
BVETMED YEAR 4 EXTERNAL EXAMINERS REPORTS

 Responses to 2017/18 External Examiners' Comments and an update to 2016/17 Actions

To be considered at the Spring TQC Meeting

- a. Update to actions from 2016/17 - the full report available [here](#):

External Examiners' comments	Year Leader's response	Update
1.5 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the Programme <i>Comments on Integrated Reasoning question (full comment in 16/17 report)</i>	Action Required: - To instigate further formative opportunities in preparation for Integrated Reasoning questions, including the emphasis on Professional Studies for students before the Year 4 Exam - To bring to the attention of the Working Party on BVetMed Assessment the comments and observations of external examiner on the Year 4 exam. Action Deadline: 01-Jun-2017 Action assigned to: Dan Chan	Ongoing
2.2 Quality of candidates' knowledge and skills, with particular reference to those at the top, middle or bottom of the range ... the level of assessment in some of the clinical reasoning questions may be too advanced for the level and experience of students at this stage in the course (<i> full comment in 16/17 report</i>)	The expectations of Year 4 students before they enter clinical rotations and what the Year 4 Exam and Finals should look like will be explore as the BVetMed Course undergoes a Curriculum Review this year. A special working party on BVetMed Assessment is being formed and will be tasked with resolving these issues. Action Required: To bring to the attention of the BVetMed Curriculum Review committee and the BVetMed Assessment Working Party the concerns raised by the External Examiners on the Year 4 Exam Action Deadline: 01-Jun-2017 Action assigned to: Dan Chan	Ongoing

All other actions have been completed!

Collaborative Report

Exam board meeting: 15-Dec-2017

Bachelor of Veterinary Medicine, Year 4, 2017/18

Lead examiner: Dr Wendela Wapenaar

Collaborating examiner(s): Dr Clare Allen, Professor Robert Foale, Dr Mickey Tivers

The Programme

Please comment, as appropriate, on the following aspects of the programme:

1.1 Course content

Appropriate

Response from college requested: **NO**

1.2 Learning objectives, and the extent to which they were met

Appropriate

Response from college requested: **NO**

1.3 Teaching methods

Appropriate

Response from college requested: **NO**

1.4 Resources (in so far as they affected the assessment)

Appropriate

Response from college requested: **NO**

1.5 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the Programme

As last year, the performance on the Integrated Reasoning questions was disappointing compared to the performance on Paper 1. Formative opportunities in preparation for Integrated Reasoning questions, including the emphasis on Professional Studies for students before the Year 4 Exam were going to be offered and we are interested to hear how this was received/carried out. We understand that due to more pressing issues a curriculum review committee (tasked with defining the level of expectation of students at this stage in the course) has only recently been formed and no meeting has taken place. The Working Party on BVetMed Assessment (tasked to better define the assessment strategy of the course) may have met (this was not known to the course director) to discuss the concerns raised at last year's exam board. A plan with regards to discussing the issues raised in previous boards would be helpful as our main concerns this year relate to issues discussed last year. The Professional studies question was structured much better this year, which may explain the improved performance compared to last year.

Response from college requested: **YES**

COURSE DIRECTOR: Mr Dan Chan

Course Director Response:

As highlighted during the Exam Board, there were formative assignments as part of the Professional Strand and individual feedback was provided to students that submitted such assignments. As this assignment was not mandatory, the submission rate was low (about third of the class) despite the fact that it was emphasised to the year, that this was for preparation of the Year 4 examination. More importantly, example question with the model

answer explaining how the question would be marked was uploaded to the Exam Information page on LEARN. Students also had 2 briefings on the Exam including a Question & Answer session to explain the format and expectations of the exam. However, attendance and engagement with the material provided with the Professional Strand may explain the performance in Paper 1. As the Externals are also aware, the actual topic of the Paper 1 is released to students 10 days ahead of the exam and includes helpful resources. We believe all of these measures should more than adequately prepare students for the examination. However, as students may prioritise the material covered in Paper 2 over the material in Paper 1, this may explain the differences in performance.

