

ANNUAL QUALITY IMPROVEMENT REPORT 2016/17

Appendix 3: External Examiners' report

BVetMed Final Year

u C D ' L 6/17 E E  
E E eports from previous years (if applicable).

A C D ' L E E C k  
section. Please ensure that any actions to be taken in response to these comments have been recorded in your Annual Quality Improvement Report.

F A F A j O o [afilipovic@rvc.ac.uk](mailto:afilipovic@rvc.ac.uk),  
01707666938

Appendix 3 consists of:

a.	Updates to actio
b.	2016/17 Collaborative Annual Report with responses from Course Director/Year Leader

a. Update to actions from 2014/15:

Report Question	E E suggested actions	C D / update in 2015/16	Update in 2016/17
3.1 Assessment methods (relevance to learning objectives and curriculum)	Introduce DOPS pilot for cohort entering rotations Feb 2016, introduce communication skills DOPS into early y3 for Sep 2016.	CMC decision (Feb 2016) to review this plan and opt for other checkpoints for student communication skills during the course; DOPS pilot not implemented.	COMPLETED
4.11 Appropriate procedures and processes have been followed	<p>A new on-line system of project marking has been piloted and aims to improve the documentation of the rationale for allocated mark, and the agreed final mark if the marks of the two examiners did not agree; it is planned that this will also be rolled out for the next cohort.</p> <p>Action Required: Introduce online RP2 marking system (cohort sitting the exam in 2017)</p> <p>Action assigned: RP2 Director</p>	Online system already used for cohort graduating in 2016, to be developed further for planned marking and feedback in batches for cohort starting rotations in 2017	COMPLETED

b. 2016/17 Collaborative Annual Report with responses from Course Director

## 1.5 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the Programme

Further consideration, perhaps, of placement and academic tutors knowing when and how to flag a concern, to enable timely remedial intervention for issues of communication and professionalism. In particular the sort of seemingly 'low level' issues of organisation, language, paperwork submissions and punctuality that can add up to a later more serious overall problem. We would be curious about the remedial support mechanisms in place, given - eg - the poor quality of writing from some final year candidates and the existence of outstanding paperwork, even after finals.

**Response from college requested: YES**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Jill Maddison**

### **Course Director Response:**

Monitoring issues relating to communication and professionalism in relation to EMS, especially in relation to assembling appropriate paperwork, is an ongoing activity overseen by the EMS team in Registry and the Director and Deputy Director of EMS. Student tutors are notified as well when there are particular concerns. The poor quality of writing for final year candidates is an entirely different problem which is perhaps not so easily monitored or solved. We hope to be able to provide a greater level of formative feedback after the 4th year exam (which involves essay type questions on clinical and professional reasoning) but the logistic difficulties of doing this remain to be solved. We will certainly be providing examples of model answers to a greater degree than previously for the 2018 finals exams.

### **Action Required:**

### **Action Deadline:**

02-Jan-2018

### **Action assigned to:**

Jill Maddison, Dan Chan and Brian Catchpole



### **2.3 Please provide any additional comm**

Overall fine, and reflective broadly of norms. However 2 (seemingly contradictory) provisos are that at the positive end we still have a student on merit who failed a core component, a passing research track student who failed

## Assessment Procedures

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

### 3.1 Assessment methods (relevance to learning objectives and curriculum)

**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)**

Yes.

However, conversation was had about difficulty signing off fail (and potentially profession exit) results without knowledge of the student, ie if the candidate is a long term 'problem' student or if this is a one off exam glitch. This may well be beyond the remit of external examiners, but it was discussed. The balance between obvious first need to ensure patient safety and offer student support (in cases of genuine welfare need) is important.

**Response from college requested: NO**

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

As previously, the OSCE is so well set up and run (all credit) that it has potential to be more reflective of 'first day at work' (valid) content. Ideas relating to - linked -clinical reasoning are welcome, eg joined stations that follow up history taking with management, or use video cases to encourage clinical reasoning. We w5(l)5(i)5(ni)7(c)-17(al)7(





**4.6 Candidates were considered impartially and fairly**

**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:**

Consider a more valid assessment of student day one competences, assessed in the work place.

**Response from college requested: NO**

**5.2 External Examiner comments: For College information only (Responses to External Examiners are remain confidential, if any)**

**Response from college requested: NO**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Jill Maddison**

**Course Director Response:**

Thank you so much for commitment to your roles as external examiners, your attention to detail and your insight and wisdom. We are committed to providing a finals examination process that appropriately, fairly and robustly assesses Day One competencies and the preparedness of our students for their first day in practice. Your feedback and guidance have been much valued and we look forward to your overview of the new finals structure in 2018 (written papers) and 2019 (OSCEs)

