

**SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' COMMENTS, 2012/2013**

Course MVetMed

Examiner Comment	RVC Response (Please remember to directly quote (copy and paste) our regulations/procedures e.g. from the intranet <a href="http://intranet.rvc.ac.uk/StudentsAndTeaching/RegsAndProcs.cfm">http://intranet.rvc.ac.uk/StudentsAndTeaching/RegsAndProcs.cfm</a> )	Actions
<b>Neil Hudson &amp; Angus Anderson</b>		<b>RVC list of actions for 2013-14</b>
<p><b>3. Assessment Process</b></p> <p>As mentioned in last year's report and the Board meeting we reiterate the need for standard declarations from the candidates regarding details of who did what in the projects and the level of support from others. Also, an indication of which piece of work is being submitted to be examined.</p>	<p>A Project Declaration form has been created to be completed by the Senior Clinical Training Scholar and submitted with their project. This form and Guidelines for the MVetMed Research Project are available in the MVetMed area of the RVC VLE 'Learn'.</p>	<p><i>Insert Actions &amp; Deadline (if any) and Individual Responsible:</i></p> <p><i>MVetMed candidates to complete new project declaration form and submit with their project.</i></p>
<p>The resit guidelines for the research project as discussed at the board need clarification e.g &lt;50% as the threshold rather than 40%. It is useful to see all the marks and comments given by internal examiners; this will facilitate our QA of the assessment process.</p>	<p>The threshold score has been corrected and now reads 50%.</p> <p>We will ensure that marks and comments given by internal examiners are provided to External Examiners.</p>	<p><i>Insert Actions &amp; Deadline (if any) and Individual Responsible:</i></p> <p><i>Exams office to provide Internal examiners' mark sheet and comments to External examiners in 2013-14.</i></p>

**List of any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes that would be worth drawing to the attention of external audiences:**

- As mentioned this MVetMed Programme overall can be highlighted as an example of excellent practice in Postgraduate clinical and research training.

**FOR COMPLETION  
AFTER THE  
EXAMINATION**

**THE ROYAL VETERINARY COLLEGE**

***EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT***

**Name of Examiner** Neil Hudson & Angus Anderson

**Programme** MVetMed

**Year of appointment**

**Year of Examination** 2013

**Examination** Final Assessment

**Dates of attendance at the RVC** 16/5/13

Please comment on the areas detailed below. If you have no comments in a particular area, please state "Satisfactory", "Good" or "Excellent".

**1. The Programme**

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

- 1.1 course content
- 1.2 learning objectives, and the extent to which they were met
- 1.3 teaching methods
- 1.4 resources (in so far as they affected the assessment)
- 1.5 the overall quality of the Programme, as revealed by the student performance, with specific reference to particular strengths and weaknesses
- 1.6 the recommendations from this Examination for the curriculum, syllabuses, and teaching methods
- 1.7 the effects of any changes made to the Programme in the last 12 months

*Type here*

Excellent.

See last year's report; general comment that the programme is bedding in more and more, with positive results.

## 2. **Candidates**

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

- 2.1 impressions of candidates' specific areas of strength and weakness, as revealed by the assessment process
- 2.2 the quality of candidates' knowledge and skills, with particular reference to those at the top, middle or bottom of the range
- 2.3 the candidates' overall performance in relation to students at a similar stage on comparable courses in other institutions, where this is known to you

*Type here*

Again, broadly the candidates performed very well in the programme, with 10 merits and 1 distinction in a cohort of 4. Congratulations to candidates and supervisors.

The candidates' strengths again are higher in the B modules compared to the A modules. As commented last year, this is not a criticism, but merely reflects the elective nature of the B modules.

The overall standard of projects was very good, many of which were at merit level or higher. Again, a good number of published papers.

Candidate performance as iterated is at least as good as, if not better, than other institutions. This formal accreditation of the Residency programme can be example to other institutions.

## 3. **Assessment Process**

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

- 3.1 the appropriateness of the assessment methods to the subject matter and their relevance to the learning objectives
- 3.2 the extent to which the assessment processes are rigorous
- 3.2 whether the assessments reflected the syllabus adequately
- 3.3 the overall standard of marks
- 3.4 any changes from previous years in which you have examined

*Type here*

We were happy that the assessment process is rigorous and robust. The overall standard of marks reflected accurately the quality of the candidates.

As mentioned in last year's report and the Board meeting we reiterate the need for standard declarations from the candidates regarding details of who did what in the projects and the level of support from others. Also, an indication of which piece of work is being submitted to be examined.

The resit guidelines for the research project as discussed at the board need clarification e.g <50% as the threshold rather than 40%. It is useful to see

**SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' COMMENTS, 2012/2013**  
Course MVetMed

all the marks and comments given by internal examiners; this will facilitate our QA of the assessment process.

**4. Assessment Procedures**

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

- 4.1 the administration of the examinations, e.g. time available for marking and moderation
- 4.2 arrangements for marking
- 4.3 procedures followed by the Board of Examiners
- 4.4 the participation of External Examiners in the process
- 4.5 adequacy of External Examiners' briefing
- 4.6 comparison with previous years in which you have examined

*Type here*

Excellent.

The administration was very smooth and we are grateful for the support and helpful response to our requests for further information

**5. Please delete responses as appropriate**

- |     |   |                         |
|-----|---|-------------------------|
| 5.1 | Comments I have made in previous years have been acted upon (declarations)  | Not quite in full (e.g. |
| 5.2 | An acceptable response has been made  | YES                     |
| 5.3 | I approved the papers for the Examination   | N/A                     |
| 5.4 | I was able to scrutinise an adequate sample of students' work and marks to enable me to carry out my duties                               | YES                     |
| 5.5 | I attended the meeting of the Board of Examiners held to approve the results of the Examination   | YES                     |
| 5.6 | Candidates were considered impartially and fairly   | YES                     |
| 5.7 | The standards set for the awards are appropriate for qualifications at this level, in this subject  | YES                     |
| 5.8 | The standards of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar | YES                     |

**SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' COMMENTS, 2012/2013**  
Course MVetMed

5.9 The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted YES

*If you have replied No to any of these questions, please comment more fully:*

*Type here*

Thank you, our comments have largely been addressed, but as discussed at the Board there are some measures we have suggested again that we hope will facilitate the exam process.

*If you have identified any areas of good practice, please comment more fully:*

*Type here*

As mentioned this MVetMed Programme overall can be highlighted as an example of excellent practice in Postgraduate clinical and research training.

Signed

Date 16/5/13

Dr Angus Anderson

Dr Neil Hudson