachment in facilitating trauma recovery and building resilience and collaborates with Professor Willem Kuyken on studies into related mechanisms of action. She combines neuroscience (fMRI, EEG, psychophysiology), experimental and clinical psychology and her methodological focus is mainly quantitative. Anke is also working as an associate therapist at the AccEPT clinic of the mood disorders centre specialising in individual and group treatment of comorbid PTSD and depression using CBT and IPT (the latter together with Dr Heather O’Mahren). Anke’s research has been funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) and charitable trusts (e.g. Wessex Medical Trust, Gerald Kerkutt Trust, Compassionate Mind Foundation).

Professor Cath Haslam  
Research Tutor;  
e-mail: c.haslam@exeter.ac.uk

Cath’s research focuses on the cognitive and social consequences of trauma and disease in neurological populations. Her work not only addresses questions about the integrity and rehabilitation of cognitive ability, notably memory, but also the impact of their loss on personal and social identity. Drawing on social identity theorising, the latter work has led to development and evaluation of social group interventions that aim to maintain and enhance the health and well-being of people with acquired brain injury and dementia.
| **Dr. Phil Yates** |
| Research Tutor; |
| e-mail:p.j.yates@exeter.ac.uk |

Phil’s research interests link with his NHS clinical role as Lead Consultant Clinical Psychologist in Psychological Medicine Services (Clinical Health Psychology & Neuropsychology). His research interests are mainly in the area of the clinical neuropsychology of acquired brain injury (ref. memory rehabilitation, persistent concussion syndrome, epidemiology of head injuries, neuropsychological consequences of head injury in childhood). Current Health Psychology projects include psychological health in emergency medical staff; medical information-giving in haematology and oncology services; and psychological aspects of medically unexplained symptoms.

| **Professor Huw Williams** |
| Research Tutor; |
| e-mail: w.h.williams@exeter.ac.uk |

Huw’s research interests include epidemiology (incidence and risk factors) of brain injury, Identity, memory and traumatic experiences and development of post-traumatic stress disorder, neuro-cognitive profiling – e.g. in Sports Concussion and in Encephalitis (with Encephalitis Society), Emotional dys-regulation post brain injury in children, Offending and brain injury, Family and parenting issues post-brain injury. Identifying and managing mood disorders (e.g. Post traumatic Stress) after brain injury and Integration of Cognitive Therapy and Neurorehabilitation for survivors of brain injury.

| **Professor Ed Watkins** |
| Research Tutor; |
| e-mail:e.r.watkins@exeter.ac.uk |

Ed’s work has focused on a) experimental understanding of psychopathology, with a particular focus on the processes and mechanisms of rumination; b) the translation of this understanding into the development and evaluation of new psychological interventions for mood disorders. The experimental research has provided the first experimental demonstrations that there may be distinct types of rumination with distinct functional effects and that rumination may be a causal process in overgeneral autobiographical memory in depression, and focused on understanding the causal roles of distinct processing styles in the consequences of rumination (e.g., Watkins, 2008; all UK Wellcome Trust funded). The translational treatment-focused research has focused on developing and evaluating novel forms of CBT including (a) CBT designed to explicitly target rumination in residual depression (NARSAD funded, Watkins et al., 2007); (b) co-investigator in a randomized controlled trial comparing Mindfulness-based CBT versus continuation antidepressant medication for relapse prevention in recurrent depression (UK Medical Research Council funded; (c) developing a novel guided self-help treatment for rumination & depression in primary care based on the experimental work (UK MRC Experimental Medicine grant.
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2. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

- Prepare graduates for a changing clinical world.
  - Understand and contribute to the clinical research literature
    - Conduct sound, high-quality research with a firm grounding in research methodology
  - Be able to effectively utilise clinical research in day-to-day clinical practice and to respond fluidly and knowledgeably to changing clinical demands.
  - Draw on and contribute to the research base to shape clinical programmes

Clinical psychologists are positioned within a rapidly changing health services profession. Our goal is to equip clinical psychologists with the skills to shape and manage health problems at an individual and systemic level. Research skills are a critical component of this training. A reflective, scientist-practitioner approach provides psychologists with a basis for understanding psychological processes and clinical outcomes. These skills are also used to advise and assist colleagues in allied professions who have not had research training. The expected outcome is that trainees will continue to be “research active” after completion of the programme either in producing research in their future careers, facilitating research or applying research to inform their practice. For trainees who choose a career in teaching and training, competence in evaluating and applying current research is a significant asset in keeping abreast of developments in their area of specialisation.

Critically, our research training is based on the MRC’s Complex Interventions Framework, a model of intervention development and evaluation. This framework serves as a comprehensive model of research development, evaluation and dissemination (Phase I: development, Phase II, piloting, Phase III, evaluation, Phase IV dissemination). Research training focuses on psychological approaches to the framework, including using theory, and incorporating systemic and process/mechanism level variables.

We are committed to supporting lifelong scholarly activity and academic development during the programme. All trainees are encouraged to build upon their existing skills by completing and publishing research, reviews and critiques within the context of the clinical programme. We strongly support and encourage this, particularly among trainees who wish to pursue research in their clinical psychology careers.

The research methods programme has been developed in consultation with other members of the training team, relevant stakeholders (e.g., research supervisors and field collaborators, trainees, service users, local Heads of Service) and research tutors on other clinical psychology programmes to ensure its relevance to clinical psychology practice. The purpose of this section of the handbook is to describe the components of the research module.
3.1. Time Allocation for Research
Trainees have been allocated dedicated self-study and research time in each year to assist them in undertaking self-directed learning as specified in their individualised research programme and to complete the specified research activities. In Year 1, trainees are allotted 180 hours of independent research study and 180 hours of on-placement time in which they can complete their SSRP work. In Year 2 trainees have 195 hours of independent research and study time. In Year 3 trainees are allotted 585 hours of independent research and study time. The independent research and study time will be a mixture of workshops, private study and research activity, the timing of which must be individually negotiated with the research supervisor and included in the independent research plan.

3.2. Programme Requirements and Assessment
To pass the research component of the programme, trainees must (a) attend formal teaching, (b) complete all assignments, (c) pass all summative assessment and (d) submit a bound research portfolio at the conclusion of the programme.

The components of the programme requirements, assignments and assessments, in detail are summarized in Tables 1 & 2:

Table 1
Brief overview of the programme requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Attend formal teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attendance will be monitored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Assignments (formative assessments)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These must be completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal feedback will be provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Methodology assignment/competency log</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research proposal presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review of the literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(as part of the research proposal submission,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see details in Table 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research presentation/ conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poster Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Summative assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These must be passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PBL (problem-based learning) exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Small-scale Service Related Project (SSRP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major research project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(consisting of a number of milestones, see</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Submission of a bound research portfolio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the conclusion of the programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Detailed overview of assessed research components in the order they have to be completed.
(Summative = formally marked. Formative = not formally marked- receive guidance and feedback).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Required structure</th>
<th>Word count</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Specific guidelines &amp; marking criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attendance and participation in the research methods teaching program.</td>
<td>Attendance monitored</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Methodology assignment/competency log</td>
<td>formative</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>October 1st and 2nd year</td>
<td>See Page 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Major research project</td>
<td>Summative/ formative</td>
<td>See specific milestones below</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>See below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1. Research proposal presentation</td>
<td>formative</td>
<td>10 min presentation 15 minute discussion</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>See Page 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3. Mini-viva/ upgrade</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Oral exam/defence with internal examiner, research supervisor and</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>See Page 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Literature review and empirical paper bound together</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>See Page 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4. Dissertation consisting of:</td>
<td>summative</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>See Page 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1. Literature review</td>
<td>summative</td>
<td>in the format of a specified journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2. Empirical paper</td>
<td>summative</td>
<td>in the format of a specified journal</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>See Page 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5. Research presentation/conference</td>
<td>formative</td>
<td>10 min presentation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>See Page 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6. Poster Presentation</td>
<td>formative</td>
<td>Abstract, Background, Aims, Methods, Results, Brief discussion</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>See page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7. Viva voce exam</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>See Page 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Research Portfolio</td>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>contents page, research PBL, SSRP, research proposal together with literature review, major research and dissemination statement.</td>
<td>24500</td>
<td>September/At the end of training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODULE CODE</td>
<td>PSYD044</td>
<td>MODULE TITLE</td>
<td>Research Methods in Clinical Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LECTURER(S)</td>
<td>Heather O’Mahen (module co-ordinator), Research Tutors &amp; invited speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDIT VALUE</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>ECTS VALUE</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-REQUISITES</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-REQUISITES</td>
<td>DClinPsy Clinical and Academic modules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURATION OF MODULE</td>
<td>36 months; start date, first semester of year one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL STUDENT STUDY TIME</td>
<td>1400 hours (Contact hours 100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AIMS**

This module comprises one of the necessary modules for the Doctorate in Clinical and Community Psychology (DClinPsy). Taken together these modules form the basis for the academic, clinical and research skills that participants require to practice as clinical psychologists. This module provides the research elements of the DClinPsy.

Principles of the module include:

1. To train DClinPsy’s to be reflective scientist practitioners such that research will inform clinical work and clinical work will inform research.
2. To utilize the MRC Complex Interventions Framework to guide teaching and thinking about clinical research while recognizing the importance of psychological research. Psychologists often conduct research at both a basic (e.g., understanding psychological processes) and applied level and we acknowledge and support building a psychological perspective in research.

