

Dr. Lisa Boden  
 University of Edinburgh  
 Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies  
 Easter Bush Veterinary Centre  
 Roslin, Midlothian EH25 9RG

25 February 2020

Dear Dr. Boden

**External Examiner’s report for MSc and PG Diplomas in Livestock Health and Production, and Veterinary Epidemiology and Public Health 2019**

On behalf of the Royal Veterinary College Board of Examiners for Veterinary Epidemiology and Public Health, and Livestock Health and Production, I would like to thank you for your External Examiner’s report for the University of London Worldwide MSc, PG Diploma and Certificates, in Veterinary Epidemiology and Public Health, and Livestock Health and Production for the 2018-19 academic year.

The External and Intercollegiate Examiner reports form an integral part of the assessment and quality assurance processes. All comments and points raised in the report have been considered and we have provided our formal response to the key areas, as outlined below:

Examiner Comment	RVC Response
<p><b>Overall quality, assessment design and structure:</b></p> <p>1). Some key issues identified across all papers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students had some challenges demonstrating understanding versus factual recall</li> <li>• Students were not always adept at answering the question that is being asked with both precision and sufficient depth</li> <li>• Legible handwriting was a very important issue for some students – which affected marks.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Responses to comments:</b></p> <p>1). Student performance in terms of how they demonstrate understanding and provide answers that are of Masters level, is an area that we are constantly working on. Students come to the courses with varying study backgrounds and experiences of how to study; most have no experience of studying at postgraduate level. They are offered study skills tutorials and teaching sessions at the beginning of their courses but these are likely to be more effective if they are revisited regularly. The programme will set up a plan for offering these tutorials more regularly for all students, not only newly enrolled students. It is also important for students to understand the depth</p>

<p>2) There are two courses (ASMVE and SMVE) where the papers have been annotated rather than a summary provided. These are not as easy to assess as the annotation may be fairly rudimentary (x or ticks) and in some cases, it is not clear how the examiner arrived at the final mark for the question.</p> <p>3) There are some instances where the language used was not well-aligned with the result awarded – but this was infrequent (i.e. using the words “good” or “excellent” implies a certain minimum grade – and on occasion the grade awarded was lower than expected (and vice versa)</p>	<p>and breadth that is required of them in their assessments. The need for clear signposting of what is expected of the responses to exam questions will be highlighted to all examiners prior to preparation of exam questions.</p> <p>2) All examiners are aware of the requirement and importance of clear feedback to accompany the marks given. The examiners on the specific modules mentioned will be reminded of the requirement for clear feedback in their marking.</p> <p>3). Examiners will be reminded of the need for consistency between feedback and marks awarded.</p>
---	---

Thank you again for your comments and for your continued support as external examiner to the Programmes.

Yours sincerely,



Dr. Christine Thuranira-McKeever (Programmes Director)

Cc: Professor Javier Guitian (Exam Board Chair)  
 Ms. Carol Worsfold (Project Administrator, RVC)  
 Ms. Stephanie Bell (Programme Manager, UoL Worldwide)  
 Mrs. Mercedes Aves (Quality Manager, UoL Worldwide)



## External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report 2018-2019 (2019)

1. Name	Lisa Boden
2. Home institution and/or professional affiliation	University of Edinburgh
3. Role	External Examiner
4. Year of Service <i>Typically up to four years; extension to 5<sup>th</sup> year of service under exceptional circumstances only.</i>	4 <sup>th</sup>
5. Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report <i>Only highest award per programme is displayed.</i>	MSc Livestock Health & Production/Veterinary Epidemiology & Public Health
6. Module(s)/Course(s) covered <i>Please provide title of each individual module or course you have reviewed. You will be asked to confirm standards of each module further down in the questionnaire.</i>	VPM013-01 Advanced statistical methods in veterinary epidemiology LVM004-01 Epidemiology and animal health economics LVM017-01 Management of infectious disease outbreaks in animal populations VPM012-01 Statistical methods in veterinary epidemiology VPM015-01 Surveillance and investigation of animal health LVM006-01 Veterinary public health
7. Date of Board of Examiners meeting	05/12/2019
8. Date of Board of Examiners meeting <i>Please provide date of second board meeting, if the report covers more than one board, for example dissertation or project boards, or a second assessment period.</i>	
9. Date of the report	08/12/2019