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

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

In our view students' performance was similar compared to courses in Bristol, Cambridge and Nottingham

Response from college requested: **NO**

2.2 Quality of candidates' knowledge and skills, with particular reference to those at the top, middle or bottom of the range

The level of knowledge was acceptable to excellent for students at middle and top of range; the failing students had obvious gaps in knowledge which need addressing. Integrated reasoning skills (particularly regarding data analysis) were limited for many students.

Response from college requested: **NO**

2.3 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the students' performance

As the student performance in the Integrative Reasoning questions has only slightly improved from last year it may be worthwhile to discuss/action ideas in the curriculum review committee and the working party on assessment, as suggested in last year's report. It was concerning to see that the marks gained in paper 2 (Integrative Reasoning) did not correlate with allocation of merits and distinctions to students, where distinction level appeared solely obtained because of EMQ/MCQ performance.

Response from college requested: **YES**

COURSE DIRECTOR: Mr Dan Chan

Course Director Response:

We indeed plan to have a number of discussions with the Curriculum Review Committee and the Working Party on Assessment regarding the importance of assessing candidate's ability to reason and clearly express their understanding and problem solving. It is also clear that skills and aptitude for correctly answering MCQ and EMQ questions does not necessarily translate in being able to demonstrate higher level reasoning that is required in the Integrative Reasoning questions. The variety of the types of questions included in this examination is intentional in that it is more inclusive for different types of learners. It is well known that learners process information differently and their ability to express their understanding also varies. The fact that students may not yet perform well in the Integrative Reasoning questions may simply be a reflection that these are nascent skills that develop with time during the clinical phase of their training. The fact that some students are able to excel in these questions (albeit the minority) at this stage of their training shows that some students can develop such skills early but the expectation is that candidates would improve in answering these types of question following their year on rotations. The fact that those that received merits and distinction in the EMQ/MCQ at this stage of their training may reflect that these skills have been mastered and also shows the limitations of this testing modality to discern higher level reasoning.

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

Assessment Procedures

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

3.1 Assessment methods (relevance to learning objectives and curriculum)

Appropriate

Response from college requested: **NO**

3.2 Extent to which assessment procedures are rigorous

The College provides all information required to review the assessment process internally and also for external examiners and we are impressed by their professional approach to the whole process and appreciate the increasing pressure of administrative and academic staff with increasing student numbers.

Response from college requested: **NO**

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

Consistent

Response from college requested: **NO**

3.4 Standard of marking

The structure and detail of model answers to aid markers and external examiners' understanding how answers were marked have again improved compared to last year. Annotation of scripts have improved as well, which facilitated external review.

Although inconsistency in marking was observed by the exams team, this was dealt with appropriately and we acknowledge the unexpected staff input/time required for remarking.

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)

In our view, the procedures for assessment and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.

Response from college requested: **NO**

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

Improved model answers for long answer paper, improved EMQs and MCQs although still room to further develop the quality of questions.

Response from college requested: **NO**

3.7 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the procedures

Efforts to standard setting procedures are commendable, the procedure and underlying motivation was clearly explained to us by Professor Catchpole and we fully support the use of it. It was unclear if all staff are aware of the fact that in the resit no new questions could be used.

Response from college requested: **NO**

General Statements

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

No

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

The concerns raised last year were to be discussed in the curriculum review committee and the working part on BVetMed assessment, and we have no confirmation that this has taken place.

Response from college requested: NO

Year Leader's response: The sub-group on Assessment of the Curriculum Review Committee met on the 5/9/17 and discussed strategies to address concerns raised by the External Examiners regarding the performance by students on the Integrated Clinical and Professional questions. Actions including providing more detailed information on the Year 4 Exam page explaining the format of the Exam (completed) and to post examples of the new format questions (completed). In addition, a further action was to brief faculty that are providing feedback on the Formative Professional Studies assignments to further aid preparing students for the Integrated Clinical & Professional Reasoning questions. Briefing took place on the 30/10/17 and led by Professional Studies Strand Leader. =

4.2 An acceptable response has been made

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

4.3 I approved the papers for the Examination

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

4.4 I was able to scrutinise an adequate sample of students' work and marks to enable me to carry out my duties

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

4.5 I attended the meeting of the Board of Examiners held to approve the results of the Examination

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

4.6 Candidates were considered impartially and fairly

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

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

No

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Internet access has been a recurring problem at RVC during external examining visits (eduroam and RVC guest access both not working)

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: NO

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:

Good practice: Well evidenced use of a self-developed standard setting procedure to improve on earlier used Ebel scores.