The research methods module aims to:

1. Inform participants of the main elements of theory and practice in clinical research, utilizing the Complex Interventions Framework to enhance understanding of how psychological research can be carried out and disseminated (TS2-4, PP4-5, E1,R1).
2. Develop participants’ ability to formulate, design, carry out, and disseminate the results of research that is relevant to the concerns of clients, service users, providers and commissioners of health services, including the broader public (TS2-4, E1-2, PP4-5, R1-4, CT1, SD1, SD3-6).
3. Provide participants with the ability to identify resources to further their learning in a way that is appropriate to their individual professional development needs and the requirements of their future professional context(s), (R1-3, PP4-5, CT1, CT2, SD1, SD2-5, E1-2)
4. Educate participants about important stakeholders in clinical psychology research and promote the collaborative involvement of these stakeholders in the research process (e.g., providers, purchasers and service users, research councils, professional training organisations, interested clinical psychology colleagues). (TS2-4, PP4-5, R1, R3, CT1-2, SD1-6, E1-2)
5. Ensure, as appropriate, that participants have the skills to critically evaluate the research/evidence base of clinical services and contribute to evidence-based practice in their own professional work (TS1-4, PP4-5, R1, R3, E1-2).
6. Recognise participants’ strengths and, where possible, facilitate their research ambitions within the context of the clinical psychology training course (TS1-4).
7. Encourage participants to adopt clinical research as part of their professional work in their training and their post-qualification careers (TS1-4, PP4, PP5, SD1-3, SD5-6).
8. At an overarching level, encourage the thoughtful, ethical and responsible application and production of research (TS1-4, R1, R4, PP4, E1-2).

**INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES**

On completion of the course, participants will take into their workplace:

**Module specific skills**

1. An ability to access and critically evaluate complex research relevant to their professional work (R1, TS1-4, PP1, E1-2).
2. An ability to apply research to solve complex problems in clinical psychology (R1-4, PP1, E1, E2).
**Discipline specific skills**
3. Knowledge about the Complex Intervention Framework, and psychological research designs and methodologies (TS1-4, R1-4, E1-2, PP4-5).
4. Knowledge of the broad principles of good research practice as specified in the Department of Health’s Research Governance framework (TS1-4, R1, E1, E2).
5. An ability to conceptualize, design, conduct and disseminate the findings from research that is relevant to the concerns of clients, service users, providers and commissioners of health services (TS1-4, Ct1, CT2, CT4, E1-2, PP4, SD1, SD3-5).
6. An ability to carry out research relevant to the planning and evaluation of clinical services (TS1-4, R1-4, E1-2, PP4, CT1-2, CT4, SD1-5).
7. An ability to use a reflective, ethical and professional framework in their research activities (TS1-4, PP1-7).

**Personal and key skills**
8. Ability to show innovation, independence and confidence in undertaking research relevant to professional practice (E1-2, PP4-7, R1-4).
9. Ability to collaborate effectively with all stakeholders (e.g., clients, service users, ethical bodies, providers and commissioners of services) throughout the research process (TS1-4, R1, PP4, CT1-2, CT4).
10. Show a capacity to act in accordance with the Research Governance framework (TS1-4, R1-4, PP4).

**LEARNING/TEACHING METHODS**
A number of learning methods will be used: Lectures, small group work, tutorials, individual presentations, problem-based learning, guided learning and research supervision. While participants will be taught by clinical staff and invited teachers, they will also learn from each other’s experiences. Assignments and assessments are designed to develop participant’s research knowledge, research competence and ability to consume and conduct clinical research to the required standard.

**ASSIGNMENTS**
Formative Assessment:

1. **Research Proposal Presentation (peer review):** Presentation of research proposals. This will involve a 15 minute presentation, with feedback from peers. Planned for Semester 2, Year 1. Formative. This assignment related to learning outcomes 2, 3, 4, 5 and 10. (TS1-4, R1-4, E1-2, PP1-8, CT1, CT2-4, SD1, SD3-6).

2. **Literature review (to be submitted with the research proposal):** This is a written assignment comprising a substantive review of the literature (including theory, empirical work, methodological issues and relevance to professional practice in clinical and community psychology) in preparation for the major research project (maximum of 4,000 words). (TS1-4, R1-4, E1-2, PP1-8, CT1, CT2-4, SD1, SD3-6).

3. **Dissemination Statement:** Dissemination of the major research project’s findings to a relevant audience in a relevant format. (Required at the time of submission of the major research project). This assignment relates to learning outcomes 6, 8, 9 and 10) (TS1-4, CT1-4, SD1, PP4, E1).

4. **Research Presentation/Poster Presentation Conference:** Presentation of findings from major research projects (30 minute presentation with questions). Following this, poster presentation of research findings in an open session. This assignment is related to learning outcomes 2, 5, 8 and 9 (TS1-4, CT1-4, SD1, PP4, E1, R1, R3-4).

Summative Assessment: All work is graded as follows — pass, conditional pass, referred or fail — and each piece needs to be passed for successful module completion.

Year 1:

1. **Research PBL:** A written individual assignment (maximum of 3500 words) involving critical evaluation of a piece of research. This is relevant to learning outcomes 1, 2, 3 and 7. Normally submitted in Year 1 (TS1-4, R1, R3, E1, PP1, PP5, CT2, CT4).

2. **Service-Related Research Project:** This is a written assignment (maximum of 2,000 words) documenting the conduct of a small scale service-oriented project undertaken during clinical placement. Related to learning outcomes 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9 and is normally submitted in Semester 2, Year 1 (TS1-4, R1-4, E1-2, PP1-8, CT1, CT2-4, SD1, SD3-6).

Year 2:

3. **Research Proposal:** This written assignment contains a detailed description of the work that participants plan to conduct as part of their major research project (maximum of 3,000 words). The work is relevant to learning outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 10. Normally semester 1, Year 2 (TS1-4, R1-4, E1-2, PP1-8, CT1, CT2-4, SD1, SD3-6).

Year 3:

4. **Major Research Project:** There are two components to the major research. The first is a literature review relevant to the major research. This would normally be a resubmission of section I of the research proposal, amended in the light of formative feedback and updated as necessary, and written in the format of a specified journal (maximum of 4,000 words). The second component should document the conduct of the major research project in the format of a journal publication (9,000 words for manuscript and maximum of 15,000 words with expanded appendices). These components will be graded independently and are related to learning outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10. Normally submitted in Semester 2 of Year 3 (TS1-4, R1-4, E1-2, PP1-8, CT1, CT2-4, SD1, SD3-6).

ASSESSMENT

Assessment is by 100% coursework. All summative assessments as outlined above contribute to progression through the programme and must receive a pass mark either on initial submission or resubmission for progression through the programme and successful module completion.

SYLLABUS PLAN

Core research teaching will commence in the first year. In the second year, participants will undertake a mixed general/individualised teaching plan, consisting of some additional core teaching, and subsequent individualised teaching in the from of workshops, online learning and consultation. The third year is primarily dedicated to the completion of the major research project.
Year 1: Foundations of research methods in clinical psychology

- Systematic Review (whole day)
- Introduction to complex interventions framework/dissemination (half day)
- Service development and evaluation: Designing and undertaking research relevant to practice and policy (half day)
- Quantitative Research I: Single Case Design (half day)
- Quantitative Research II: Correlational and Experimental Design (half day)
- Quantitative Research III: RCT efficacy to Effectiveness (half day)
- Quantitative Research IV: Designing and thinking about Mediation and Moderation (half day)
- Qualitative Research I: Introduction to philosophy, principles, strengths and weaknesses of qualitative research. Selecting and using qualitative data (full day)
- Qualitative Research II: Training in qualitative methodology (e.g., grounded theory, interpretative phenomenological analysis, theory and data analysis; half day) (half day)
- Tutorial 1: Ethics in research
- Tutorial 2: Preparing for Research Presentations
- Tutorial 3: Prepping for Research proposal, review of how to do a literature review.
- Quantitative Research V: SPSS and data management, analysis of clinical data (e.g., statistical & clinical significance, power and effect sizes, correlation, ANOVA/ANCOVA, multiple regression, 1 full day session)

Year 2: Advanced research methods and evaluation in clinical psychology

Workshops will be offered in quantitative and qualitative analytical techniques (5 full days)

Year 3: Continuing professional development and application of research in clinical psychology

- Workshop series:
  - Publication
  - Getting grants
  - Disseminating research in the NHS – panel discussion with commissioner, service users, clinical lead.
- Learning/teaching sessions in Years 1, 2 and 3 will be delivered via a combination of lectures, small group work, tutorials and guided learning.


Also see: http://www.bps.org.uk/publications/publications_home.cfm


# Core text.  * Highly recommended.
4. RESEARCH SUPPORT AND FACILITIES

There are a number of resources and support pathways available to trainees. The flow chart in Figure 1 may help you to find the support you need. This flow chart outlines the existing areas of support and when and who to go to for support. In addition, you find below a detailed overview of available resources.

Figure 1 Flow chart for finding research support, see explanation in the text
In addition to the assistance that research supervisors and field collaborators offer, trainees can receive support and advice from the following sources:

### 4.1. The handbook and other material on Exeter learning environment (ELE): This is your **primary source** for checking guidelines, downloading teaching materials and checking other useful resources that the research team has put up there. The web address is: [http://vle.exeter.ac.uk](http://vle.exeter.ac.uk) and you will need to login to access the material.

### 4.2 Weekly Research Consultations: Trainees can seek additional advice during the time allocated for Research Tutor Consultation, which occurs weekly in term time, 12.15-1.15 on Tuesdays. No appointments will be made as you will be seen on a first come, first served basis. **This will be the primary source of contact during term time.** If general emails are sent to research tutors outside of consultation then, they will simply refer you to this mechanism for consultation. As noted earlier, this is in addition to the support offered by research supervisors whom you can contact at any time during the course of training.

### 4.3 Research Tutorials: In Year 1 time has been allocated for one two hour research tutorial per term. These will be run by research tutors and aim to support small groups of trainees in meeting the requirements of the research module. The topics covered will normally include planning, writing and general management of research work (e.g., small scale service related projects, research proposals) in addition to ethical issues in research. We recommend you consider what you need to ask before the research tutorials.

### 4.3 Computing and Statistics Helpdesk: A computing and statistics helpdesk is available 9:30 – 12:30 weekdays during term time in the School of Psychology. The aim of this service is to provide immediate advice on statistical problems and computer programmes. Their email address is psy-helpdesk@exeter.ac.uk.

### 4.5 Research facilities at the university: A number of research facilities at the university are available when you do your research with one of the supervisors in the School of Psychology.

#### 4.5.1 Interview & telephone rooms: for research activities within the Mood Disorders Centre (MDC), trainees can book interview or phone rooms.

