

---

 BVETMED YEAR 4 EXTERNAL EXAMINERS REPORTS
 

---

 Responses to 2017/18 External Examiners' Comments and an update to 2016/17 Actions
 

---

 To be considered at the Spring TQC Meeting
 

---

 a. Update to actions from 2016/17 - the full report available [here](#):

External Examiners' comments	Year Leader's response	Update
1.5 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the Programme  <i>Comments on Integrated Reasoning question ( full comment in 16/17 report)</i>	Action Required: - To instigate further formative opportunities in preparation for Integrated Reasoning questions, including the emphasis on Professional Studies for students before the Year 4 Exam - To bring to the attention of the Working Party on BVetMed Assessment the comments and observations of external examiner on the Year 4 exam.  Action Deadline: 01-Jun-2017  Action assigned to: Dan Chan	Ongoing
2.2 Quality of candidates' knowledge and skills, with particular reference to those at the top, middle or bottom of the range  ... the level of assessment in some of the clinical reasoning questions may be too advanced for the level and experience of students at this stage in the course ( <i> full comment in 16/17 report</i> )	The expectations of Year 4 students before they enter clinical rotations and what the Year 4 Exam and Finals should look like will be explore as the BVetMed Course undergoes a Curriculum Review this year. A special working party on BVetMed Assessment is being formed and will be tasked with resolving these issues.  Action Required: To bring to the attention of the BVetMed Curriculum Review committee and the BVetMed Assessment Working Party the concerns raised by the External Examiners on the Year 4 Exam  Action Deadline: 01-Jun-2017  Action assigned to: Dan Chan	Ongoing

All other actions have been completed!

c. Collaborative Report for 2017/18

# Collaborative Report

Exam board meeting: 15-

answer explaining how the question would be marked was uploaded to the Exam Information page on LEARN. Students also had 2 briefings on the Exam including a Question & Answer session to explain the format and expectations of the exam. However, attendance and engagement with the material provided with the Professional Strand may explain the performance in Paper 1. As the Externals are also aware, the actual topic of the Paper 1 is released to students 10 days ahead of the exam and includes helpful resources. We believe all of these measures should more than adequately prepare students for the examination. However, as students may prioritise the material covered in Paper 2 over the material in Paper 1, this may explain the differences in performance.

**Action Required:**

**Action Deadline:**

**Action assigned to:**

## 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

In our view students' performance was similar compared to courses in Bristol, Cambridge and Nottingham

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

The level of knowledge was acceptable to excellent for students at middle and top of range; the failing students had obvious gaps in knowledge which need addressing. Integrated reasoning skills (particularly regarding data analysis) were limited for many students.

Response from college requested: **NO**

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

As the student performance in the Integrative Reasoning questions has only slightly improved from last year it may be worthwhile to discuss/action ideas in the curriculum review committee and the working party on assessment, as suggested in last year's report. It was concerning to see that the marks gained in paper 2 (Integrative Reasoning) did not correlate with allocation of merits and distinctions to students, where distinction level appeared solely obtained because of EMQ/MCQ performance.

Response from college requested: **YES**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Mr Dan Chan**

**Course Director Response:**

We indeed plan to have a number of discussions with the Curriculum Review Committee and the Working Party on Assessment regarding the importance of assessing candidate's ability to reason and clearly express their understanding and problem solving. It diir

## Assessment Procedures

General Statements

**4.4 I was able to scrutinise an adequate sample of students' work and marks to enable me to carry out my duties**

**Yes**

**Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:**

**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:**

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 assessme.54 2572.6W\*nq212.84 698.52 75.86 16.98 reW\*nBT/ nq46E Tn.98 re answer







students to reason through the options available and apply the theoretical frameworks that they have been taught in a way that is meaningful and authentic.

The marking for this question was reasonably consistent, although one marker seemed to score the papers slightly higher than the others, with less emphasis on the requirement for students to use an ethical framework for a higher score. More consistent annotations of how the markers are interpreting the scores were noted compared to previous years, which is appreciated. However, there is still some room for improvement, as some markers did this more clearly than others. In general, the students performed more consistently on this question than on professionalism topics in the past. However, there was still a low number of students that performed at merit or distinction level. Furthermore, it was apparent that there was a poor correlation between performance in the exam and performance on this question, with some merit and distinction level students

"Á@Áã @Áč á^} • Á @ Á ^!^Áãã \* Á ç^!ã  
"Á@Á ^•Á~!Áç^!ãÁæ•Á æ\Áã áãæ•  
"Á@Á~!Áã áãæ•Á

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Mr Dan Chan**

**Course Director Response:**