Suggestions for improvement: Online assessment to make the assessment easier for students (less handwriting) and the marking process more efficient and objective for academic and administrative staff

Response from college requested: NO

5.2 External Examiner comments: For College information only (Responses to External Examiners are published on the College's website. Please only use this box to add any comments that you wish to remain confidential, if any)

Further detailed comments on each part of the exam paper:

MCQ

Students did very well on this part of the examination.

The standard of the exam / questions was very good and had improved from the previous year.

This year the MCQ (and EMQ) were analysed prior to the external examiners meeting. This meant that poorly performing questions were identified internally and recommendations were made to the external examiners on how to manage these questions. This greatly facilitated the process for the external examiners.

Three questions were identified as having a low level of discrimination; 45, 46 and 59.

Question 45 was considered to be a poor question with answer C considered to be ambiguous (depending on whether animal was recumbent or not) and answer E was also considered to be correct. This question was removed from the paper and we would recommend that it is extensively re-written prior to repeat use.

Question 46 was considered to have a very appropriate, clinically relevant testing point, with some problem solving. However, it seemed that this information had not been specifically taught to the students and for this reason the question was removed. The question should be retained but modified as in its current form it asks, 'which one of the following', which is not necessary. Please consider changing to 'which antibiotic would be the most appropriate choice....'

This question highlights an opportunity to align teaching with assessment.

Question 59 was also removed as the teaching material related to this question was ambiguous.

The external examiners noted that 16/60 MCQs (25%) were answered correctly by 80% or greater of the students. This seemed to suggest that a relatively large proportion of easier questions were included (or that these areas had been particularly well taught. However, this should not be a major issue as it will be moderated by the standard setting.

Specific comment on question 17:

This question asked: "Which antiepileptic drug is the first line treatment of seizure disorders in cats?" It was unclear whether this was for chronic management or in the acute seizure episode. The question implies the former and this agrees with the answer. However, d). Diazepam could be a correct answer for an acute seizure episode. Perhaps re-write to emphasise that this is for chronic management?

Whilst the majority of questions were well written, there are still a fair number of questions did not seem to pass the 'cover up test'. For some of these it is possible that simply rewording the question will satisfy this, i.e. changing so that they don't say 'which one of the following....'. However, some questions are dependent on a list (e.g. questions 22 and 30, 40, 43, 57). Please consider reviewing the questions and revising as necessary (although we appreciate that this may be challenging).

EMQ

The pass mark for the EMQ paper was standard set at 52.47% (EMQ), which reflected a slightly higher proportion of high facility questions compared to last year. The EMQ standard set pass mark was adjusted from 52.37% to this new level, due to moderation of questions as described below. The external examiners recommend that the question writers and examiners critically read the questions and review the examination statistics including those questions that have been used on previous occasions. This is because questions are occasionally not read/interpreted as expected and "errors" and misunderstandings still arise in questions that have been used previously without any problems.

It is appropriate to have a proportion of questions with high facility, but it is worth checking that these questions are rigorous enough that they require knowledge appropriate for Year 4 BVM students, and are not simply easy due to the structure of the question. Also, the external examiners noticed that the student cohort performed noticeably better on small animal questions compared to large animal questions.

This year, due to the new standard setting method, the internal examination team had already reviewed poor performing questions and had collected additional information prior to the external examiners met, which was extremely helpful as it helped us to make informed suggestions about those questions. In addition, the external examiners reviewed all questions that performed poorly and/or had a low discrimination according to the Point Biserial score of less than 0.2. We also reviewed questions with a high facility. Based on review and discussion, we concurred with the internal examiners that one of the EMQ questions should be moderated and it was not necessary to moderate any of the other questions. However, there were several questions that the external examiners would recommend being reviewed by the question writers prior to future use, as detailed below:

Q11-15 and Q16-20. These questions are very well written examples of EMQ's, and perform well on facility and discrimination. However, both of these EMQ series relate to neurolocalisation, which seems to be an overrepresentation of that material. In discussion with the Course Director this was due to the limited number of validated questions for this strand of the curriculum, and so although would recommend avoiding duplication of topics across more than one EMQ series of questions we understand the challenges.