#### 4.5.2 AV equipment: for research activities within the MDC, trainees can book digital audio or video recording devices. Some of the rooms under 4.5.1 are also equipped with AV devices.
4.5.3. Experimental facilities: The MDC also has a number of testing rooms with computers that are ideal for experimental research.

4.5.4. Biobehavioural lab: The biobehavioural lab is part of the MDC and is equipped with multichannel EEG (Brainproducts), equipment to measure peripheral parameters such as heart rate, skin conductance, EMG (BIOPAC) and eye trackers (Tobii, Eyelink 2000). There are also different Virtual Reality equipments currently used for research on emotion processing and PTSD. Trainees interested in doing research with one of the MDC researchers (e.g. Anke Karl, Kim Wright, Natalia Lawrence) can make use of these excellent facilities.

**MY PGR**
As trainees in a doctoral programme for clinical psychology at Exeter University you have the status of Postgraduate Research (PGR) students (see 6.4.1 for more information)
5. GUIDELINES FOR THE COMPLETION OF RESEARCH WORK

5.1. General guideline
All work should follow the 6th edition of the manuscript preparation guidelines of the American Psychological Association (APA) style (http://www.apastyle.org). Work must be within the stated word count. Reports over the word count will be returned for reduction. While figures, tables and boxes are not included in the word count, excessive use of boxes (i.e. long sections of text shifted to boxes) will be sent back for reduction.

In the following section please find the specific guidelines for the required assessments and assignments.

5.2. Guidelines for written work
Writing up and evaluating research are complex tasks. Research can address numerous questions, legitimately use several different methodologies and be written up and disseminated in a variety of ways. Evaluation of research necessarily considers all these factors. Therefore, rather than provide extensive guidelines, key references for writing and assessing aspects of the research portfolio are given. As research paradigms evolve and change, guidelines for writing and evaluating research necessarily change. In section 6 you will find specific guidelines and marking criteria for all research work.

5.3. Guidelines for Presentations
As part of the programme, trainees will be required to give several presentations and to attend their colleagues’ presentations (as with all teaching, attendance will be monitored). The purpose of these presentations is to increase confidence and effectiveness in communicating research ideas and findings and to get feedback from colleagues on design and presentation. Trainees are expected to give the following presentations throughout the programme:

1. Research Proposal (Year 1): A 15 minute presentation outlining a research question, relevant literature and the general approach to be used in evaluating the question.
2. Research Presentation/Conference (Year 3): A 20-30 minute talk, in the format of a conference presentation, reporting results of the major research project.

It is essential to allow sufficient time to plan your presentation and in doing so you may wish to keep the following questions in mind:

1. What is the purpose of the presentation (or the central question under investigation)?
2. What is the best style of presentation? How can I maintain audience interest?
3. Are the sections of the presentation clearly organised? Are the main points clear and accurate (an itemised summary of key points might help here)?
4. Is the presentation pitched at the right level for the audience?
5. What overall message do I want to convey? Is this clear in my final summary?
6. What is my time limit?

There are some additional considerations relevant to the content of the research proposal and the research presentation/conference. The content of these should include the following:

1. identification of the research question,
2. a brief overview of the most pertinent literature,
3. identification of hypotheses,
4. description of the research design,
5. identification of participants,
6. the main ethical considerations,
7. Proposal analytical plan (1st year), or results of data analysis (3rd year),
8. Importance of the research (1st year) or Conclusions or answer(s) to research question (3rd year).

5.4. Administrative Issues

Stationery

You are entitled to use stationery from the office for research-related work (paper, pens, paper clips etc). However, you should always ask the secretaries before taking anything from the office.

Fax

There is a fax machine in the PhD Office across from the DClinPsy office. You may use the fax machine for research-related faxes, but please write the details in the book by the fax machine, including your full name, so that the fax can be easily identified.

Research expenses

All School research expenses must be approved in advance by the Programme Director. A budget of £200 is available to each trainee. This budget is intended to cover virtually all costs of your work (e.g. photocopying above your allowance, questionnaires, video tapes, photographic materials, reasonable travel for research, attendance at conferences). If equipment is required, you must ensure it is not available for borrowing from the School, is critical for your research and within budget (the latter judgements should be made in consultation with your supervisor). All purchases must be made by the School on your behalf and any remaining materials or equipment will remain the property of the DClinPsy. Please note that you will not be reimbursed if you decide to make an independent purchase. If you anticipate that your research will cost more than this budget, you will need to apply to the Discipline's Research Committee. Please note that there is no guarantee that the Research Committee will grant you the extra money, so such an application needs to be made in good time so that you can make alternative plans if necessary. You can check how much you have left in your allowance with the Programme Administrator, Liz Mears.

Allowable expenses, from your standard budget allocation, include:

1. Materials for research (e.g. stationery, disks, blank audio and video tapes, printing costs of questionnaires, photographic materials, postage etc). Costs for stationery available through the School will not be reimbursed.

2. Small items of equipment or apparatus under the conditions stated above.

3. Attendance at one UK conference provided all other research costs have been covered. Your Supervisor support will be required to access funds for this purpose.

4. Transcription costs on two conditions: (a) that the trainee has transcribed at least a third of interviews themselves and (b) that prior approval is given by their supervisor. The MDC has a well-established undergraduate program. With appropriate planning, you may take on an intern to assist with your research. Transcription may be part of the tasks the intern is assigned to. Please note that the intern program must have educational components, so if you take on an intern you must be
willing to meet with the intern on a regular basis for supervisor and to provide discussion about the broader context of your research.

Non-allowable expenses include:

1. Anything that amounts to paying for research assistance (e.g. clerical work, typing expenses, payment of interviewers or independent judges etc.). If you need such assistance (e.g. second coding of interviews) ask your fellow trainees who will no doubt help out if you reciprocate.

2. Expenses associated with writing up theses (e.g. photocopying or binding the finished thesis).

3. Local travel.

4. Books and offprint costs.

5.5. Extenuating Circumstances

The programme Handbook provides the timeline for submission of the major research. As in the case of all continuously assessed work, trainees may submit a case to mitigation (see Programme Handbook) where there are difficulties meeting deadlines. However, in the case of major research only there may be extenuating circumstances where completion of the various stages may (a) not fall within the criteria for mitigation but (b) remain beyond the trainee’s control. The ethics and research governance procedures, in particular, have on occasion taken substantially longer than envisaged and this is not typically covered by mitigation.

The criteria and procedure for extenuating circumstances are as follows:

1. Extenuating circumstances would apply when there are unpredictable events, beyond the remit of Mitigation Committee, that hinder progress with continuously assessed work. For example, evaluation of submissions to NHS and Research Governance Committees may take longer than the 3 to 5 months that we suggest trainees set aside for this process. The critical criterion is that progress has been hindered unreasonably such that the delay is greater than what would normally be expected. Weaknesses in areas of research competence would not be sufficient grounds, as this should have been picked up earlier in appraisal and in research supervision.

2. Anyone seeking extenuating circumstances needs to make a case to the Programme Director. This will need to be in writing explaining clearly the relevant circumstances, the period of delay and the additional time being sought for submission of their major research. For instance, if the ethical delays were unreasonable then the trainee would need to provide evidence of such delays (e.g., correspondence), the length of the delay and the impact that this has had on their progress. A supportive statement from their supervisor would strengthen the case. It is critical that you keep a running log, with supporting documentation, of any factors contributing to possible delays. This material must be submitted with your request for mitigating circumstances. The request will not be granted without this documentation.

3. The Programme Director will be responsible for judging each case. Where the case for extenuating circumstances has been approved, a revised submission date will be provided in writing.
6. SPECIFIC GUIDELINES AND MARKING CRITERIA

6.1. The Research Competency Log

The log of research and related generic skills & competencies is designed to help you to record and reflect on your experience and development during training. It will provide an overall summary of your clinical research skills and highlight areas for continued professional development.

The log outlines main areas of competence which the BPS expects a trainee to develop during training.

The list is not exhaustive and there are many other competencies, you will acquire. It is important to recognise that you may not be able to develop all of the competencies in every year of training. Equally, by the end of training you should not expect to be expert in everything: some areas will be better practised than others.

How to use the Log of Research Competence

1. Consider the experience you have gained prior to or during training in teaching, the SSRP, the dissertation or other activities (e.g. your placement). Read through the list of competencies below.

2. Use a fresh column for each time (start of training and after every year) where you have gained experience.

3. Refer to the rating definition on the following page, and rate yourself on each competency with respect to your level of competency and the importance this skill has for you.

4. Meet with your research supervisor (or tutor if supervisor unavailable) at the end of each year and ask for their feedback. Where you and your supervisor agree on the appropriate rating, complete in pen. If you and your supervisor differ, then leave your pencil rating and add your supervisor’s in pen alongside.

5. Submit your log to your appraiser and research tutor/supervisor before your annual appraisal meeting (normally in September).
Using the Rating Scheme (Trainee)

We are interested in mapping your development of the expected competencies and the importance of the competencies across the three years of training using a four point scale, where 1 = limited competency through to 4 = a thorough level of competency, typical of a newly qualified clinical psychologist. We recognise that your level of competency and importance in a particular area may vary across years.

