



**1.5 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the Programme**

Further consideration, perhaps, of placement and academic tutors knowing when and how to flag a

# Collaborative Report

Exam board meeting: 14-Jun-2018

### 1.3 Teaching methods

## 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**



## Assessment Procedures

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

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

Mixed methodology approach still seems to work well, although we are still of the opinion that some skills and knowledge currently assessed in the OSCEs in final year could be signed off in earlier years in3Qq41.16 635.74 €

Ensure that it is made explicit to student, assessors and external examiners how the written finals examination maps to BVetMed course outcomes

**Action Deadline:**

01-Apr-2019

**Action assigned to:**

John Fishwick and Jill Maddison

**3.3 Consistency of the level of assessment with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ)**

Consistent with FHEQ level 6/7.

**Response from college requested: NO**

**3.4 Standard of marking**

Good evidence of consistent marking and double of CRQs within and between questions. Post hoc analysis of OSCE stations seems appropriate and resulted in removal of one station based on inconsistent marking by one assessor. OSCE scoring was consistent (inter-rater and intra-rater) from significant live observation and paper provisions.

**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**  
b71.48 843.2 323nq417.064 reQQq550.8 3-2(F7 9(H)-1E( ex)-strai-2(F7ic)-10(i)-1.16 537.31 509.64 23.04 reW\*nl



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

Consideration could be given to requiring a minimum mark for example 35% or 40% in each compulsory CRQ to ensure omnicompetence has been demonstrated.

As discussed previously, some of the activities assessed in OSCEs seem inappropriate for final examinations, and could be assessed earlier in the course or through a workplace-based assessment, allowing more complex and integrated OSCE stations which might test students' preparedness for practice better.

**Response from college requested: NO**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Jill Maddison**

**Course Director Response:**

. Note that if a minimum mark of 35% had been set this would not have changed the overall results. If a minimum mark of 40% had been set a very small cohort would have failed. Commented on previously and under review

**Action Required:**

**Action Deadline:**

**Action assigned to:**

### 3.7 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the procedures

**Response from college requested: NO**





**4.11 Appropriate procedures and processes have been followed**

**Yes**

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

**Response from college requested:**

## Completion

If you have identified any areas of good practice, please comment more fully here. We may use information provided in our annual external examining report:

**5.1 Do you have any suggestions for improvements based on experience at other institutes? We may use information provided in our annual external examining report:**

As discussed, concerns highlighted by external examiners about particular questions when circulated have not always been addressed,

**Response from college requested: NO**

Apologies for this oversight. In the future , we will make sure that the External Examiners receive feedback to their questions raised and, if so, the reasons for why their comments were not acted upon.

