

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' COMMENTS, 2012/2013

Course: BVetMed Year 3

Examination: BVet Med Year 3 2013

Examiner Comment	RVC Response	Actions
<p>Ms Andria Cauvin Prof Chris Proudman Dr Phil Scott</p>		<p>RVC list of actions for 2013-14</p>
<p>1. The Programme</p> <p>There was a disappointing fail rate in the EMQ paper on this occasion and a couple of questions were especially poorly answered and this is likely to have skewed the overall results. The internal examiners need to critically look at these questions and the corresponding teaching.</p>	<p>We are disappointed by the high fail rate in the EMQ paper, which occurred despite well-attended paper review and standard setting meetings. Particular attention will be paid to the quality of EMQs used in subsequent papers. We have critically evaluated the teaching and as a result each strand is introducing a session dedicated to clinical reasoning. We are confident that the content of the examination reflected the teaching delivered in the third year lectures, directed learning and clinical scenarios.</p>	<p><i>Insert Action:</i> Ensure high quality EMQ papers are mapped to the relevant teaching through more rigorous paper review and standard setting meetings. <i>Insert Deadline:</i> Preparation of spring 2014 papers <i>Responsible individual:</i> Exam Board Chair, Strand Leaders and question setters.</p>
<p>3. Assessment Process</p> <p>Some EMQs seem to fit more of the MCQ format and again internal examiners should try and rework these questions. This year the EMQ fail rate seems particularly high unlike in previous years where the opposite has been the case.</p>	<p>We will avoid the use of EMQ questions to examine those parts of the course better assessed by the use of MCQs.</p>	<p><i>Insert Action:</i> Review number of EMQ versus MCQ questions at call for questions. <i>Insert Deadline:</i> Preparation of spring 2014 papers <i>Responsible individual:</i> Exam Board Chair, Strand Leaders and the Director of Assessment.</p>

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' COMMENTS, 2012/2013

Course: BVetMed Year 3

Examination: BVet Med Year 3 2013

<p>4. Assessment Procedures There was a mixed response from internal examiners as to the external examiners comments during the proof reading stage. Our general feeling was that some of the concerns were not addressed and ultimately led to several questions being withdrawn.</p>	<p>We will ensure that all comments and amendments suggested by external examiners are acted upon in preparation of the final version of the paper or an explanation fed-back to the external examiner.</p>	<p><i>Insert Action:</i> Full response to external examiner comments on paper <i>Insert Deadline:</i> Preparation of spring 2014 papers <i>Responsible individual:</i> Exam Board Chair and Exams Officer</p>
<p>With regard to the timing of the external examiner's visits we would like to suggest that on the first day we start examiners convene midmorning to allow better travel arrangements and that the board meeting the following day is scheduled for midmorning allowing a lunchtime departure.</p>	<p>We will amend the timing of the external examiners' visit to fit this proposed schedule.</p>	<p><i>Insert Action:</i> Amend timing of external examiners visit to review examination results <i>Insert Deadline:</i> Spring 2014 external examiners visit <i>Responsible individual:</i> Exams Officer</p>

likely to have skewed the overall results. The internal examiners need to critically look at these questions and the corresponding teaching. Some of these questions were moderated as a result. There is always a disparity in overall marks with MCQs being answered better than EMQs but this year it was particularly marked. Some of this will reflect the stage the students are at in their teaching i.e. pre-clinical.

2. Candidates

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

- 2.1 impressions of candidates' specific areas of strength and weakness, as revealed by the assessment process
- 2.2 the quality of candidates' knowledge and skills, with particular reference to those at the top, middle or bottom of the range
- 2.3 the candidates' overall performance in relation to students at a similar stage on comparable courses in other institutions, where this is known to you

Type here

The AHEMS projects were of high quality and the pass rate was excellent (98%). The students are clearly putting in a lot of work and hopefully using their tutor's direction at an early stage of the project. Despite clear guidelines that statistics are not a crucial component of the project they seem to unduly preoccupied with statistics.

There seems to be some ambiguity as to the weighting of important key facts and what would be considered 'first day knowledge'.

Direct comparison with other institutes is difficult as courses are structured differently.

3. Assessment Process

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

- 3.1 the appropriateness of the assessment methods to the subject matter and their relevance to the learning objectives
- 3.2 the extent to which the assessment processes are rigorous**
- 3.2 whether the assessments reflected the syllabus adequately
- 3.3 the overall standard of marks
- 3.4 any changes from previous years in which you have examined

Type here

Currently the MCQ and EMQ format seems to be working well and the subjects covered in the third year do mostly lend themselves to the newer EMQ. There has been gradual improvement in the standard of the EMQs, but the internal examiners need to still critically review those questions less well answered. Performance statistics provided

to the external examiners were very helpful in this respect. Some EMQs seem to fit more of the MCQ format and again internal examiners should try and rework these questions. This year the EMQ fail rate seems particularly high unlike in previous years where the opposite has been the case.

4. Assessment Procedures

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

- 4.1 the administration of the examinations, e.g. time available for marking and moderation
- 4.2 arrangements for marking
- 4.3 procedures followed by the Board of Examiners
- 4.4 the participation of External Examiners in the process
- 4.5 adequacy of External Examiners' briefing
- 4.6 comparison with previous years in which you have examined

Type here

Administration of the exam process is good and runs smoothly. Computer marking provides a convenient and accurate method of marking a large number of scripts and the statistics generated are very useful in post-hoc evaluation.

There was a mixed response from internal examiners as to the external examiners comments during the proof reading stage. Our general feeling was that some of the concerns were not addressed and ultimately led to several questions being withdrawn.

With regard to the timing of the external examiner's visits we would like to suggest that on the first day we start examiners convene midmorning to allow better travel arrangements and that the board meeting the following day is scheduled for midmorning allowing a lunchtime departure.

5. Please delete responses as appropriate

- | | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|----|-----|
| 5.1 | Comments I have made in previous years have been acted upon | YES | NO | N/A |
| 5.2 | An acceptable response has been made | YES | NO | N/A |
| 5.3 | I approved the papers for the Examination | YES | NO | N/A |
| 5.4 | I was able to scrutinise an adequate sample of students' work and marks to enable me to carry out my duties | YES | NO | N/A |
| 5.5 | I attended the meeting of the Board of Examiners held to approve the results of the Examination | YES | NO | N/A |

Prepared by: Ana Filipovic

Date: 13th June 2013

5 of 6

- 5.6 Candidates were considered impartially and fairly YES ~~NO~~ N/A
- 5.7 The standards set for the awards are appropriate for qualifications at this level, in this subject YES ~~NO~~ N/A
- 5.8 The standards of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar YES ~~NO~~ N/A
- 5.9 The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted YES ~~NO~~ N/A

If you have replied No to any of these questions, please comment more fully:

Type here

If you have identified any areas of good practice, please comment more fully:

Type here

Andria Cauvin
Dr Phil Scott
Prof.Chris Proudman

15th May 2013