Definitions

1. Emerging competence in the area described/ little importance
2. Developing Competence/ some importance
3. Good Competence/ importance
4. Thorough Competence/high importance

X If there is insufficient opportunity to provide evidence of competency, please put a cross through the relevant box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L = level, I = importance</th>
<th>Start of training</th>
<th>End of 1st year</th>
<th>End of 2nd year</th>
<th>End of 3rd year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Generic skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Research management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Time Management</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Organizational skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being a critical recipient of research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Reading research papers critically</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Reliability and validity of measures/research</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Writing a critical review</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Scientific writing and communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Writing a research proposal</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Writing an ethics application (for NRES)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. Writing a dissertation</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4. Writing a publication</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5. Writing a critical review</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6. Dealing with journal editors and referees</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7. Presenting your Work at Conferences</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8. Communicating research to wider audiences/Talking to the Media</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. General PC/software skills

4.1. Powerpoint (for Presentations, Posters)
4.2. SPSS/Excel
4.3. Literature search (e.g. Pubmed)
4.4. Literature referencing (e.g. Endnote)
4.5. Running research via the web

**II. Methodological and statistical skills**

| L | I | L | I | L | I | L | I |

5. Generating Research Questions and Hypotheses

6. Experimental Designs

6.1. Basic experimental designs (between-subjects, randomization, matching, within-subjects)
6.2. Quasi-experimental designs
6.3. Surveys
6.1. Designs for change monitoring (longitudinal, cross-sectional, sequential)

7. Qualitative Methods

7.1. Interpretative phenomenological analysis
7.2. Grounded theory analysis
7.3. Discourse analysis

| L | I | L | I | L | I | L | I |

8. Quantitative Methods/Statistical skills

8.1. Power, effect size, sample size determination
8.2. t-tests
8.3. Correlation
8.4. Bivariate regression,
8.5. Partial correlation,
8.6. Multiple regression
8.7. Statistical mediation
8.8. Statistical moderation
8.9. Logistic regression, categorical predictors
8.10. Exploratory Factor Analysis,
8.11. Cluster Analysis
8.12. One-way ANOVA, multiple comparisons
8.13. ANCOVA and MANOVA
8.14. Factorial ANOVA
8.15. Repeated Measures ANOVA
8.16. Nonparametric analysis

L = level, I = importance

**Development aims:**
When reflecting on the list below, identify specific areas you need to develop and why (e.g. training in advanced regression techniques for the dissertation etc.)
Start of training:

End of first year:

End of second year:
6.2. Problem-Based Learning (PBL) Exercise:
This is a written assignment involving critical evaluation of a piece of research. Trainees are required to submit an individual summary. As in the academic module, the problem-based learning exercise will be used to complement the teaching program. The same principles involving use of “real life” stimuli, as well as co-operative group and tutor facilitated work to promote learning will apply here. You will be required to complete one research PBL exercise which will be assessed by way of individual write-up. For this exercise, trainees will work in the same PBL groups as for the academic module.

Trainees are expected to review critically the outcome of a small-scale service related project. The individual piece (maximum of 3,500 words) will assess your ability to critically evaluate the conduct of the project including the design and methodology, data analysis, interpretation and overall quality. The PBL report should comprise a critique of the SSRP and a new proposal that is feasible as an SSRP. It should include the following sections:

- **Critique of the SSRP report** (this section should provide a constructive discussion of areas where the SSRP shows flaws in design, analysis, interpretation, reasoning and argumentation and general writing)
- **Background** (this section should provide a link between the previous evaluation and ideas for development and briefly cover relevant literature and theory),
- **Methodology** (covering issues such as the measures and methods to be used, participants and relevant consultations)
- **Analysis** (in which you will identify and justify the analysis strategy)
- **Ethical consideration** (raising any issues relevant to the conduct of the re-evaluation)
- **Implications for the service** (consider the benefits to the service and justify this in terms of the costs)

In addition to teaching, it is expected that trainees will access a wide range of resources (such as research tutors, the library, internet and other electronic resources, personal experience) to support their learning.

The individual written assignments are marked according to specific guidelines describing the standards of a good PBL report which are listed below.
### 6.2.1. Guidelines for a good PBL report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marking criterion</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. CRITICAL REVIEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and identification of research question</td>
<td>A clear understanding of the aim of the evaluation and a concise statement of the research question(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory and evidence base</td>
<td>The review undertakes a thorough consideration of the evidence relevant to the project, identifying any gaps where they arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>A thorough evaluation of the methods used is undertaken and their appropriateness in addressing the research question is provided. Alternative methods suggested and justified, as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of analysis and interpretation of findings</td>
<td>Evaluation of the analysis strategy is thorough with suggestions for extending analysis as required. Clear consideration is given to the appropriateness of the conclusions drawn and implications of findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for the service</td>
<td>The applicability, benefits and overall and impact of the work on the service is directly addressed. Future re-evaluation in the context of the research findings is considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. PRESENTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>The critical review has a logical structure with clear integration of ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>The review is written professionally, using appropriate language with clear expression and connections between sentences, paragraphs and sections that ensure clarity and readability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>All work cited is referenced accurately and in the appropriate style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. REFORMULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>The rationale for extending the evaluation is clear and compelling with an explicit link to findings from the previous evaluation. The new evaluation is feasible as an SSRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>A thorough evaluation of the methodology is undertaken (including consideration of participants, methods and procedures) and the proposed approach has clear justification and is feasible. Consideration is given to the consultation process to ensure the effective and efficient conduct of the re-evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis strategy</td>
<td>The rationale for the analysis strategy is described and justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for the service</td>
<td>There is evidence of careful and thorough consideration of the benefits to the service which is clearly justified in the context of the costs to the service (e.g., financial, time, effort) in conducting the re-evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The marking and feedback sheet for the PBL exercise is overleaf.
Feedback Form for Individual Write-up of Research PBL

Trainee Number:                    Marker:                            Recorded:
Moderator: Module Leader

Year: 1
Grade: PASS / CONDITIONAL PASS / REFERRED / FAIL
Assignment: Individual Research PBL Conforms to regulations: YES/NO

General evaluation and response to specific requests for feedback

Strengths of the work

Weaknesses of the work

If appropriate: specific areas identified for improvement with suggestions for how improvements could be made
6.3. Small-scale Service Related Research Project (SSRP)
In line with BPS requirements, trainees are expected to conduct and write-up one SSRP during training. The programme views service evaluation as an integral part of professional practice that provides a foundation for research practice in clinical settings. For these reasons, trainees will be required to plan and conduct a service-related project as part of their first placement in Year 1 and submit a written assignment describing its conduct and findings.

Your SSRP will be allocated to you by the research team. Services will put forth SSRP proposals at the beginning of the year, which will be evaluated by the research team for methodological quality and feasibility. Top ranking SSRP projects will then be chosen. We will aim to match trainees, as much as is possible, with projects within their service. If this is not possible, we will match by trust, then area, and if not possible within those confines, more broadly outside of area. Involvement in this project should take approximately half a day per week from the point of assignment until the due date. Extensions must be negotiated with your service, the SSRP site, and the research director. The written submission should not exceed 3,000 words and should include the following:

1. **Title page** (name of trainee, project title and word length),
2. **Background, service issue under investigation and service description:** Consider relevant background literature and comment on any relevant service-related or other research in the area. Describe the issue under investigation within the context of the service (service aims, clients referred, clinical orientation). State why it is important to investigate.
3. **Methodology:** What methods were used to conduct the project? If measures were used, provide a rationale for those developed or chosen. Is there anything that can be said about the reliability, validity or the trustworthiness of measures used or the data collected?
4. **Findings:** What were the main findings from the project? Present the data in a way that is accessible to all disciplines.
5. **Conclusions and implications:** What are the main implications for the health service? How will the findings be used to improve the service? How can these improvements be evaluated in future?

Trainees should seek support for this assignment as outlined in Figure 1. The primary contact person is the SSRP supervisor and additional support can be obtained in research consultancy or the research tutorials. However, trainees may also receive support from their research tutor. The role involves providing advice and direction for particular projects (e.g., appropriateness of the project, analysis strategy). Your research tutor can also provide support and guidance to your field collaborator regarding this project, should she/he request such support. A copy of the final report must also be submitted to the service in which the research was conducted.

The SSRP is marked using guidelines listed below
### 6.3.1 Guidelines for a good SSRP report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marking criterion</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guidelines for a good SSRP report</strong></td>
<td>Aims of the service or intervention under evaluation A clear and concise statement of the aims of the evaluation and its relevance to the service under investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of the service or intervention under evaluation</strong></td>
<td>A thorough but concise description of the service under evaluation (including its primary role and objectives) which places the SSRP in context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief literature review</strong></td>
<td>A brief and focused review that draws upon existing and relevant service-related research. The review provides an excellent background to research in the area and is linked well with the aims and objectives of the SSRP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td>The methods are clearly described and appropriate to the aims of the study with clear justification where required. The description of the research methodology suggests the research aims can be answered fully and appropriately by the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of analysis and interpretation of findings</strong></td>
<td>The rationale for analysis is described in full and the analysis performed is accurate. Results are presented clearly and in the appropriate format suggesting a thorough knowledge of the analytic strategy used. Interpretation of findings is well grounded in the data, balanced and considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implications of the study</strong></td>
<td>Implications are clearly described with a thorough consideration of issues relevant to both the service and clinical psychology practice in general. Considerable thought has been given to recommendations for future research with clear justification for the direction suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the writing and presentation (clarity, coherence and organization)</strong></td>
<td>The work is extremely well written, and develops arguments, ideas and evidence very effectively. The work is written in a logical, sophisticated and sequential manner. The writing accurately reflects the work. There is a highly effective use of graphs, tables, figures and examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The marking sheet for the SSRP report is overleaf.
Feedback Form for Small-scale Service Related Research Projects

Trainee Number: 
Marker: 
Moderator: Module Leader

Year: 1 
GRADE: PASS / CONDITIONAL PASS / REFERRED / FAIL 
Assessment: SSRP Conforms to regulations: YES/NO 

General evaluation and response to specific requests for feedback

Strengths of the work

Weaknesses of the work

If appropriate: Specific areas identified for improvement with suggestions for how improvements could be made

Overall evaluation

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Good Very good Excellent
6.4. Major Research Project

The major research project involves a series of milestones and will be carried out between the end of the first and the third year. The purpose of the research project is to evaluate trainees’ ability to carry out a relevant research project. Ideally, the work will lead to important, disseminated contributions to the clinical psychology knowledge base. The total process is likely to involve:

1. The generation of a research question,
2. Selection or adoption of a suitable research design,
3. Negotiating permission, supervision, access and ethical approval,
4. Choosing and piloting appropriate research methods,
5. Determining the feasibility of the research,
6. Data collection (if not using an existing database),
7. Documentation of findings using one of the approved styles, and
8. Disseminating the findings.