Q22. This was a very challenging question that only 33.71% of students answered correctly and which did not discriminate well (Point Biserial = 0.022). None of the distractors were favoured significantly over the others by the students, although a high proportion of students selected surgical excision of the mediastinal mass (G) instead of a Tru-cut biopsy and histopathology (E). In reviewing this question, in consultation with the director of exams, the external examiners felt that this was a complex, tertiary level case, and that several different answers could be interpreted to be appropriate, especially for students at this level. We concurred, therefore, with the internal examiners' decision to remove this question from the exam and recalculate the standard setting.

Q23. Only 30.3% of the students answered this question correctly, reflecting that this was a complex case. The Point Biserial was 0.117, indicating a low discrimination, although not as poor as for Q22. However, in this case, the external examiners felt that there was a clear correct answer, and so advised retaining this question. For future use, the question should be reviewed, and it should be considered whether the reference to travel in France in the dog's history is too much of a distraction for 4th year students.

Q26. Only 15.53% of students answered this question correctly and the discrimination of the question was marginal (Point Biserial = 0.195). A high number of students (39.02%) answered incorrectly that the hydatid cyst in an ovine liver was a public health risk, while still identifying that the organs correctly as category 2. On review, the external examiners considered this to be an appropriate, if challenging question.

Q39. This question had a low facility (46.97) and marginal discrimination (Point Biserial = 0.192), but, based on discussion with content experts there is a clear, correct answer. One of the distractors was trace element testing, which was covered in question 4 of the long answer paper and may have caused confusion. We recommend reviewing this question to consider if distractors are appropriate.

Q45. Only 26.89% of students answered this question correctly and the discrimination was marginal (0.166). However, on review the answer was clear and appropriate.

Q56-60. This EMQ series had an option for "K" but there is no "K" option on the answer sheet. The correct answer for question 57 was "K". Students were informed of this after it was brought to the attention of the invigilators during the exam, and an announcement was made to all students sitting the exam that they should write "K" on the answer sheet if they chose it as their answer for any of this series of questions. All but 10 students did this. The external examiners considered that this series of questions was marginal in terms of clinical relevance. While these questions may map to the course learning objectives, we would recommend considering if this material is a good use of an EMQ series. It may be more relevant to have students select an imaging modality option for different case scenarios.

Long answer Paper

The external examiners reviewed all exam scripts for students that were failing, marginal passes, marginal merits and marginal distinction. The results for this question tended to cluster towards the middle range, with a high proportion of students scoring a marginal pass (55) on the Common Grading Scheme. This may be inevitable for this kind of topic, but if it is possible to encourage greater discrimination through a more structured question or model answer, that may be helpful in the future.

Question 1 (Professionalism)

This was a well-written question with a helpful model answer. The examiners should be applauded for the way in which the professionalism topic was contextualized in a specific, real-world scenario. This encouraged the

students to reason through the options available and apply the theoretical frameworks that they have been taught in a way that is meaningful and authentic.

The marking for this question was reasonably consistent, although one marker seemed to score the papers slightly higher than the others, with less emphasis on the requirement for students to use an ethical framework for a higher score. More consistent annotations of how the markers are interpreting the scores were noted compared to previous years, which is appreciated. However, there is still some room for improvement, as some markers did this more clearly than others. In general, the students performed more consistently on this question than on professionalism topics in the past. However, there was still a low number of students that performed at merit or distinction level. Furthermore, it was apparent that there was a poor correlation between students' overall performance in the exam and performance on this question, with some merit and distinction level students performing very poorly on this question and some marginal students performing well. This has some implications for how this topic is valued by the students that should be discussed by the examiners and course organisers.

