

Collaborative Report

Dr Sarah Channon

Thank you for your positive comments on the exam process this year, and on the achievement of our students. We use a bank of MCQs and continually review the MCQ question bank to ensure that questions are up to date and relevant, but agree that in some areas we could increase the number of questions available. A very small number of questions are repeatedly used by design, since they are helpful in acting as an aid to standard setting and tracking the performance across successive cohorts of students. We feel this is useful. The MCQ paper undergoes scrutiny internally from strand leaders to ensure questions are suitable and then is made available to the externals for comment. We are aware that students from this cohort will not have had the experience of undertaking summative ISF oral examinations in BVetMed 1. ISF orals are planned for 2020-21, but clearly this year group will need support in their preparation for the BVetMed 2 ISFs. We are currently exploring how we can achieve this alongside discussing the format of the 2020-21 oral exams.

Actions:

Ensure new MCQs are called for in November call for exam questions Year 1 leader
Finalise plans for 2020-21 ISF orals Year leaders of BVM1, 2 and GAB; Director of Assessment; Head of Exams
Create formative experience or sufficient support for BVM2 students ahead of their summative Year 2 ISF Oral
BvetMed 2 co-leaders

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

This is similar to performance at comparable institutions.

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

Performance in the newly-introduced research paper based Integrated Reasoning Question was good, supported by solid and extensive formative opportunities students had to practice this type of assessment. It was reassuring to see that the move away from the Essay did not lead to a lowering of marks, as feared based on IRQ performances in previous years (a particular concern of the EE team last year). The weighting between parts A and B is justified for year 1 students, as is the proposed shift in weighting for higher years.



4.5 I attended the meeting of the Board of Examiners held to approve the results of the Examination

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:

4.11 Appropriate procedures and processes have been followed

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