The research project must involve human participants, be based in the area of clinical psychology, broadly defined, and should make a valuable contribution to the knowledge base of clinical psychology.

The following milestones are important:
1. Identifying a research area that interests you and finding a supervisor,
2. Preparing a research proposal and an initial literature review/sign supervisory contract,
3. Defend your proposal,
4. Conduct your research,
5. Write the dissertation (partial research portfolio comprising literature review and research paper),
6. Take the viva voce exam,
7. Disseminate your results.
6.4.1 Choice of topic, supervisor(s) and the supervision process:
The research topic will ordinarily address a question that makes a theoretical and/or professional
contribution to clinical psychology. Projects using archival data and meta-analyses may be
acceptable alternatives to collecting original data. The programme follows a policy of matching
trainees with research active staff. The “supervisor research fair” is a ½ day scheduled each January
where potential supervisors and trainees can meet to speak about possible projects and mutual
research interests. A list of potential supervisors will be emailed out to trainees in December.
Trainees may further approach staff in the DClinPsy (directly) and the School (via the Research
Director) to act as potential supervisors of their major research. Trainees are then encouraged to
familiarize themselves with the publications and research interests of the possible supervisors, and
discuss these with the supervisors on the research fair day. After the research fair, trainees will have
approximately 2 weeks to further negotiate a potential match with supervisors they are interested in.
Trainees will then rank order their top 3 supervisor choices. This should be emailed to the research
administrator (Emma Woodcock). All trainees are required to specify three choices. The research
director will match the trainee to a supervisor based on rankings and availability. Matches will be
emailed out within 2 weeks of the ranking process.

All trainees are required to have a research active supervisor. Trainees may wish to have two
supervisors (e.g., secondary supervisor who is a clinical psychologist in the NHS with access to
patient populations, a supervisor with specialist content, methodological or statistical knowledge of
relevance to the thesis) who between them can provide appropriate supervision, although in this
case it may be helpful to nominate one as the primary supervisor. The percent time of the second
supervisor should be discussed between the supervisors and trainees. Options are: 50%, 25%, and
10%
Please note, the primary supervisor is expected to devote up to one hour per week supervising the
major research project. This includes time reading documents, planning, attending meetings, and
responding to correspondence.

In the summer of Year 1 (July), trainees must complete a contract specifying the responsibilities
and expectations of all parties (see the contract at the end of this section). You will need to
consider the BPS policy statement on authorship and publication credit for the contract. This
deadline is important to ensure trainees establish a research topic and are in a position to meet their
project commitments. The timing of this process may also be helpful if individuals experience
difficulties in finding an appropriate supervisor. The draft contract highlights research activities that
should be considered when clarifying roles and expectations. Please feel free to add to these as
required. All parties should keep a copy of the signed contract. If changes occur in the research
process a new contract should be developed and submitted to the Research Director. There is a
University of Exeter code of good practice for postgraduate supervision (http://
www.admin.ex.ac.uk/academic/tls/tqa/pgsuper.htm) which you might find helpful in consideration
of responsibilities of supervisors and students. While not developed specifically for the DClinPsy
programme, there are components of the code which are relevant to our research practice.

The exact role that your field supervisor plays should be discussed at the outset of the research and
be figured into the research contract.

In line with university policy, trainees should keep notes of supervision sessions and share these
with supervisors. Trainees should participate in the MYPGR system.
http://utils.exeter.ac.uk/acadsys/sits/mypgr/ (guidelines and guidebook available). This is an
interactive supervision tracking system required by the College for all PGR students. You should
record your meeting dates and supervision notes on this system. The system will send an email to
your supervisor, who will then sign off on the note Your notes should include the content of the
supervision session and any actions..

At the end of each academic year (approximately April/May), trainees and supervisors are required to fill out an annual progress report. This progress report will be circulated at the designated review time. Reports should be returned to the research administrative assistant, who will compile them. The Senior Management Group and the Clinical Research Director will review the reports, noting any concerns about timely progress. If there is a concern, these will be flagged up and discussed with the trainee and supervisor and an action plan will be put in place should concerns be further validated upon discussion. The action plan is intended to assist the trainee in making appropriate progress. If appropriate progress on that particular project is not possible, or if mitigating circumstances are present, steps to assist the trainee in completing a research project in an appropriate time frame will be discussed.

It is also wise to seek advice about library resources, analyses, quality control and statistics, as appropriate, before beginning the research. Trainees are encouraged to make use of local resources in the University and the NHS (see section on research support).
Supervisory contract for DClin Psych dissertation

Between

Trainee
Name:_____________________________________________________________________
Contact details:_______________________________________________________________________________________________

And supervisor(s)

Principal Supervisor
Name:_____________________________________________________________________
Contact details:_______________________________________________________________________________________________

2nd Supervisor
Name:_____________________________________________________________________
Contact details:_______________________________________________________________________________________________

for a research project titled:___________________________________________________________________________

starting from:______________________ ending: when the trainee passed (i.e. after required amendments have been made by the trainee after the viva and approved by the examiner).

Purpose and milestones:
The dissertation supervision is established in order to support the trainee to successfully submit a research dissertation that follows the BPS/CTCP criteria and involves the following milestones and deadlines1:

1 Dates to be inserted by the trainee before the contract is signed

(1) Generating the research question, date __________________________
(2) Development of research plan, date __________________________
(3) Discussion and presentation of the dissertation proposal with supervisors, peer trainees and research tutors during “first year presentation”, date __________________________
(4) Submission of a written dissertation proposal that has been approved by all supervisors for internal review, date __________________________
(5) Addressing the proposal reviewer’s comments (see handbook for grades and time frame)
(6) Seeking ethics approval by the School of Psychology Ethics Committee (obligatory) and the NRES (if necessary), informing the academic administrator about progress with these date __________________________
(7) Registering the project with Research Governance at the University of Exeter and the appropriate NHS trust (if necessary) date __________________________
(8) Participant Recruitment, date __________________________
(9) Data collection, date __________________________
(10) Data analysis, date __________________________
(11) Submission of first draft of literature review to supervisor(s), date __________________________ (to be agreed between trainee and supervisor)
(12) Submission of first draft of empirical paper to supervisor(s), date __________________________ (to be agreed between trainee and supervisor)
(13) Submission of dissertation, date __________________________
(14) Presentation of dissertation results for peers and research tutors as a viva preparation, date: __________________________
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(15) Viva voce examination, date________
(16) Addressing the examiners’ requests for amendments (see handbook for grades and time frame)
(17) Submission of final, amended and approved version of the dissertation (see handbook for specific requirements)

The contract involves for the trainee:
(1) Meeting deadlines (official and internally agreed ones)
(2) Responding to correspondence from supervisor (e-mails, phone calls)
(3) Keeping all supervisors informed about their progress, taking responsibility for their own dissertation and bringing issues to the attention of the supervisor and/or research coordinator
(4) Prepares for supervisory meetings
(5) Keeping a log book about all meetings, writing a brief memo to all supervisors after meeting outlining issues discussed and agreed action

The contract involves for the supervisor:
(1) Taking time for regular meeting with trainee,
(2) Monitoring the trainee’s progress and raising attention to issues to be solved
(3) Giving regular feedback and advice on dissertation proposal, ethics application, progress reports and at least one draft of the dissertation
(4) Helps trainee preparing for the viva
(5) Supports trainee in addressing examiners requests for amendments
(6) If more than one supervisor is involved: a clear distribution of responsibilities may be helpful and can be stated here:

○ Role of Principal supervisor:______________________________________________
○ Role and % of time of 2nd supervisor:_______________________________________

Publication policy:
(1) The trainee is strongly advised to submit a version of the dissertation to a peer-reviewed journal. Ideally, this should be accomplished in the first year after the training finished; after this period, the supervisor may decide to publish the project or parts of the project in order to comply with ethical and research governance guidelines. The trainee will be informed about this and is an important co-author (i.e. second or joint first author). Note: BPS guidelines state that if the project has not been submitted for publication within 2 years, the supervisor may submit and put him or herself as first author (barring that the trainee has not made substantial progress towards submitting the article),
(2) Trainee and supervisor should communicate about this early on and agree (if necessary in writing) about authorship and order of authors and procedures of writing up. They should be guided by the APA and BPS recommendations available in the handbook when this decision is made. Usually, the trainee is the first author unless (a) other agreements have been made, (b) the trainee fails to prepare the manuscript(s) within two year after the submission and (c) major intellectual input for the project came from the supervisor(s) and the trainee mainly recorded data for a previously designed project.
(3) To avoid confusion, both parties should communicate about this transparently and also follow their “common sense” and sense of “good style”. Supervisors see themselves in a mentoring role for training the inexperienced but motivated trainee in scientific writing.
**Additional agreements:**

Frequency of meetings:________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

Individual agreements (e.g. on authorship, on what to do in cases of unavailability of the principal supervisor etc.):

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

At least three copies of this contract are signed, one remains with the trainee, one with the supervisor(s) and one remains with the Programme Administrator Emma Woodcock and/or the trainee’s research file.

Signatures

Trainee:____________________________________________ Date:___________________

Principal supervisor:___________________________________ Date:___________________

2nd supervisor:_________________________________________ Date:__________________
6.4.2. Research Proposal
The research proposal provides a detailed description of the work that trainees plan to conduct as part of their major research project. The proposal should be no longer than 3,000 words (excluding appendices) and should comprise the following (as appropriate, see suggested marking criteria below):

1. Title page including (see an example outline at the end of section 6.4):
   1.1 Provisional title of major research project,
   1.2 Name of trainee,
   1.3 Names of supervisors: Main research supervisor and field collaborator(s) (including full name and position held),
   1.4 Target journal,
   1.5 Proposed research setting,
   1.6 General statement that the work contributes to the overall D ClinPsy degree,
   1.7 Word count,
   1.8 Date of submission.