### Part A Summary

#### Standards of Award

10. The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject. Yes

11. If not, please explain why.	
<b>Student performance</b>	
12. The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar.	Yes
13. If not, please explain why.	
14. If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.	
<b>Conduct of processes</b>	
15. The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.	Yes
16. If not, please explain why.	
17. If processes are of a higher standard than would be expected, please elaborate.	
The processes are of a very high standard.	
<b>Good Practice and Innovation</b>	
18. Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes. Please highlight any items of good practice in programme arrangements and/or procedures for external examination.	
The programme is robustly assessed. For the majority of courses, the examiners provided model exam answers and detailed comments on the marking as well as overall comments as to whether the questions were answered satisfactorily. This provides very useful context for the external examiners.	

<b>Part B Standards</b>
-------------------------

19. Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts. <i>Please provide comments on each individual module in separate paragraphs, highlighting in particular where differences between them occur.</i> <i>You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Please refer to the <a href="#">Framework for HE Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies (FHEQ)</a>.</li><li>• For the International Foundation Programme please refer to the <a href="#">Qualification and Component Levels</a>.</li><li>• Where applicable, please refer to the relevant <a href="#">Subject Benchmark Statements</a>.</li></ul> The assessments cover an appropriate range of topics considering the breadth and depth of the course. This is an exemplary course.
--

<p>20. The standard of assessment in each module is comparable to modules of the same level.</p> <p><i>Please consider for each module.</i></p>
<p>Yes - all of the modules I have reviewed are comparable</p>
<p>21. If the standard of assessment is not comparable to modules or courses of the same level, please elaborate.</p> <p><i>Please provide details for all modules that are not comparable.</i></p>
<p>22. The standard of assessment is comparable to modules of the same level as for students at University of London member institutions.</p> <p><i>Please consider for each module.</i></p> <p><i>This question is aimed at External and Intercollegiate Examiners who are appointed to University of London distance and flexible learning Boards of Examiners and are also appointed as External or Intercollegiate Examiners to Boards of Examiners assessing students for the equivalent programme based at a member institution.</i></p>
<p>Yes - all of the modules I have reviewed are comparable</p>
<p>23. If the standard of assessment is not comparable to modules of the same level as for students at University of London member institutions, please elaborate.</p> <p><i>Please provide details for all modules that are not comparable.</i></p>
<p>24. The standard of assessment is comparable to modules of the same level at your own University of London member institution.</p> <p><i>Please consider for each module.</i></p> <p><i>This question is aimed at Intercollegiate Examiners from one of the member institutions of the University of London.</i></p>
<p>Yes - all of the modules I have reviewed are comparable</p>
<p>25. If the standard of assessment is not comparable to modules of the same level at your own University of London member institution, please elaborate.</p> <p><i>Please provide details for all modules that are not comparable.</i></p>
<p>26. The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.</p> <p><i>Please consider for each module.</i></p>
<p>Yes - all of the modules I have reviewed are set at the appropriate level</p>
<p>27. If the assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are not set at the appropriate level, please elaborate.</p> <p><i>Please provide details for all modules that are not set at the appropriate level.</i></p>

28. Please comment on the standards of student performance.

*Where relevant, please make reference to performance on individual modules.*

*You may want to include:*

- *the relation to the specified learning outcomes*
- *candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.*

Students are performing well, with a number of students attaining merit. Students appear to face some challenges:

1. Students had some difficulties in demonstrating understanding and application of principles rather than factual recall;
2. Students were not always adept at answering the questions with precision or appropriate depth;
3. Students are struggling to write legibly. Possibly - due to lack of practice in other areas of life.

## **Part C Programme and assessment design**

29. The aims and learning outcomes for the programme and modules/courses are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.

