

a. Update to 2014/15 Actions:








|

|

|

|



RCVS Certificate in Advanced Veterinary Practice, 2014/15

Professor Mike Herrtage

## The Programme

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

### 1.1 Course content

The course content is clearly defined.

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



Please comment, as appropriate, on:

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

The assessment is fair, but the introduction of the new Common Grading Scheme for clinical cases is causing difficulty. Concerns were raised that in some instances candidates that passed this year would have had to re-submit their work under the old regulations. The criteria need to be adjusted if 40% is considered a pass so that poor practice is more appropriately penalised. There should be more descriptors below the pass mark to ensure that, as this is a professional exam, poor clinical practice is not incorrectly rewarded with a pass.

Response from college requested: **YES**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Jill Maddison**

Course Director Response:

We agree that this issue is of real concern for the CertAVP where the feedback provided to candidates is a very important part of the learning experience. There are two options - to have the Masters Assessment and Award regulations modified so that the mark threshold to contribute to the weighted module mark is higher (e.g. above 45%) or if this is not possible, to amend the marking descriptors so that there is an additional grade between 35% and 38% to improve the grading options in this mark range and the descriptors are appropriate for a professional exam.

Action Required:

Discussion with appropriate RVC committees to progress this

Action Deadline:

31-Jul-2016

Action assigned to:

Jill Maddison

### 3.2 Extent to which assessment procedures are rigorous

The assessment is rigorous, but the descriptors under the new Common grading Scheme are incorrectly scaled for a professional exam. See above.

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

There is good consistency of assessment between the modules.

Response from college  
requested:

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

3.1 Assessment methods (relevance to learning objectives and curriculum)

The assessment is fair, but the introduction of the new Common Grading Scheme for clinical cases is causing difficulty. Concerns were raised that in some instances candidates that passed this year would have had to re-submit their work under the old regulations. The criteria need to be adjusted if 40% is considered a pass so that poor practice is more appropriately penalised. There should be more descriptors below the pass mark to ensure that, as this is a professional exam, poor clinical practice is not incorrectly rewarded with a pass.

Response from college requested: **YES**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Jill Maddison**

Course Director Response:

We agree that this issue is of real concern for the CertAVP where the feedback provided to candidates is a very important part of the learning experience. There are two options - to have the Masters Assessment

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

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was 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

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

No

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

The new Common Grading Scheme has introduced anomalies which need to be addressed.

Response from college requested: YES

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Jill Maddison**

Course Director Response:

As previously discussed. The seriousness of the issue is noted and agreed with.

Action Required:

As discussed previously

Action Deadline:

31-Jul-2016

Action assigned to:

Jill Maddison

## 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:

Do you have any suggestions for improvements based on experience at other institutes? We may use information provided in our annual external examining report:

No. The Modules are well managed and provide a good training platform.

Response from college requested:

NO