2. Background (a summary only of the rationale which mentions the critical theoretical and empirical background to aims and hypotheses, i.e. the background should lead logically to the aims; note: this section is not meant to be a repetition of the literature review)

3. Aims, hypotheses and/or research questions

4. Methods
   4.1 Design (brief outline of how the design will address the aims and/or answer the hypotheses)
   4.2 Sample/participants (inclusion and exclusion criteria, recruitment, sample size)
   4.3 Power analyses and justification of sample size (if appropriate)
   4.4 Method of data collection (list of measures used or interview method chosen and their rationale)
   4.5 Procedure (stages involved in carrying out the design)
   4.6 Proposed data analysis strategy

5. User Consultation (this includes consideration of the mechanisms for consulting with relevant users/carers)

6. Ethical approval and considerations (specify from whom ethical approval will be sought. Trainees should identify any ethical considerations and how they plan to manage these. Possible ethical considerations include, informed consent, confidentiality, freedom from coercion or deception, debriefing, use of research results, participation of vulnerable groups, personally or socially sensitive topics). This should be supplemented with a major research risk matrix. The example provided at the end of section 6.4 is a programme-based major research risk matrix which should be adapted for your particular project.

7. Timeline (table of the tasks and proposed deadlines for completion of the tasks, which will be reviewed at the end of Year 2 to ensure it meets research needs)

8. Feasibility (of all aspects, particularly in relation to data collection, to indicate the project can be completed in the time available)

9. Significance/contribution to knowledge (original contribution to clinical psychology and clients and projected benefits of the work upon dissemination)

10. Brief plan for dissemination of results

11. Signatures from supervisor(s) and field collaborator are essential. The assignment will be handed back, with penalty for late submission if this applies, if signatures are not provided.

12. Appendices: This section should include the participant information sheet, consent form (if no consent form, please explain how participants’ implicit informed consent will be obtained) and all forms, questionnaires, scales and interview schedules that participants will be asked to
6.4.2.1 How to get best support for writing the research proposal?
Guidelines for writing and evaluating the research proposal in its entirety are outlined below. Feedback on the research proposal can be sought from research supervisors prior to final submission of the work. Trainees are strongly encouraged to seek clear direction from their research supervisors who are allowed to comment on a single draft only of the work; and then only in very general terms, not fine detail. They may comment on the overall balance and content of the work and, for instance, can highlight the omission of key references and studies in the background section or problems in the proposed methodology, analysis strategy and ethical issues relevant to the proposal. It will be up to the trainee to ensure that the draft is submitted to supervisors within a reasonable timeframe and is of a sufficiently high quality to ensure they receive maximum benefit from this feedback.

6.4.2.2 Procedures for the Assessment of the Research Proposal
Assessment of the research proposal is summative. The assessment will occur in a “mini-viva.” The mini-viva is a meeting with your internal marker (generally a research tutor), yourself, and a moderator (the research director, deputy director, or some other appropriate individual). The marker and moderator will have read your literature review and proposal. The marker will ask you questions about the piece. The moderator’s role is to primarily oversee the process, although s/he may also ask you some questions. After the mini-viva, the marker and moderator will decide a mark. The moderator will ensure that the marking procedure is consistent across markers. You will receive written feedback about your mark, based on both your written work and the responses to your questions in the “mini-viva.” If you have questions about the process or your feedback, you may direct these to your research tutor. The research proposal is marked using the following specific guidelines.
6.4.2.3 Guidelines for a good Research Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marking criterion</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROPOSAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Clear and concise statements explaining the rationale for the research is provided. The rationale is both understandable and convincing. Relevant theory is described briefly and is explicitly linked with the literature review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims, research questions and hypotheses</td>
<td>The proposal contains clear and concise statements of research aims, research question(s) and hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. METHODOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and method</td>
<td>The study design is well described and is clearly appropriate to the research aims. Justification for the methods and measures used is informed by theory and there is a clear rationale for how they will address the research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample/participants</td>
<td>Participants are clearly described and appropriate for the research. Inclusion and exclusion criteria are explicit and there is clear justification for the sample size (including a power analysis where appropriate). The recruitment strategy is understandable, convincing and feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>The description of the procedure is thorough, logical and coherent. All stages involved in conducting the research are clearly described and the approach feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis strategy</td>
<td>The analysis strategy is clearly described and optimal in addressing the research question(s). There is a thorough justification of the strategy and evidence of in-depth consideration of alternative approaches, where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical considerations</td>
<td>There is a thorough treatment of relevant ethical issues that may arise in the conduct of the research (e.g., risks and inconveniences, recruitment, confidentiality, data protection, informed consent, criteria for participant withdrawal, termination of the research, adequacy of research site).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>The timeframe proposed is entirely appropriate and feasible, taking a thorough account of potential difficulties at each stage of the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance and contribution to knowledge</td>
<td>The potential contribution to knowledge is clearly explained and very compelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination plan</td>
<td>Plans for dissemination are clearly described, highly relevant and will target the appropriate audiences to ensure the maximum likelihood of the work having an important impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the writing and presentation (clarity, coherence and organization)</td>
<td>The proposal is extremely well written, and develops arguments, ideas and evidence very effectively. The work is written in a logical, sophisticated and sequential manner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is the marking sheet for the research proposal.
Feedback Form for the Research Proposal

Trainee:  
Marker:  
Supervisor:  Module Leader  
Moderator:  

Year:  2  
Grade:  PASS / CONDITIONAL PASS / REFERRED / FAIL  
Assignment:  Literature Review and Research Proposal  
Conforms to regulations:  YES/NO  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Requires work</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims/objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and sample size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of outcome measure(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Evaluation and response to specific requests for feedback:

If appropriate: specific areas identified for improvement with suggestions for how improvements could be made

Overall evaluation

Unsatisfactory  Satisfactory  Good  Very good  Excellent
RESEARCH PROPOSAL SUGGESTED OUTLINE

PROVISIONAL TITLE

TRAINEE NAME:

SUPERVISORS — PRIMARY: (name, position held and affiliation)

SECONDARY: (name, position held and affiliation)

FIELD COLLABORATOR: (name, position and affiliation)

TARGET JOURNAL:

PROPOSED RESEARCH SETTING:

GENERAL STATEMENT THAT WORK HAS BEEN SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DOCTORATE IN CLINICAL AND COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY DEGREE

WORD COUNT:

DATE OF SUBMISSION:

2. BACKGROUND (a summary only of the rationale which mentions the critical theoretical and empirical background to aims and hypotheses, i.e. the background should lead logically to the
aims; note: this section is not meant to be a repetition of the literature review)

3. AIMS, HYPOTHESES AND/OR RESEARCH QUESTIONS

4. METHODS
   4.1 Design (brief outline of how the design will address the aims and/or answer the hypotheses),
   4.2 Sample/participants (inclusion and exclusion criteria, recruitment, sample size),
   4.3 Power analyses and justification of sample size (if appropriate),
   4.4 Method of data collection (list of measures used or interview method chosen and their rationale),
   4.5 Procedure (stages involved in carrying out the design),
   4.6 Proposed data analysis strategy.

5. USER CONSULTATION

6. ETHICAL APPROVAL AND CONSIDERATIONS

7. TIMELINE

8. FEASIBILITY

9. SIGNIFICANCE/CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

10. BRIEF PLAN FOR DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS

11. SIGNATURES

12. APPENDICES:

   Will the research involve any of the following people?
   1. Children under 16 years        Yes/No
   2. Persons with special needs      Yes/No
   3. Persons with mental health disorders  Yes/No
   4. Persons who are detained       Yes/No

   If "Yes" to any of the above, please describe:

   1. Will feedback/debriefing be provided Yes/No/N.A.
   2. Will subjects have the right to withdraw Yes/No*/N.A.
   3. Will records remain confidential  Yes/No*/N.A.
   4. Will anonymity be ensured       Yes/No*/N.A.
   5. Will the study involve `deception' Yes*/No/N.A.
   6. Will invasive procedures be included Yes*/No/N.A.

   If "*" to any of above, please elaborate

SIGNATURES

Trainee:
Supervisor:

Field Collaborator:

Statistical Advisor (if required):

Date:

APPENDICES
Participant information sheet, consent form (if no consent form, please explain how participants’ implicit informed consent will be obtained) and all forms, questionnaires, scales and interview schedules that participants will be asked to complete.
## MAJOR RESEARCH RISK MATRIX: DClinPsy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Risk</th>
<th>Management of risk</th>
<th>Level of risk, in light of management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining confidentiality and anonymity</td>
<td>- Use of participant codes where possible, not names</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Storage of names and codes separate from data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use of pseudonyms in any write-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use of password protected computers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Safe storage of data, in lockable cabinets where possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking confidentiality (e.g., due to risk of self-harm or injury)</td>
<td>- Identified in research proposals where appropriate.</td>
<td>Low-medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Any arising would be discussed with research supervisor and field collaborator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant and researcher safety, when seeing people in their own homes</td>
<td>- Trainees, who are employees of the NHS, apply NHS lone worker policy</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Issues discussed with research supervisors and field collaborators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of data</td>
<td>- Researcher to ensure two copies of data; one raw and one for computer entry or transcription.</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Researcher and supervisor identify means for safe storage of data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional distress in the course of research</td>
<td>- Management plan identified in research proposal and judged by (a) independent scientific review panel and (b) ethics committee (either NHS or University as appropriate)</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Suitability and general management of research project | - All trainees supported by research supervisor and in many cases, field collaborators.  
- Research proposal is evaluated for scientific quality and feasibility. Any potential problems or risks identified need to be addressed before project is passed.  
- Trainees have access to research consultancy to obtain independent feedback should they raise concerns in this area. | low |
| Feasibility of project | - Considered by trainee, supervisor and field collaborator (where appropriate) in development of project.  
- Evaluated in the assessment process through independent scientific review | Low - medium |
| Sufficient resources to conduct research | - Material resources identified as part of research proposal and evaluated for feasibility.  
- Appropriate consideration has been given to the number of participants required for projects (e.g., power calculation, saturation).  
- Research time allocated in the DClinPsy programme. | Low-medium |
| Health and Safety | - As NHS employees all trainees receive instruction about health and safety procedures  
- Incidents managed by either | low |
R50

University of NHS health and safety procedures, as appropriate.
6.4.3. Dissertation (Partial research portfolio)

There are two components to the major research submission (dissertation). The first is a literature review and the second is a report of the conduct of your major research in the format of a journal manuscript with expanded appendices. The partial portfolio sent for examination by the external examiners must include: the literature review and the, research paper.