*Please consider for the programme as a whole and for each module you have been asked to review.*

Yes - the aims and learning outcomes are set at an appropriate level for the programme and modules/courses

30. If the aims and learning outcomes for the programme and modules/courses are not clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter, please elaborate.

*Please provide details for the programme as a whole and any modules without clearly defined aims and learning outcomes.*

31. Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment (i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertation, etc.).

*Please consider for the programme as a whole and for each module you have been asked to review.*

*Please comment in relation to:*

- *the subject*
- *the students*
- *the respective level of study*
- *the expected learning outcomes.*

The courses exhibit appropriate balance between types of assessment (i.e TMA's versus written examination). Students seem to struggle with long essay-type questions if the wording of the question is not sign-posted appropriately.

32. Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.

*Where relevant, please comment on individual modules.*

I cannot comment on these from the exam papers alone - apart from to say that the students appear to have all the information necessary to respond well to the exam (evidenced by the students who performed highly).

33. Please comment on the overall quality of programme and assessment design and structure.

The quality of the programme and assessment is high. The exams are double marked. This year, the examiners have provided detailed feedback about their marking in summary sheets which has been extremely helpful. There are some instances where the language used was not well-aligned with the result awarded – but this was infrequent (i.e. using the words “good” or “excellent” implies a certain minimum grade – and on occasion the grade awarded was lower than expected (and vice versa)). In SIAH there were a number of instances of large discrepancies between the two examiners (52 – a sound answer vs 35- a poor answer). There are two courses (ASMVE and SMVE) where the papers have been annotated rather than a summary provided. These are not as easy to assess as the annotation may be fairly rudimentary (x or ticks) and in some cases, it is not clear how the examiner arrived at the final mark for the question. Some key issues identified across all papers:

1. Students had some challenges demonstrating understanding versus factual recall;
2. Students were not always adept at answering the question that is being asked with both precision and sufficient depth;
3. Legible handwriting was a very important issue for some students – which affected marks.

Specific courses:

TMA: Appropriately marked. 1 marker provided a mark of 100% but then gave the student information on areas for improvement and additional points that could be considered. I agree the submission was excellent, but think that a mark of 100% should only be reserved for occasions when there can be no further improvement.

ASMVE: Performance satisfactory across all questions.

EAHE: Questions were generally well answered with weaknesses around understanding of study design, sources of bias such as confounding, measures of association, and ROCs, PPVs and NPVs, and cost-benefit analysis in particular.

MADO: Satisfactory performance of students across most of the exam components. The major weakness was the over-reliance of students on factual information, rather than the application of concepts. There was fairly poor performance on the question on surveillance.

SMVE: Performance was generally satisfactory across all questions.

SIAH: Overall performance was good. Students struggled with articulating precise answers – particularly re risk communication, probability distributions and uncertainty.

VPH: risk analysis and HACCP was a point of weakness for some students- otherwise satisfactory performance across all questions.

**Part D Assessment Process**

**Information**

34. Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment? Yes

35. Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment Yes

*(e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marketing criteria)?*

36. Did you receive this information in good time? Yes

37. Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements? Yes

38. Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.

The arrangements were excellent and in keeping with the previous year.

**Paper-setting** [Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]

39. Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see? Yes

40. Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate? <i>Please consider for the programme as a whole and for each module you have been asked to review.</i>	
Yes - the nature, spread and level of assessment questions/coursework is appropriate for the programme and modules/courses	
41. If the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework was not appropriate, please elaborate. <i>Please provide details for all modules where the nature, spread and level is not appropriate.</i>	
42. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments in the paper-setting process?	Yes
43. Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process. <i>Where relevant, please comment on individual modules.</i>	
No further comments.	
<b>Marking and sampling</b> [Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]	
44. Did you receive the scripts or other assessed work in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?	Yes
45. Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent? <i>Please consider for each module.</i>	Yes
46. Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?	Yes
47. Were you satisfied with the standard of marking? <i>Please consider for each module you have been asked to review.</i>	
Yes - the standard of marking was appropriate for all modules/courses	
48. If you were not satisfied with the standard of marking, please elaborate. <i>Please provide details for all modules where the standard of marking was not satisfactory.</i>	
49. Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked or second-marked and moderated? <i>Please consider for each module you have been asked to review.</i>  <i>Assessed work for University of London Track C programmes is second marked and moderated on a sample basis as per the <a href="#">Guidelines for Examinations</a>.</i>	
Yes - assessment for all modules was marked in accordance with the guidelines	
50. If you were not satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked or second-marked and moderated, please elaborate. <i>Please provide details for each module.</i>	