Some general comments to consider for feedback to the students:

- In general there seemed to be some misunderstandings about the equine industry. For example, several students seemed to be under the impression that competing a horse in eventing would supply an income, when in fact it is much more likely to cost the owner more than it will earn. Similarly, the suggestion of using charity funds to pay the bill for care of a horse was less realistic than for small animals, and would have likely had to be negotiated in advance. Also, although in theory selling the horse would provide funds to pay the bill, students should be able to reason that this is unlikely to be a satisfactory option for a client who is invested enough in her horse to have treated the original injury so carefully.
- Several students mentioned using insurance to pay the bill, but reliance on insurance was irrelevant to this particular scenario since it would be too late to provide coverage at this stage. While it should have been obvious to students that the scenario was unlikely to have arisen if the horse had been insured, the question setters may want to consider making this explicit in future iterations of the question so that students are less likely to waste time on that tangent.
- Several students seemed unclear that Care Credit and other loan companies require pre-approval of clients before providing coverage, which may not be possible if the client is in financial difficulty. So, although that may still be an option, it should factor into the analysis of the situation.
- There seemed to be a lack of understanding of how delayed payments or a payment plan would have an adverse financial impact on the practice. Some students mentioned that there would be a problem with paying practice bills while waiting for payment, but few students seemed to recognize the real cost of this in terms of interest payments or lost income. Similarly, students that mentioned debt collection did not seem to understand that there are costs involved in such a service so that the practice is unlikely to recoup the full payment. This may be a more merit or distinction level of understanding, but such practice finance issues should be relevant to the teaching of year 4 students.

Question 2 (FMD epidemiology)

This was the data interpretation question.

We felt that this was an excellent question with a very clear marking scheme. The marking scheme was excellent and this was felt to facilitate consistency between markers. The tables provided made it very clear how marks should (and should not) be allocated. The markers' comments were very helpful as it was clear where the students got credit and therefore it was easy to see how the marks were determined.

Unfortunately, this question was not answered very well by the students, with a mean of 47.6%. We felt that the question was very fair and we would have expected the students to perform better. It would seem that students find this type of question difficult or do not prepare this material well.

Qu 3a and 3b (Seizure dog)

This is a well-written clinical reasoning question that presents a realistic "real life" clinical case scenario with a young dog that presents with an acute history of seizing. The delayed release information indicates that the dog is hypoglycaemic and has probably eaten a toxic quantity of xylitol-containing chewing gum. The question covers a wide range of clinical reasoning requirements asking the students to create a prioritised problem list, a differential diagnosis list and then to discuss appropriate diagnostic investigations in a first-opinion emergency practitioner whilst also considering appropriate emergency treatments. The second part of the question then asks the students to discuss the immediate treatment options for xylitol toxicity whilst also addressing the necessary supportive treatments required, followed by a section focusing on the communication skills required to manage the owners in light of the potentially guarded prognosis for a patient who initially appears to be responding well to treatment and for whom financial constraints are also an issue. It is my opinion that this is a very good clinical reasoning question and I am surprised that the students who have obtained merit and distinction marks overall have not performed better on this question. This question would have also suited a finals examination question, so helping students to structure their answers to consider the interpretation of the clinical data in more detail may be helpful for future year 4 examinations.

Every student attempted to answer both part a and part b of the question and the mean score obtained was 56.6 for question 3a and 56.3 for question 3b. Forty two scripts in total were assessed and marked by the external examiner, the scripts being chosen as a result of their classification as being from:

- The eight students who were failing overall
- The lowest four overall pass mark candidates
- The four candidates with high overall pass just below achieving merit
- The four candidates with the lowest overall merit marks
- The four candidates with high overall merit just below achieving distinction
- The four candidates with the lowest overall distinction marks
- The twelve candidates for whom the internal re-marking had highlighted considerable disparity between the original marker and the second marker.

In all of these twelve papers I agreed or very closely agreed with the re-mark score, so I have a slight concern that the original marks given were significantly inaccurate considering the degree of detail and explanation given in the model answer

The external examiner felt that of the 42 papers assessed, 11 had marks with which he disagreed, but this was only ever by one CGS score and for none of these candidates did the alternative mark alter their overall mark allocation, so no changes were requested. The model answers were very well constructed and gave clear guidance as to how marks should and should not be awarded, for which the question writers should be commended as this clearly helped ensure that the marking process was very consistent and reproducible. As noted previously, good annotation on the scripts by the internal examiners aided the external examiner to understand how the marks had been given, which extremely helpful and should be encouraged.

