ANNUAL QUALITY IMPROVEMENT REPORT 2018/19

Appendix 3: External Examiners' report

MVetMed

This appendix contains Year Leader's responses to 2018/19 External Examiners' comments and updates to actions from previous External Examiners' reports (if applicable).

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

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

Appendix 3 consists of:

a.	Updates to actions from previous years' reports
b.	2018/19 Collaborative Annual Report with responses from Course Director – *no actions from previous years!*

Collaborative Report

Exam board meeting: 20-Jun-2019

Master of Veterinary Medicine, 2018/19

Lead examiner: Professor Carmel Mooney

Collaborating examiner(s): Dr Veronica Roberts

The Programme

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

1.1 Course content

The course content appeared appropriate.

Response from college requested: NO

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

Learning objectives were appropriate and met.

Response from college requested: NO

1.3 Teaching methods

Teaching methods appeared appropriate.

Response from college requested: NO

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

n/a

Response from college requested: NO

1.5 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the Programme

The Programme is in its penultimate year and after next year all students will be enrolled on a new programme. The changes will likely improve the Programme.

Response from college requested: NO

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

The students' performance is similar to those at a similar stage in University College Dublin and University of Bristol where the external examiners emanate from.

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

Candidates knowledge and skills appeared high. All students gained merit or distinction.

Response from college requested: NO

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

No further comments.

Response from college requested: NO

Assessment Procedures

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

3.1 Assessment methods (relevance to learning objectives and curriculum)

Assessment methods varied depending on modules taken but such variability is expected.

Response from college requested: NO

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Vicky Lipscomb

Course Director Response:

This variability will reduce further with the new curriculum.

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

3.2 Extent to which assessment procedures are rigorous

There was some concern regarding the consistency of marking and procedures adopted when two examiners gave disparate results across the marking bands (e.g. merit or distinction). It was not made clear to the examiners how consensus was reached. However, overall any change dictated by using the higher of the two marks did not influence the overall results.

Response from college requested: NO

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Vicky Lipscomb

Course Director Response:

A new change has already been introduced to College Marking Schemes (but not yet in place for this cohort) which will clarify how markers achieve a consensus.

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

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

A consistent marking rubric was used by the examiners.

Response from college requested: NO

3.4 Standard of marking

The standard of marking was acceptable. However, the level of feedback on the research component was highly variable from detailed sentence-by-sentence feedback to more general feedback and in a few cases no feedback.

Response from college requested: NO

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Vicky Lipscomb

Course Director Response:

This year all examiners were reminded to make sure appropriate feedback was given and that certainly a blank feedback box was not acceptable. This will be re-iterated again this year and the examiners will also be reminded to use/refer to the marking rubric in relation to their feedback. It was discussed that the quantity, detail and overall aim of the feedback should be the same for all - and that this is at the level of review of a manuscript being submitted for publication for MVetMed.

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

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)

The whole examination procedure was organised extremely efficiently and all necessary paperwork was made available to the external examiners.

Response from college requested: NO

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

There was only one discernible change from last year. A rubric for marking the oral defence was used by the internal examiners, making it clear how the student was being assessed.

Response from college requested: NO

3.7 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the procedures

Work-based assessment feedback should be made available to the external examiners.

Consideration should be given to assessing the degree on a Pass/Fail basis - many postgraduate degrees are based on this premise. With the current system all students are almost guaranteed at least a merit because of the breakdown of the component grades.

Response from college requested: NO

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Vicky Lipscomb

Course Director Response:

Work Place Based Assessment (WPBA) feedback can certainly be made available. In the new MVetMed the degree will be pass/fail.

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

General Statements

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

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

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

Not applicable

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

This was not applicable.

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

Not applicable

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

All of the students' research work and grades for all didactic modules was made available.

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

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

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:

As stated previously consideration should be given to making this a pass/fail degree.
The number of modules available should be condensed - many are discipline specific, have variations on their title but effectively cover the same basics e.g. numerous modules covering scientific article reviews.
If discrepant marks are given by two internal examiners, the reasons for deciding on a final mark should be made available to the external examiners. Alternatively a third examiner could be used.

Response from college requested: NO

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Vicky Lipscomb

Course Director Response:

In the new MVetMed the degree will be pass/fail.

The number of modules in the new MVetMed is reduced to 3. As the old MvetMed students are entering their final year, very few have any modules left to complete.

A new change has already been introduced to College Marking Schemes (but not yet in place for this year) which will clarify how markers achieve a consensus, with a third facilitator being used if needed.

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

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)

Response from college requested: NO