<b>Dissertations / project reports</b>	
51. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate? <i>Please consider for all modules where appropriate.</i>	Yes
<b>Oral assessment</b>	
52. Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment? <i>Please consider for all modules where appropriate.</i>	Yes
53. Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work. <i>Where relevant, please comment on individual modules.</i>	
No further comments. See above.	
<b>Board of Examiners meeting(s) and results</b>	
54. Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes
55. Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes
56. Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting? <i>'Final Board of Examiners' meeting' – a meeting where awards are confirmed.</i>	Yes
57. If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?	N/A
58. Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes
59. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?	Yes
60. Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.	
Efficient and well-executed meeting.	

## Part E Other Comments

61. Please provide comments relating to Professional and Statutory Body requirements, if applicable.
NA
62. How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?
No further comments regarding the course or assessment (both of which are robust). As in the past, I extend my compliments this year to the administration team for their excellent organisation, provision of materials and kind and generous way that they have looked after us.
63. Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.
Provision of examiner comments on papers – to justify breakdown of scores is a recurring issue for a couple of subjects. Overall, where examiners have provided summary notes, this has been extremely helpful for the assessment process.

64. If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the University of London distance and flexible learning programmes or the School of Advanced Study.

NA

65. Please provide any other comments you may have.

*Please use this box for responding to any specific questions the Programme Team may have asked you to consider.*

No further comments. A robust process that is very efficiently conducted.

Professor Nick Jonsson  
College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences  
University of Glasgow,  
464 Bearsden Rd,  
Bearsden G61 1Q

25 February 2020

Dear Professor Jonsson

**External Examiner's report for MSc and PG Diplomas in Livestock Health and Production, and Veterinary Epidemiology and Public Health 2019**

On behalf of the Royal Veterinary College Board of Examiners for Livestock Health and Production, and Veterinary Epidemiology and Public Health, I would like to thank you for your External Examiner's report for the University of London Worldwide MSc and PG Diplomas, in Livestock Health and Production, and Veterinary Epidemiology and Public Health for the 2018-19 academic year.

The External and Intercollegiate Examiner reports form an integral part of the assessment and quality assurance processes. All comments and points raised in the report have been considered and we have provided our formal response to the key areas, as outlined below:

Examiner Comment	RVC Response
<p><b>Programme and assessment design:</b> 1). The dependence on essay-type long questions is too high, particularly given the diverse cultural backgrounds of the participants. For many of the participants, the critical essay is not a familiar mode of assessment at either the school or university level. I suggest that over time, some short questions, data interpretation questions, multiple choice and extended matching questions should be introduced. Given that essay-type long questions will remain the dominant question type in the foreseeable future, some attempt should be made to sign-post questions to indicate the breadth and scope expected in the responses. Where examples are required, this should be specified in the question.</p>	<p><b>Responses to comments:</b> 1). The proposed introduction of a variety of assessment methods is noted, and will be highlighted for discussion and decision-making by the module leaders and the Course Management Committee.</p> <p>The need for clear signposting of what is expected of the students in their responses to exam questions is an important element of assessment, and this will be highlighted to all examiners prior to preparation of exam questions. This will be done by including this requirement in the examinations guidelines and information that is sent to all examiners.</p>