The students who performed poorly in this question generally showed an inability to logically order their thoughts and produced inadequate and/or inaccurate problem and differential diagnosis lists. Students performing well conversely were able to create logical and detailed problem and differential diagnosis lists that were well prioritised and led to appropriate treatment choices. The question does require clinical knowledge and ideally experience to answer well; as we have noted for the other long answer questions, this may explain why the average mark for question 3 obtained by the higher performing students is significantly lower than the marks obtained in the EMQ and MCQ papers.

Although not significant, there were some recurring errors noted, namely:

- Many students appear to think that a complete blood count can be used to diagnose an infection as a stand alone test and none of the students mentioned that a stress leucogram is likely to be a common finding in a dog who has recently experienced a seizure
- Some students said they would perform serum hepatic enzyme analysis every 4 – 12 hours, which implies a lack of understanding of hepatic transaminase half-lives and the clinical interpretation thereof
- None of the scripts assessed contained a comment that ALP may be elevated as a stress response in dogs but many mentioned ALP as a marker of hepatic damage (as opposed to ALT and AST) which raises the possibility of students moving into their rotations without a good understanding of the diagnostic utility of alkaline phosphatase
- There was a general trend towards candidates not being able to interpret the clinical relevance of what was a mild increase in rectal temperature

Question 4a&b (Poor growing lambs)

Although the topic was well chosen it seemed that students could receive marks for providing the same information twice ('change wormer'), and occasionally more. This led to this question being narrow with regards to topics covered and could have expanded into different areas to further differentiate student performance. The phrasing of questions could be improved to help getting more concise and correct answers; 'how might you advise the farmer to manage the lambs this year' is not a wrong question to ask but makes providing a clear and concise mark scheme challenging and therefore reduces transparency in marks awarded. The mark scheme was challenging to apply which may have led to similar (average pass) marks. It would help to further develop the mark scheme to make clear what merit and distinction level students have to achieve beyond what's already in the 'pass' category. Sometimes it appears that further interpretation/detail of advice (trace element testing from a mention to suggesting a supplementation trial) is this increased knowledge that needs to be provided, however it would be helpful to further clarify this, particularly when the number of markers increase with increasing student numbers. It was recognized that professional skills were included in this question; there would be the opportunity to include abattoir/VPH/legislation related questions in this case to test a broader clinically applied area of farm vet work.

With regards to brand names; Rycoben was provided without further information (albendazole and cobalt); we would recommend to provide the information of what is in the wormer to students as brands/contents change and the relevant knowledge is related to the active ingredients.

Response from college requested: YES

COURSE DIRECTOR: Mr Dan Chan**Course Director Response:**

We thank the External Examiners for their comments acknowledging continued improvement in the processes and questions used in our examination. We also thank the examiner for their extensive and detailed comments which we have taken note and plan to distribute these to question authors in time for the next examination. Of note, as our responses to External Examiners are published on the Intranet and are viewable to students, we cannot go into details about how we would modify each question. The external examiners have also brought up their concern that many questions did "not pass the cover up test" and we would like to respond that we have evaluated every single question in which this question structure was used prior to finalising the exam. When possible, the question was reworded. However, there were questions, when it was deemed an appropriate question format. We also looked at the performance of these questions when used previously and we were fully satisfied that the question structure did not appear to negatively impact how candidates answered the questions. We will continue to refine our question with these very constructive comments.

The feedback on the Integrated Reasoning Questions are also very detailed and we will be providing these to question authors in time for the next exam compilation. We appreciate the insight provided by the External Examiners and will consider these in the next iteration of the delivery of this teaching.

Action Required:

Distribution of detailed External Examiner comments to exam question authors in time for preparation of the next exam

Action Deadline:

27-Aug-2018

Action assigned to:

Dan Chan Year 4 Leader