6.4.3.1 Literature Review

The substantive review should be prepared in the format of either a clinical psychology review journal (e.g., Clinical Psychology Review, Psychological Review or Psychological Bulletin) or in the form of a Cochrane Library review. The Cochrane Collaboration, responsible for the preparation, maintenance and promotion of accessible scientific reviews into the effects of health care intervention, provide useful resources (see http://www.cochrane.org/index.htm). There are helpful “how to” accounts for writing a review in the APA Publication Manual (6th ed.) (2009), Bem (1995), Rosnow and Rosnow (1998) Sternberg (1993; 2000) and Locke et al. (2000). Examples are the Cochrane Library reviews, selected articles in Clinical Psychology Review, and Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy and Psychological Bulletin. See also examples of book chapter formats such as that by Kazdin (1998) “Methodological issues and strategies in clinical research” and Barker et al., (2002) “Research methods in clinical and counselling psychology.” There is engaging and useful advice for writing a methodology paper in Maxwell and Cole (1995). The review should be no longer than 4,000 words. The trainee may very appropriately, but not necessarily, write the review with an eye to subsequent submission for publication.

The review should include:

1. A statement of the topic area
2. A clear search/research question,
3. A description of the search strategy (databases searched, keywords, timescales, search limitations, inclusion/exclusion criteria),
4. A summary of the articles included in the review (possibly?),
5. a description of the way in which the themes in the literature are organised by the author for review,
6. Conceptual and definitional problems,
7. A review of the theoretical and research literature,
8. A review of the methodologies available to research the topic,
9. A critical appraisal of the potential research methodologies, in terms of their advantages and disadvantages in relation to the topic, highlighting key studies and key methodological problems.
10. an overview of the review process including gaps in existing knowledge,
11. future directions, and
12. A copy of instructions for authors for the nominated journal.

6.4.3.2. Research Paper

The Research Paper must be prepared in the format of a targeted journal. This refers to aims and scope, manuscript presentation (which includes tables and figures) and referencing style. Please check with supervisors and research tutors that the nominated journal is appropriate, both for content and length. Some journals stipulate a lower word count than that recommended by the programme for this piece of work, in this case you should write in the
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At minimum the research paper should include the following:

1. **Title page:** containing title; names of trainee, supervisor(s) and field collaborator; title of nominated journal and statement indicating that the manuscript has been submitted in partial fulfilment of a Doctoral degree in Clinical Psychology; and word count,

2. **Table of contents:** Listing all components of the manuscript and appendices in order with consecutive page numbering,

3. **Copy of Instructions for Authors:** From intended journal,

4. **Abstract:** written in the style and format of the intended journal

5. **Manuscript:** written in the style and format of the intended journal,

6. **Appendices:** Should include the following, but not necessarily in this order.
   - **Ethics documentation:** This should include letter(s) of approval, information sheets, consent forms etc.
   - **Questionnaires and interview format:** Copies of all questionnaires used in the research and interview questions should be included.

7. **Dissemination statement:** Statement of the intended dissemination including any evidence of dissemination (e.g., conference presentation).

To help you structure your dissertation, we strongly recommend that you access major research projects that have been submitted in recent years. Your supervisor and research tutors can advise on appropriate projects to access and copies are held in the School.

Please note that trainees are required to write up their major research project as a paper for a targeted journal, and we hope that many are eventually submitted for publication. However, it does not necessarily follow that all projects will be appropriate for publication; there are several circumstances, scientific and pragmatic, where submission would not be appropriate. Trainees are encouraged to discuss the appropriateness of publication with their supervisor and, if required, research tutors. Where it is appropriate to pursue publication, the expectation is that the major research write-up would constitute a sound first draft.

The maximum word count is 8,000 words for the manuscript. Please note that appendices are included in the marking criteria for the major research project (see Appendix R-11) and hence it is critical that this section supplements your manuscript appropriately and that its structure is logical to ensure it is easy to follow.

**6.4.3.3. Ethical approval and research governance**

All research projects involving NHS clients, staff premises or resources must have trust approval from the appropriate NHS R&D Department as well as ethical approval from an
NHS Research Ethics committee before it can begin. General helpful resources and information around ethical issues can be found on the homepage of the Integrated Research Application System (IRAS) (https://www.myresearchproject.org.uk/Signin.aspx) and ELE (see under resources). In addition, your local NHS R&D Department should be your first point of contact as they can offer advice on research governance and ethical approval procedures for their area. Information about the National Research Ethics Service and submissions can be found at: http://www.nres.npsa.nhs.uk/. A link to the electronic application is also available from this site. In addition, R&D management permission is required at each site before research can begin. Contact details of R&D Managers can be found at: http://www.rdforum.nhs.uk/links.htm. Applications for R&D management permission can be made alongside the application for ethics approval. The process can be lengthy, require amendments and, in most cases, a meeting with the committee. Trainees must take the initiative to approach the relevant Ethics Committee and the host R&D, and obtain applications to meet submission deadlines. Please plan for at least 3 months and upwards of 5 months to obtain ethics approval. Good practice guidelines for the conduct of psychological research in NHS settings can be downloaded from www.bps.org.uk/downloadfile.cfm?file_uuid=E615A15A-1143-DFD0-7E9F-60808ED2875D&ext=pdf. Also some specific guidelines have been developed for conducting research on the internet (see http://www.bps.org.uk/document-download-area/document-download$.cfm?file_uuid=2B3429B3-1143-DFD0-7E5A-4BE3FDD763CC&ext=pdf). Please check also ELE for the university’s indemnity requirements.

Once the project has been approved, you need to inform the Chair of the School of Psychology’s Ethics Committee in writing with relevant documentation attached (i.e., copies of the research proposal and letter from the Health Service Ethics Committee stating the research has been approved). The School’s Ethics Committee will issue de facto approval for projects approved by NHS Research Ethics Committees. However, if your research involves a population outside of the NHS’s remit, then you will need to request ethical approval from the School of Psychology Ethics Committee. Information about the ethics process is available online: http://psynet.ex.ac.uk:8200/gen/ethics/index_html/.

6.4.4. Viva

You will be asked to submit an abstract describing your major research normally 3 months prior to the actual submission date. This will be used to allocate appropriate examiners for the viva. There are two examiners, internal and external, who will be present at the viva. The purpose of the viva is to examine the partial research portfolio and, to this end, trainees will be asked to elaborate on and defend all aspects of their work including literature review, research paper and appendices, as appropriate. The viva examination is likely to be about an hour in length. The timing of the viva is planned for July in the final year, to enable revisions (if required) to be made before the end of the programme.

Approximately one month prior to the viva, you will have the opportunity to do a viva prep session with your supervisor. You should schedule this well in advance of the actual viva preparation date with your supervisor. The viva prep session is much like a mock viva. The session should give you a sense of the kinds of questions you may be asked in the viva, and give you the opportunity to discuss how you might respond to these with your supervisor. Materials can be found on ELE.
6.4.5 Procedures for the Assessment of the Major Research Project

The assessment of the major research project follows guidelines for the examination of University post-graduate research dissertations. These guidelines will be distributed to examiners and trainees in good time. The University has set procedures that have to be followed. There is a system of Faculty Boards for each Postgraduate Faculty. This Faculty Board is chaired by the Dean of the Postgraduate Faculty and has representatives from each School. The Board makes decisions on matters such as appointment of examiners, examiners' reports, re-registration, withdrawal and suspension. These decisions are then ratified by the University's Senate, which also meets about once a term. Remember that the process for examination and final award of your degree all has to be done via the Faculty Boards and Senate, so it is important for you and your supervisor not to lose track of the procedures you have to follow. The University of Exeter School of Psychology Office holds copies of Faculty Board papers.

Trainees will submit their partial research portfolios (comprising the literature review and the research paper) by a stated deadline (see programme timetable for submission dates). The partial research portfolios will be sent to an external and internal examiner as soon as they are available. Both examiners mark the literature review and the research paper separately and provide a preliminary report (see marking sheet at the of this section).

It is a University requirement that candidates for the DClinPsy degree normally have a viva examination. The Research and Programme Directors are responsible for organising and coordinating the vivas (see programme timetable for viva date). Examiners for research work will have suitable research qualifications, although it will not always be possible for examiners to have direct experience in the topic area of the submitted work. Under no circumstances will the research supervisor for a piece of assessed work also be the examiner. The two examiners will meet before each viva to discuss the partial portfolio and the format that the viva will take. The external examiner acts in a primary role, with internal examiner serving in a secondary role. As well as assessing the work, the internal examiner is responsible for ensuring that the viva is conducted in an even-handed, constructive way that is in line with University regulations. After the viva, the examiners meet again to recommend a grade (excellent/very good; good/satisfactory; requires revisions; fail), the nature of any required further work and the general feedback to be given to the trainee.

Once the examiners have agreed upon a grade for the work, the nature of any required further work and the general feedback to be given to the trainee, all information is passed to the Board of Examiners for discussion and ratification. The Board of Examiners then makes the examination decisions.

The marking conventions for the major research project are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irredeemable</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>New project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Referred</td>
<td>&gt;8 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Conditional Pass</td>
<td>&gt;4-8 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Pass – with minor changes</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If the work is awarded a Pass—with minor changes, or conditional pass, the nature of the corrections will be specified. Where the Board recommends a pass with minor changes, a deadline for corrections would normally be no longer than four weeks. In the case of a conditional pass, the deadline will be no more than 4 weeks for changes to be resubmitted. In both cases, changes will be assessed by the internal examiner.

If the work is to be conditional pass, there will be a clear statement indicating those aspects of the work that the Examination Board regards as requiring changes. The examiners and the Programme Director should set a date for resubmission (normally two dates are specified with the resubmission being “no earlier than” and “no later than” the nominated dates). For referred work, sufficient time should be given for the work to be conducted. This may require further supervision, which under no circumstances should be from the examiners. Referred work is reassessed by the external and internal examiners and may only be graded pass, conditional pass or fail.