<p>2) The justification of marks provided by the examiners for each of the questions was completed in detail for all the modules and was very helpful, but care is needed to ensure that the comments are not derogatory or patronising of the candidates.</p> <p>3) Availability and use of past papers deserves review. Consistent with the heavy dependence on essay-type long answer questions, students might perform very well if they make use of past papers.</p>	<p>2). Examiners will be reminded of the need to ensure use of appropriate language in feedback.</p> <p>3) Past papers are not available to students. In addition, examiners are reminded at the point of writing exams questions, to be mindful of reusing questions that they may have used in the previous years. A model exam paper is provided for each module, to give students an idea of the format of exam papers.</p>
---	---

Thank you again for your constructive comments and for the support to the programme during this examination cycle.

Yours sincerely,



Dr. Christine Thurania-McKeever (Programme Director)

Cc: Professor Javier Guitian (Exam Board Chair)  
Ms. Carol Worsfold (Project Administrator RVC)  
Ms. Stephanie Bell (Programme Manager, UoL Worldwide)  
Mrs. Mercedes Aves (Quality Manager, UoL Worldwide)



## External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report 2018-2019 (2019)

1. Name	Nicholas Nils Jonsson
2. Home institution and/or professional affiliation	University of Glasgow
3. Role	External Examiner
4. Year of Service <i>Typically up to four years; extension to 5<sup>th</sup> year of service under exceptional circumstances only.</i>	1 <sup>st</sup>
5. Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report <i>Only highest award per programme is displayed.</i>	MSc Livestock Health & Production/Veterinary Epidemiology & Public Health
6. Module(s)/Course(s) covered <i>Please provide title of each individual module or course you have reviewed. You will be asked to confirm standards of each module further down in the questionnaire.</i>	Animal Disease (Current Concepts) Animal Welfare Principles of Livestock Production Developing and Monitoring Livestock Production Systems Economics for Livestock Development and Policy Reproduction and Fertility Research Design Management and Grant Application Writing Research Project
7. Date of Board of Examiners meeting	05/12/2019
8. Date of Board of Examiners meeting <i>Please provide date of second board meeting, if the report covers more than one board, for example dissertation or project boards, or a second assessment period.</i>	
9. Date of the report	10/12/2019

### Part A Summary

#### Standards of Award

10. The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject. Yes

11. If not, please explain why.

### Student performance

12. The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar.

Yes

13. If not, please explain why.

14. If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.

### Conduct of processes

15. The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.

Yes

16. If not, please explain why.

17. If processes are of a higher standard than would be expected, please elaborate.

### Good Practice and Innovation

18. Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes. Please highlight any items of good practice in programme arrangements and/or procedures for external examination.

The allocation of 2.5 days to go through all the assessments for this programme provides a high level of rigour and enables the external examiner to be thoroughly prepared for the Board of Examiners' Meeting.

## Part B Standards

19. Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts.

*Please provide comments on each individual module in separate paragraphs, highlighting in particular where differences between them occur.*

*You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.*

- Please refer to the [Framework for HE Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies \(FHEQ\)](#).
- For the International Foundation Programme please refer to the [Qualification and Component Levels](#).
- Where applicable, please refer to the relevant [Subject Benchmark Statements](#).

I will not comment on each of the 7 modules in this section independently because in all cases my assessment is the same - that each of the modules includes content that is current and delivered in a coherent manner, with appropriate supporting materials.

