

ANNUAL QUALITY IMPROVEMENT REPORT 2015/16

Appendix 3: External Examiners' report

BVetMed Year 1

This appendix contains the December Year Leader's response to External Examiners' comments and updates to actions from 2014/15 External Examine

Update to 2013/14 actions:

Question	External Examiners' comments	Year Leader's response	2014/15 Update	2015/16 Update
1.4 <b>Resources</b>	The BVM programme structure is complex as a consequence of the integrated, systems approach. To assist stage-specific external examiners, the relationship between, for example, years 1 and 2 could be articulated. We believe such an exercise has been completed for accreditation purposes. This is an aspect which might usefully be tabled at future INSET training.	The external examiners receive the course handbook in advance of proposed visits. The external examiners also received a briefing on the course content and level of knowledge expected for a particular strand or module for each of the years 1 and 2 at the time of the examination. It is however conceivable that very clear demarcation is not very easy to discern in a spiral curriculum like ours. ACTION: To provide an easy to grasp academic snapshot (map) showing interconnection and flow of teaching between years 1 and 2.	This has not been achieved but the process is underway to provide an easy to grasp integration map of teaching in 2015/16. It is however good to note that this was not an issue in the last academic year the reason most likely being that as all examiners are doing their second round of examining at the RVC and well acquainted with the teaching program.	This will be progressed through the mapping of learning outcomes exercise in 2016/17 for the whole BVetMed curriculum.  <b>An email is to be sent out to all external examiners at the same time the summer exams are sent out for moderation ( April 2017) seeking clarification as to which specific document each of the examiners would like see/ has failed to access via the RVC website or otherwise would like to receive in a different format if access on the website is not possible.</b>

Update to 2014/15 actions:

Question	External Examiners' comments	Year Leader's response	2015/16 Update
2.2 Quality of candidates' knowledge and skills, with particular reference to those at the top, middle or bottom of the range	A high proportion of students gain an overall mark in the either distinction- or merit-level category. 0 g0 Gh(n)3( 55(st 5-2		

3.2 Extent to which

3.4 Standard of marking	have been covered in lectures superficially as opposed to areas/strands which have been covered in greater depth, i.e. the transition needs to take into account the extent of study in a particular strand. Overall, the standard of marking was high and in line with marking guidelines. However, it was noted that in regard of		
-------------------------	---	--	--

	<p>The absence of Speedwell analysis data for Paper 1 (MCQ) was disappointing, as this would have been very useful in gauging the efficiency and accuracy of the MCQ standard setting (performed for the first time in 2014-2015).</p>		
<p>4.1 Comments I have made in previous years have been addressed to my satisfaction</p>	<p>Comments made in last year's Candidate in marking objectives in acknowledge that ethical areas should be treated with equal respect to both sides of the debate</p> <p>The examiners consider this has not been addressed and this was a significant factor in the problem encountered in the marking of an essay question in Paper 3, June 2015 (see Section 3.4). Subjective questions should be avoided in essay style questions.</p>	<p>The observations made were valid.  Action Required: That the concerned internal examiner (s) as well as the staff in PS strand be made aware of the need to provide model answers that allow for the alternative views in questions dealing with ethical issues.  Action assigned to: Elizabeth Chan/ Raymond Macharia</p>	<p>Completed</p>



Response from college requested:

**NO**

**Raymond Macharia-Year Leader response-**

An email is to be sent out to all external examiners at the same time the summer exams are sent out for moderation ( April 2017) seeking clarification as to which specific document each of the examiners would like see/ has failed to access on the RVC website or otherwise would like to receive in a different format if access on the website is not possible.

## Student performance

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

**2.1 Students' performance in relation to those at a similar stage on comparable courses in other institutions, where this is known to you**

The student ability appears to be commensurate with that of similar cohorts at other UK Universities. The three examiners (from three separate Universities) cover most aspects of the course.

Response from college requested: **NO**

**bottom of the range**

**particular reference to those at the top, middle or**

A high proportion of students gain an overall mark in the either distinction- or merit-level category. From scrutiny of the various elements of the assessed work for these students, it is clearly evident such awards are deserving. In contrast, it is also clear that the relatively small group of students in the bottom range display a uniformly weak performance across the board.

Response from college requested: **NO**

Response from college requested: **NO**



## Assessment Procedures

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

### 3.1 Assessment methods (relevance to learning objectives and curriculum)

The range of assessment methods is in general appropriate (see comment regarding Essays in 3.2) and aligned to the stated learning objectives.

Response from college requested: **NO**



**3.5 In your view, are the procedures for assessment and the determination of awards sound and fairly conducted? (e.g. Briefing, Exam administration, marking arrangements, Board of Examiners, participation by External Examiners)**

There is excellent administrative support for the assessment process provided by the examinations office; this extends from the timely drafting and review of papers right through to the board meeting.

As discussed in Section 3.4, there was an issue regarding the adherence to the CGS, which was a reoccurrence from last year. However, marking arrangements were dealt with efficiently by the examination chair, both with the support of the examinations office administration and in full consideration of the views of the external examiners. As such, no candidates in the examination were disadvantaged and the procedures for assessment and the determination of awards were therefore sound and fairly conducted.

**Response from college requested: YES**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Raymond Macharia**

**Course Director Response:**

I concur with the examiners observation.

**Action Required:**

As stated in 3.4 above, the mix-up in the grading scheme was quickly addressed. A thorough scrutiny of all questions and their model answers will be put in place to forestall such an unfortunate circumstance.

**Action Deadline:**

01-Apr-2017

**Action assigned to:**

Raymond Macharia/ Exams office

**3.6 Opinion on changes to the assessment procedures from previous years in which you have examined**

ded and the new developed methodology should be further disseminated as a pedagogical advancement.

Although we commend the change in structure of Papers 2 and 3, in response to our comments in the 2014-15 report, which now no longer allow students to avoid certain subject areas, we still question the availability of choice within such exam papers within a professional course.

We would also again like to raise concerns regarding the removal of sample marking if essay style questions are to be retained (see 3.4).

**Response from college requested: NO**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Raymond Macharia**

**Course Director Response:**

**4.1 Comments I have made in previous years have been addressed to my satisfaction**

**No**

**Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:**

See section 3.4 for areas which have and have not been addressed following previous years report.

**Response from college requested: YES**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Raymond Macharia**

**Course Director Response:**

A response have been made in in section 3.4

**Action Required:**

**Action Deadline:**

**Action assigned to:**

**4.2 An acceptable response has been made**

4.4 I wa  
my duties

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Raymond Macharia

Course Director Response:

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

**4.9 I have received enough support to carry out my role**

**Yes**

