

# Collaborative Report

Bachelor of Veterinary Medicine, Year 5, 2013/14

Dr Wendela Wapenaar

## The Programme

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

### 1.1 Course content

Adequate

Response from college requested: **NO**

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

Difficult to assess with material provided

Response from college requested: **NO**

**NO**

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

Not aware of any lack of resources

Response from college requested: **NO**

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



Response from college requested: **YES**

Please see our response to 3.2 below.



The EMQ paper had a similar pass mark to the spot test (54%); however the level of questions asked was more like what can be expected from final year students that will go out into practice shortly after these assessments. Whilst the mean student mark was around 73%, this was felt to more accurately reflect students performing well on an appropriately-pitched exam containing typical "bread and butter" type questions. However, of the 100 items (20 topics with 5 stems each), six items were negative discriminators (Q. 33, 39, 50, 56, 72, and 78), and many of the other items were weak positive discriminators with scores < 0.3. When considering the "bank" of items for use in future years, these item statistics should be taken into consideration. During review of the item performance it was found that one item had a second correct answer that had been selected by 95% of students – the answer options were adjusted in the system prior to exam board and this improved the grade of some top-end students (who moved from a Merit to a Distinction for that part of the exam), but not those at the lower end. One "theme" (anaemia, EMQ 8, Q.36-40) performed poorly compared to the others – this may be a combination of students performing the questions poorly (in which case a review of teaching in this area may be warranted; average % of students answering correctly varied between 61.1% and 9.6%) and items performing poorly (four discriminated weakly and one was a negative discriminator).

The OSPEs are, as in previous years, well organised and run smoothly. It was encouraging to see nine students passed all 20 stations, against the nine students who need to resit as they failed more than eight stations. It is difficult to understand how the pass mark (within each station but also the overall pass mark of 12/20) is achieved and the literature referred to in the exam board meeting would be useful to have for external examiners to better understand this process. There was variance for certain stations with regards to the difference circuits/sessions held throughout the week - it would be valuable to understand where this difference arises from and how it is dealt with. It was concerning to see more than half of the students failing one of the two communication skills stations. This was perhaps a more challenging station, but not unrealistic in practice, which is where they will hopefully be shortly after this assessment. There were around 20% of students failing both communication skills stations. However, some of these passed the OSPEs as assessment point, as they only need to pass 12 out of 20 stations. Knowing that communication errors are a frequent reason for cases to be dealt with at the VDS, it is worth a discussion of how sensible it is to be able to pass these practical exams without having to pass either of these communication stations. A more detailed investigation of failed points in both stations demonstrated that students did not focus on the client and patient, this may have been due to the artificial 'simulated' environment, however, there is limited evidence that these students would perform much better in a 'real' environment.

The overall OSCE process appears relatively robust, other than the observation that abilities omitted 3 inentatu1(r)-eatu1(r)-irqn(r)-nsan t(s)-

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

**3.6 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the assessment process**

Feedback to staff writing questions, with some clear examples of good discriminating mCS0 cs 0 s re to CS0 cs 0 s r s (F)-51.

## Assessment Procedures

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

**4.1 In your view, are the processes for assessment and the determination of awards sound and fairly conducted?**

Yes

Response from college requested: **NO**

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

No significant changes to comment on

Response from colleg5(l)-1/TT1625.6



5.1 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

5.2 An acceptable response has been made

Yes

**5.7 The standards set for the awards are appropriate for qualifications at this level, in this subject**