<p>20. The standard of assessment in each module is comparable to modules of the same level.</p> <p><i>Please consider for each module.</i></p>
<p>Yes - all of the modules I have reviewed are comparable</p>
<p>21. If the standard of assessment is not comparable to modules or courses of the same level, please elaborate.</p> <p><i>Please provide details for all modules that are not comparable.</i></p>
<p>22. The standard of assessment is comparable to modules of the same level as for students at University of London member institutions.</p> <p><i>Please consider for each module.</i></p> <p><i>This question is aimed at External and Intercollegiate Examiners who are appointed to University of London distance and flexible learning Boards of Examiners and are also appointed as External or Intercollegiate Examiners to Boards of Examiners assessing students for the equivalent programme based at a member institution.</i></p>
<p>N/A</p>
<p>23. If the standard of assessment is not comparable to modules of the same level as for students at University of London member institutions, please elaborate.</p> <p><i>Please provide details for all modules that are not comparable.</i></p>
<p>24. The standard of assessment is comparable to modules of the same level at your own University of London member institution.</p> <p><i>Please consider for each module.</i></p> <p><i>This question is aimed at Intercollegiate Examiners from one of the member institutions of the University of London.</i></p>
<p>Yes - all of the modules I have reviewed are comparable</p>
<p>25. If the standard of assessment is not comparable to modules of the same level at your own University of London member institution, please elaborate.</p> <p><i>Please provide details for all modules that are not comparable.</i></p>
<p>26. The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.</p> <p><i>Please consider for each module.</i></p>
<p>Yes - all of the modules I have reviewed are set at the appropriate level</p>
<p>27. If the assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are not set at the appropriate level, please elaborate.</p> <p><i>Please provide details for all modules that are not set at the appropriate level.</i></p>

28. Please comment on the standards of student performance.

*Where relevant, please make reference to performance on individual modules.*

*You may want to include:*

- *the relation to the specified learning outcomes*
- *candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.*

The variation in performance of students reflects the challenges of online delivery in an international programme. Educational backgrounds of participants, although comparable, are not the same.

## Part C Programme and assessment design

29. The aims and learning outcomes for the programme and modules/courses are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.

*Please consider for the programme as a whole and for each module you have been asked to review.*

Yes - the aims and learning outcomes are set at an appropriate level for the programme and modules/courses

30. If the aims and learning outcomes for the programme and modules/courses are not clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter, please elaborate.

*Please provide details for the programme as a whole and any modules without clearly defined aims and learning outcomes.*

31. Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment (i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertation, etc.).

*Please consider for the programme as a whole and for each module you have been asked to review.*

*Please comment in relation to:*

- *the subject*
- *the students*
- *the respective level of study*
- *the expected learning outcomes.*

Overall the assessment was conducted with a high degree of rigour.

In my opinion, the dependence on essay-type long questions is too high, particularly given the diverse cultural backgrounds of the participants. For many of the participants, the critical essay is not a familiar mode of assessment at either the school or university level. I suggest that over time, some short questions, data interpretation questions, multiple choice and extended matching questions should be introduced.

Given that essay-type long questions will remain the dominant question type in the foreseeable future, some attempt should be made to sign-post questions to indicate the breadth and scope expected in the responses. Where examples are required, this should be specified in the question. If an essay-style format is required, this should clearly be stated. Whereas it would have been possible for me to make these comments on review of the examination papers, my comments are largely the result of seeing the responses of the students to the questions and the responses of the examiners to the students' responses.

The justification of marks provided by the examiners for each of the questions was completed in detail for all the modules and was very helpful, but care is needed to ensure that the comments are not derogatory or patronising of the candidates.

In some modules students were allowed a choice of questions. This represents extra work for all involved in the assessment process, has the potential to bias results according to the students' selection of questions and for modules with small numbers of students means that comparison of student achievement is not possible within the module. I suggest that the amount of choice of questions be reduced progressively in future.

Availability and use of past papers deserves review. Consistent with the heavy dependence on essay-type long answer questions, students might perform very well if they make use of past



papers. Certain questions were answered in a way that gives this impression (eg "As will be seen in the discussion below, X is not a factor for ...")

In some modules, the questions and marking reflected an orientation to UK health and production problems. The underlying assumptions of the examiners appears to have resulted in some misunderstandings with students.

**Animal Disease:** This is a very challenging module for those with a non-veterinary background, as indicated by the low marks and high proportion of students who failed the module. The level of detail expected by the examiners was very high in some questions. There was variation among the questions in the level of detail required for the same marks. Good feedback and good agreement among markers.

**Animal Welfare:** This was a challenging and rigorous module. No major comments that are not addressed in the general comments above.

