

ANNUAL QUALITY IMPROVEMENT REPORT 2017/18

Appendix 3: External Examiners' report

BVetMed Year 1



2.2 Quality of			
-----------------------	--	--	--

knowledge and skills, with particular reference to those at the top,

and support before and during the

	<p>consistently. This was highlighted when the externs reviewed the draft paper, but the problem persisted into the final version. We suggest that dividing PSQs into more, smaller sections may remedy this problem.</p> <p>PSQs 2: For question 3, the second marker disagreed with the marks for 50% of the papers assessed, yet signed off the marking as agreeing with the marking scheme.</p>	<p>To increase the number of PSQ from 4 to 6. To increase the number of essay questions to 12 (3x4 sections) with a student answering a question from each section. To work with the exam office to ensure that the wording of the rubrics on the cover sheet is systematic, free of errors and succinctly clear to the candidates.</p> <p>To address the issue of discrepancies between marks awarded by two or more makers of the same question through a departmental forum or meeting.</p> <p>Action Deadline: 25-Sep-2017</p> <p>Action assigned to: Dr Vicky Waring</p>	
<p>3.7 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the procedures</p>	<p>We welcome the statistical analysis with which we have been provided - it is impressive. In future, it would be good to receive an analysis of the relative</p>		

	<p>values are far below the representation of Animal Husbandry in the course, and certainly its importance in veterinary practice. This should be remedied in 2018, and the student told that this will occur,</p>	<p>Action Deadline: 15-May-2018</p> <p>Action assigned to: Troy Gibson, Vicky Waring and Exams office</p>	
--	--	---	--

Collaborative Report

Exam board meeting: 10-Jul-2018

Bachelor of Veterinary Medicine, Year 1, 2017/18

Lead examiner: Dr David Bainbridge

Collaborating examiner(s): Mr David Kilroy, Dr Ian Jeffcoate, Dr Karin Mueller

The Programme

Please comment, as appropriate, on the following aspects of the progrts (p) 671.1 nBT/F6 9.96 Tf1 0 0 1 41.2

Student performance

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

Assessment Procedures

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

3.1 Assessment methods (relevance to learning objectives and curriculum)

[DB] I had an interesting discussion with the examiners about

3.4 Standard of marking

(KM) You may wish to consider a common policy for marking a question where a large proportion of students have misunderstood the task set, so that each marker will treat such a situation in the same way. This is particularly relevant for the Essay paper, where students can choose from multiple questions.

DK: Some Paper 2 questions were very clearly and comprehensively annotated; some had little if any annotation. For failing students in particular, I think how and why marks are awarded should be made plain so that appropriate feedback can be given to the student.

[DB] I have some specific comments here regarding the PSQs:

The format of the different PSQs seemed quite heterogeneous – for example, the extent to which each question 'builds up' to higher levels of understanding or analysis. This did not render the exam unfair as all candidates must answer every question, but I think more consistency in this would be good in future.

In addition, some of the questions did not seem to be very 'problem solving'.

I will now make some specific comments about the PSQs, mainly because they seemed to be a valuable way of assessing the students, and their complexity means that there is more to say about them than is the case for the MCQs.

Q1. Good. Students at the RVC, as in every university, cannot seem to believe that the word 'list' means what it says!

Q2. Good, although as in most vet schools, students seem to think ruminants eat nothing but carbohydrates.

Q3. Section (e) could, in hindsight, have been slightly clearer about what was expected – i.e. endocrine/paracrine rather than specific examples. Also, some students, but not all, got full marks without mentioning the word 'paracrine'.

Q4. A few things.

d) Some of the marking seemed weirdly nit-picky. When the students are expected to describe the entire layout of the circulation for 2 marks, penalising them for writing 'pulmonary artery' instead of 'pulmonary trunk' seems a bit mean.

d) I suggested that the questions should be rephrased to explicitly exclude the need to discuss the hepatic portal system; this suggestion was not acted on and some candidates did waste valuable time describing that system, gaining no extra marks in the process

e) I also suggested that the type of 'reason' expected for inter-

answer should be accepted?

Response from college requested: NO

3.5 In your view, are the procedures for assessment and the determination of awards sound and fairly

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

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

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

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:

For assessments where a large number of examiners are involved with random allocation of students to these examiners, like the ISF Oral component, an ANOVA or similar may be useful to check for particularly harsh or lenient marking.

Response from college requested: NO