As in the general handbook, on re-submission the markers ensure only that the areas identified for change are addressed. If the research project fails, the trainee is given a further opportunity to conduct and complete a new major research project. The Board of Examiners and the Programme Director would set an appropriate deadline. The new project will be examined by an external and internal examiner (to include a viva). If the new major research project fails again, the examiners will recommend to the Board of Examiners that the trainee fail the research module and the programme.

After the Board of Examiners meeting, the responsibility for completing the “Report of the Examiners on the examination of a candidate for a degree of DClinPsy” (see Appendix R-12) is given to the internal examiner. The examiners’ report should provide an outline of the strengths and weaknesses of the work and an overall evaluation of the work. The overall evaluation (excellent, very good, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory) is derived across the criteria for each section of the work. In the case of a conditional pass, the overall evaluation could still be excellent, very good, good or satisfactory. Work that is referred is normally unsatisfactory in the overall evaluation. The examination report is passed to the Postgraduate Faculty Office for processing and to the trainee as feedback. Please note, where the Board of Examiners recommends the award of conditional pass, the report is not submitted to Faculty for approval until all submitted copies of the partial research portfolio have been amended and the amendments approved.

Assessment criteria
The major research project will be evaluated against the following criteria:

1. contribution to knowledge in clinical and/or community psychology,
2. relevance to clinical and/or community psychology practice,
3. quality of the research project’s literature review,
4. quality of the research questions, aims and where appropriate hypotheses,
5. methodological adequacy,
6. quality of the analyses,
7. quality of the conclusions,
8. quality of the recommendations for theory, research and policy/practice,
9. quality of the writing and presentation (clarity, coherence and organisation),
10. economy of exposition,
11. appropriateness of research dissemination, and
12. professional and ethical conduct in research.
13. quality and brevity of expanded appendices

The criteria for the grade (pass, conditional pass, referred and fail) can be found in the general section of the Handbook covering assessment procedures and conventions.
### 6.4.5.1. Guidelines for a good Literature Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marking criterion</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. INTRODUCTION TO THE REVIEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of the title</td>
<td>The introduction makes explicit the topic for the proposed major research project and what the review will be about. It convincingly addresses the issues raised or implied by the title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene setting</td>
<td>The introduction provides a clear and compelling rationale for the choice of topic (e.g., theoretical importance, professional relevance, relevance to trainee's professional development). Key concepts and terms are defined in an informed and useful way. There is an understandable and convincing rationale for inclusion and exclusion of material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE REVIEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>The review has a clear and coherent overall structure, with good linkage between the elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherent and systematic development</td>
<td>Arguments and ideas are developed extremely effectively. The review is written in a logical, sophisticated and sequential manner. The review has a logical ordering of arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>The review answers the question and keeps to the point. The review contains only material that is highly relevant to the title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of sources</td>
<td>Within the scope of the review, the use of sources demonstrates an excellent/good understanding of how to select key material to support a strong argument. The review includes an appropriately wide selection of the most salient current material and the most important historical sources. The writer relies on high quality primary sources. Sources are cited appropriately and flawlessly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasp of theory</td>
<td>The review shows evidence of deep, thorough and extensive knowledge of relevant theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasp of methodology</td>
<td>The review shows evidence of deep, thorough and extensive knowledge of relevant methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive critical analysis</td>
<td>The review critically evaluates theories, ideas, evidence and methodology in a focused, rigorous, creative and balanced way to develop the arguments effectively, constructively and with insight. The material is well-integrated. The review uses the critical analysis constructively (e.g., to build theory and recommend further research).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application to major</td>
<td>The review applies itself to the proposed research topic in a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research project topic</td>
<td>Seamless, constructive fashion that demonstrates a high degree of understanding and research potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of professional issues</td>
<td>The review integrates professional issues in the context of the title and the main arguments in a coherent, thoughtful and constructive way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of original thought</td>
<td>The review's overall thesis builds on existing theory, evidence and ideas to provide an insightful and original synthesis, viewpoint or analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. CONCLUSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of the argument</th>
<th>The review's summary follows clearly and succinctly from the information and ideas presented in the review to provide a compelling rationale for the major research project.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>The review draws out the implications of the ideas in the main body of the work for the proposed major research project in a way that is extremely helpful in informing theory, research questions and/or methodology. The recommendations are firmly grounded in the review and are presented in a highly accessible way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. PRESENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Must be consistent with the nominated journal</th>
<th>Adheres to appropriate journal guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adheres to appropriate journal guidelines</td>
<td>The review adheres fully to the appropriate guidelines with regard to style and content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Spelling is correct throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing style</td>
<td>The review is written in a professional, disciplined, clear fluent and consistent style. The writing style always makes intended meanings clear. Whenever possible, a professional writing style is achieved in a vivid, imaginative and interesting way. The review has connections between sentences, paragraphs and sections that ensure clarity and readability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of References</td>
<td>All work cited is referenced accurately and in the appropriate style.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.4.5.2 Guidelines for a good research paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marking criterion</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to knowledge in clinical psychology</td>
<td>The work makes an excellent/very good actual or potential contribution to knowledge and understanding in clinical and/or community psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to clinical psychology practice</td>
<td>The work has excellent/very good relevance to the practice of clinical psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the literature review and research questions, aims and/or hypotheses</td>
<td>The literature review provides an excellent background to theory and research in the area, setting up the research questions/hypotheses in a compelling way. The review's overall thesis builds on relevant and up to date theory, evidence and ideas to provide an insightful, critical and original synthesis, viewpoint or analysis. Key concepts and terms are defined in an informed and useful way. There is an understandable and convincing rationale for inclusion and exclusion of material. As appropriate, the writer’s epistemological stance, theoretical orientation and implicit assumptions are explicitly identified and the work set in this context. The research question(s) / hypotheses are formulated optimally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological adequacy</td>
<td>The methods are extremely appropriate to the question set out for study. The description of the research methodology suggests the research question (s) / hypotheses can be answered fully and appropriately by the proposed study. It is possible to make a balanced judgment about the adequacy of the research method from a reading of the methods. As appropriate, replication of the methodology would be readily possible without further reference to other work. The write-up shows evidence of deep, thorough and extensive knowledge of relevant methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the analyses</td>
<td>The rationale for and actual analyses are described fully and well. The write up enables a knowledgeable reader to understand in detail why the data was analyzed/described as it was and exactly what was found. The analyses are highly appropriate, fully described and explicitly related to the research question in a focused and helpful way. The analyses are presented in the appropriate format, suggesting thorough and extensive knowledge of the analytic strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the conclusions</td>
<td>The conclusions are based seamlessly in the data and analyses presented. Interpretation of findings is extremely well grounded in the data and is very balanced and thoughtful. Conclusions are linked flawlessly to the discipline’s existing body of knowledge. Limitations of the research are correctly identified and discussed in a way that tempers the conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the recommendations for theory, research and policy/practice</td>
<td>The work draws out the implications of the research in a way that is extremely helpful in informing theory, further research and/or practice. Any recommendations are firmly grounded in the findings and are presented in a highly accessible way. The work spells out an original and compelling contribution to theory, research and practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the writing and presentation (clarity, coherence and organization)</td>
<td>The research paper is extremely well written, and develops arguments, ideas and evidence very effectively. The work is written in a logical, sophisticated and sequential manner. The work has a logical ordering of arguments. The writing accurately reflects the work. There is a highly effective use of graphs, tables, figures and examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy of exposition</td>
<td>The work is presented with an optimal balance of being succinct without any loss of important detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of research dissemination</td>
<td>The choice(s) of ways of disseminating the research suggest the appropriate audiences will be targeted and the form of dissemination ensures the highest likelihood of the work having a significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adheres to appropriate journal guidelines</td>
<td>The work adheres fully to the appropriate guidelines with regard to style and content (including tables and figures).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and ethical conduct in research</td>
<td>The work shows evidence of excellent / very good attention to all relevant professional and ethical issues. The work is sensitive to and respectful of participants and stakeholders in the research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback Form for Major Research Project

Student:
External examiner: Recorded:
Internal examiner:

Year: 3
Grade: PASS / CONDITIONAL PASS / REFERRED /FAIL
Assessment: Major research project Conforms to regulations: YES/NO

Part 1: Individual examiner’s report for the Major Research Project

(A) Literature Review:

General evaluation

Strengths of the work

Weaknesses of the work

If appropriate: Specific areas identified for improvement with suggestions for how improvements could be made

Overall evaluation of literature review

Irredeemable Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Good Very good/excellent
(B) Research Study:

General evaluation

Strengths of the work

Weaknesses of the work:

If appropriate: Specific areas identified for improvement with suggestions for how improvements could be made

Overall evaluation of research paper

Irredeemable  Unsatisfactory  Satisfactory  Good  Very good/excellent
Part 2: Joint examiners’ report for the Major Research Project

(C) Viva

(D) Suggested outcome for the Major Research Project
(taking together A-C; please highlight the suggested outcome)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irredeemable</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>New project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Referred</td>
<td>&gt;8 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Conditional Pass</td>
<td>&gt;4-8 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Pass – with minor changes</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good/Excellent</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RECORD OF MODULE RESULTS (INCLUDING DISSERTATION) AS APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODULE CODE</th>
<th>CREDIT VALUE</th>
<th>FULL TITLE</th>
<th>DATE OF PASSING</th>
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OVERALL MEAN_

OVERALL RECOMMENDATION (Tick one box only)

* (a) that the Degree of DClinPsych be awarded (please delete as appropriate)

* (b) that the Degree of DClinPsych be not awarded (please delete as appropriate)

* (c) that the candidate should pursue his/her studies and be re-examined by means of,

not earlier than____

and not later than____

* (d) that minor corrections to the dissertation be made to the satisfaction of the following examiners

__

not later than____

This should be confirmed to the Graduate School in writing.
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Approved by Dean of Postgraduate Studies ___Date___
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