**Developing and Monitoring Livestock Production Systems:** Good module, fairly assessed. Some excellent responses from students.

**Principles of Livestock Production:** Some of the general comments above in relation to question type, boundaries, depth etc apply particularly to this module.

**Economics for Livestock Development and Policy:** Question structure and marking were very clear and fair. Care is needed with the nature of the comments provided in the justification of the marks. Students have the potential to see these comments.

**Research Design Management and Grant Application Writing:** Rigorously assessed.

**Reproduction and Fertility:** Small number of candidates. The use of essay-type questions in this module is difficult to justify given the nature of the material assessed. If long questions are to be used, more care is required to define the nature of the expected response.

**Research Project:** Very rigorously assessed. No criticisms.

Tutor-marked assignments were consistent in quality and well graded, with excellent feedback.

32. Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.

*Where relevant, please comment on individual modules.*

All materials were presented in an appropriate manner and are of a high quality.

33. Please comment on the overall quality of programme and assessment design and structure.

See comments above regarding the nature of the questions.

The overall breakdown into examinations and assignments is consistent among modules and is appropriate.

## Part D Assessment Process

### Information

34. Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment? Yes

35. Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment  
*(e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marketing criteria)?* Yes

36. Did you receive this information in good time? Yes

37. Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements? Yes

38. Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.

All the information provided to me was timely, of a high standard, and useful.

<b>Paper-setting</b> [Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]	
39. Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see?	Yes
40. Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate? <i>Please consider for the programme as a whole and for each module you have been asked to review.</i>	
Some of assessment questions/coursework are not appropriate	
41. If the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework was not appropriate, please elaborate. <i>Please provide details for all modules where the nature, spread and level is not appropriate.</i>	
Please see comments above. In some modules, there is excessive use of essay-type long questions.	
42. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments in the paper-setting process?	Yes
43. Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process. <i>Where relevant, please comment on individual modules.</i>	
None to add	
<b>Marking and sampling</b> [Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]	
44. Did you receive the scripts or other assessed work in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?	Yes
45. Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent? <i>Please consider for each module.</i>	Yes
46. Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?	Yes
47. Were you satisfied with the standard of marking? <i>Please consider for each module you have been asked to review.</i>	
Yes - the standard of marking was appropriate for all modules/courses	
48. If you were not satisfied with the standard of marking, please elaborate. <i>Please provide details for all modules where the standard of marking was not satisfactory.</i>	
49. Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked or second-marked and moderated? <i>Please consider for each module you have been asked to review.</i> <i>Assessed work for University of London Track C programmes is second marked and moderated on a sample basis as per the <a href="#">Guidelines for Examinations</a>.</i>	
Yes - assessment for all modules was marked in accordance with the guidelines	

50. If you were not satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked or second-marked and moderated, please elaborate. <i>Please provide details for each module.</i>	
<b>Dissertations / project reports</b>	
51. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate? <i>Please consider for all modules where appropriate.</i>	Yes
<b>Oral assessment</b>	
52. Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment? <i>Please consider for all modules where appropriate.</i>	Yes
53. Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work. <i>Where relevant, please comment on individual modules.</i>	
No additional comments.	
<b>Board of Examiners meeting(s) and results</b>	
54. Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes
55. Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes
56. Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting? <i>'Final Board of Examiners' meeting' – a meeting where awards are confirmed.</i>	Yes
57. If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?	N/A
58. Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes
59. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?	Yes
60. Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.	
Overall, the process at RVC is one of the best that I have ever been associated with. The organisation was excellent. The process was rigorous and serious, but conducted in a collegial atmosphere. I am very impressed.	

<b>Part E</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
---------------	-----------------------

61. Please provide comments relating to Professional and Statutory Body requirements, if applicable.	
No comments to make.	
62. How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?	
This is my first year in this role.	

63. Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.

Not applicable.

64. If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the University of London distance and flexible learning programmes or the School of Advanced Study.

Not applicable.

65. Please provide any other comments you may have.

*Please use this box for responding to any specific questions the Programme Team may have asked you to consider.*

Thank you