

| Report Question | External Examiners' comment | Course Directors response and actions | Update in 2019/20 |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| <p>3.4 Standard of marking</p> | <p>... We would however urge that internal examiners are encouraged to annotate the scripts to help see where marks had been allocated where appropriate.</p> <p>However, with regard to question 2 of paper 2, although this was a well written and constructed question that was very fair, it was poorly answered by the students, who seemed to have a lack of relevant knowledge. It was surprising that so few of them were able to correctly identify the use of median and range or define incidence and prevalence. It seems that there is still a lack of engagement in this topic amongst the student. The scripts were clearly marked and there seemed to be good correlation between different markers. However, it struck the external examiners that the nature of this sort of question does not lend itself as well to the common grading scheme. Many of the answers required in this question are simple statement of facts or brief descriptions and this may be easier to mark with a simpler mark scheme, using a 10-point scale for example. We believe that this was suggested and discussed at the exam board in 2017 and we would suggest that this idea is revisited.</p> <p>We also had concerns that the model answer for question 3 of paper 2 was possibly too detailed and made marking it using the CGS challenging for new examiners, which led to an over-engineered solution and excessive time spent marking for the internal examiners; We noted that the model answer had been modified to incorporate a detailed 100-point marking scheme that was then converted to the common grading scheme. This seemed like a complicated and time-consuming additional step for the marking process. However, we were happy that the results were fair and accurate. It was however noted that marker 3 was more generous than the other markers. This was obvious from the marker averages but this was not picked up by the</p> | <p>We thank the external examiners for their comments and observations. The structure of the Paper 2 is being reviewed to better reflect the aspects of the course that require higher level analysis. Question 2 which is commonly referred as the "Data Analysis" question may be modified and comments from the external examiners will be taken into consideration. If such a question is retained, we may employ a different College approved marking scheme such as the 10 point scale.</p> <p>We also recognise that further training of internal examiners in applying the CGS to long answer papers would be beneficial. We also appreciate that model answers should avoid being restrictive. These suggestions will be incorporate in the training of new examiners ahead of next year's exam composition.</p> <p>Action Required:</p> <p>Set up training sessions for internal examiners in setting questions and applying CGS to marking of exam scripts.</p> <p>Action Deadline:</p> <p>01-Oct-2019</p> <p>Action assigned to:</p> <p>Year 4 Leader Dan Chan</p> | <p>Completed</p> <p>The training need has been fed to the organisers of the Annual Inset day on Assessment</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | <p>sample marking. Perhaps the sample marking should be modified so that the sample marker independently grades the papers rather than checking that the way that the paper was marked makes sense?...</p> | | |
| <p>3.6 Opinion on changes to the assessment procedures from previous years in which you have examined</p> | <p>, it was felt that question 7 and possibly question 24 were very hard for 4th year students. Question 7 was therefore removed, and it was recommended that this was revised for future use.</p> | <p>We thank the external examiners for their comments. Comments regarding</p> | |

Comments from external
examiners to be fed back to
internal examiners
Further training sessions of
internal examiners to be
scheduled before next exam

Collaborative Report

Exam board meeting: 12-Dec-2019

Bachelor of Veterinary Medicine, Year 4, 2019/20

Lead examiner: Dr Mickey Tivers

Collaborating examiner(s): Professor Robert Foale, Mr Lorenzo Viora, Dr Gudrun Schoeffmann

The Programme

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

1.1 Course content

This was considered appropriate in terms of breadth and detail for fourth year veterinary students.

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

Learning objectives were considered appropriate

Student performance

Please comment, as appropriate, on:



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

As last year, staff had reviewed the statistics for the MCQ and EMQ papers prior to the congregation of the external examiners. They had identified poorly performing questions, investigated and made appropriate recommendations for the external examiners. This was, again, excellent and very helpful. We were thus able to 'sign off' this part of the examination in an extremely timely fashion, allowing more time to be spent on assessing the rest of the examination. Thank you.

3.7 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the procedures

Additional comments regarding specific questions are provided in the next section.

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:

No.

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

We have the following specific comments regarding the individual parts of the examination;

comments were redacted before shared with others; Year Leader has considered these comments.

College Response: We thank you for your comments.

A note for future writing of the reports: As these reports are published on our website, specific comments about individual questions need to be fed back separately and not via this report unless we redact these which would be undesirable.

