

This appendix contains Course Director's/Year Leader's responses to 2016/17 External Examiners' comments and updates to actions from External Examiners' reports from previous years (if applicable).

As Course Director/Year Leader please ensure you reflect on External Examiners' comments in the Course Review section. Please ensure that any actions to be taken in response to these comments have been recorded in your Annual Quality Improvement Report.

For support or advice please contact Ana Filipovic, Academic Quality Officer 'Standards', afilipovic@rvc.ac.uk, 01707666938

Appendix 3 consists of:

a.	Updates to actions from previous years' reports
b.	2016/17 Collaborative Annual Report with responses from Course Director

<p>learning objectives and curriculum)</p>	<p>modules these appear appropriate as well. Given the extensive offering of elective modules these have not been evaluated thoroughly.</p> <p>Candidates who submit a short publication are sometimes disadvantaged by not including background work or negative results. Where author guidelines restrict the written submission significantly, candidates should be advised to include additional information</p>	<p>that as part of the restructured MVetMed, the module leader and deputy module leader for the Research module are already looking at the suitability of the Common Grading Scheme to mark dissertations and manuscripts with parity. We are also examining whether a move towards a manuscript format would be more appropriate, given the requirement for (almost all) residents to submit manuscripts for publications as part of attaining their credentials. As an aside, we have already performed an initial correlation of project performance vs protected time for research (as the amount of off-clinic time varies significantly depending on the specialty); from an analysis of 50 students (from the past 3 years), there is no significant correlation between these two parameters.</p> <p>Action Required: Ongoing monitoring and revision of assessment format for the research project</p> <p>Action Deadline: July 2018</p> <p>Action assigned to: Dr David Brodbelt and Dr Rob Fowkes</p>	
<p>3.2 Extent to which assessment procedures are rigorous</p>	<p>There is a rigorous process for assessment of projects. However some paperwork is inconsistent in its completion (declarations not present for all candidates).</p> <p>One project co-supervisor was assigned this project to mark, which is unsurprising given the small pool of examiners in some sub-specialties. Where possible this should be avoided. Given that both markers scored similarly and that we have also reviewed each submission this is more of a theoretical rather than an actual problem,</p>	<p>Whilst we note that the examiners have not requested a response, we thank them for raising this particular incident (which we believe to be an isolated case). For the past few years, the College has implemented a requirement for two independent examiners to assess major pieces of coursework – neither of whom should either be supervisors or involved with the project in any way.</p> <p>Action Required: Ongoing monitoring and implementation of assessment process</p> <p>Action Deadline: July 2018</p> <p>Action assigned to: Dr Vicky Lipscomb & Mr John Sanger</p>	<p>Please note the deadline is July 2018, no update available yet</p>
<p>3.7 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations</p>	<p>Some candidates have high Turnitin Plagiarism scores. Evidence that such high scores have been acted on should be mentioned.</p>	<p>Turnitin has been used extensively at the RVC for several years, partly as a tool to assist in detection of plagiarism, but also as an online coursework marking system. Both staff and students are given guidance and training on how to use Turnitin (for marking, or for submission purposes, respectively). Research conduct, plagiarism and</p>	<p>Please note the deadline is July 2018, no update available yet</p>

regarding the
procedures

Might want to consider whether
students with higher or equivalent
qualifications (e.g. PhDs) can use the
APL route for some aspects of the
core modules

Submission by publication
sometimes limits the extent of work
and can appear like a very small
body of work, especially where pilot
work is not available to examine.

Collaborative Report

Exam board meeting: 24-May-2017

Master of Veterinary Medicine, 2016/17

Lead examiner: Professor Carmel Mooney

Collaborating examiner(s): Dr Mark Bowen

The Programme

Assessment Procedures

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

3.1 Assessment methods (relevance to learning objectives and curriculum)

Adequate. Candidates were assessed using a variety of methods.

Response from college requested: **NO**

3.2 Extent to which assessment procedures are rigorous

The research component was marked by two people with an agreed final mark. Most marks from each of the two examiners were comparable.

One student submitted published work out with the regulations. This should be avoided and resubmission of the original project required if this occurs again.

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

Not applicable.

Response from college requested: NO

3.7 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the procedures

See above regarding spread of marks. It would also be advised that a standardised marking descriptor be devised to allow better assessment of each examiners marks, that would also provide more detailed feedback to the students.

COURSE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE

“This is covered in the RVC common grading scheme descriptors, see [Common Grading Scheme](#)”

4.7 The standards set for the awards are appropriate for qualifications at this level, in this subject

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

4.8 The standards of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

4.9 I have received enough support to carry out my role

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Excellent support both before and during visits to RVC.

Response from college requested: NO

4.10 I have received sufficient information to carry out my role (where information was insufficient, please give details)

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

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: NO

4.12 The processes for assessment and the determination of awards are sound

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested:

