Collaborative Report

Master of Veterinary Medicine, 2014/15

Lead examiner: Dr Angus Anderson

Collaborating examiner(s): Dr Mark Bowen

The Programme

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

1.1 Course content

Response from college requested: NO

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

Response from college requested: NO

1.3 Teaching methods

Response from college requested: NO

1.4 Resources (in so far as they affected the assessment)

Response from college requested: NO

1.5 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the Programme

Difficult for us to comment on the specifics above but the MVM programme is excellent

Response from college requested: NO
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

The level of performance of residents at the RVC continues to compare extremely well with programmes in other institutions. Overall standard of research projects was very good.

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 overall high marks attained in the modules indicates a high standard of student attainment and quality of teaching and supervision

Response from college requested: NO

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

Response from college requested: NO
Assessment Procedures

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

3.1 Assessment methods (relevance to learning objectives and curriculum)

Assessment process is appropriate

Response from college requested: NO

3.2 Extent to which assessment procedures are rigorous

Rigorous and robust

Response from college requested: NO

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

The level of assessment is appropriate for a Masters level qualification

Response from college requested: NO

3.4 Standard of marking

The standard of marking was consistent and appropriate

There is a very considerable discrepancy in the contribution made to the project by students varying from 40% to nearly 100%. We suggest that a level is set which should be regarded as a minimum and that this is clearly stated on the student declaration. The percentage contribution made by the primary supervisor should also be stated and consideration given to a maximum value for this contribution. Other contributors could be named but unless their contribution exceeds a certain amount the precise level (in terms of %) probably does require a numerical value.

We request that the marks given by the internal examiners for the project are shown individually (as well as their average) in the summary table so that they can be assessed at a glance.

Response from college requested: YES

COURSE DIRECTOR: Prof Chris Lamb

Course Director Response:
An alternative approach would be to accept that the student's contribution is sufficient if it is the largest of any collaborators.
It will be possible to show individual examiner's marks as requested.

Action Required:
For consideration at next CMC

Action Deadline:
15-Sep-2015

Action assigned to:
C. Lamb
3.5 In your view, are the procedures for assessment and the determination of awards sound and fairly conducted? (e.g. Briefing, Exam administration, marking arrangements, Board of Examiners, participation by External Examiners)

Response from college requested: NO

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

It has been useful to see abstracts submitted with all projects

Response from college requested: NO

3.7 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the procedures

Response from college requested: NO
General Statements

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

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

4.2 An acceptable response has been made

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

4.3 I approved the papers for the Examination

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

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: 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 the awards are appropriate for qualifications at this level, in this subject
Yes
Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

4.8 The standards of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar
Yes
Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

4.9 I have received enough support to carry out my role
Yes
Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

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 assessment and the determination of awards are sound
Yes
Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO
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:

Response from college requested: NO

External Examiner comments: For College information only (Responses to External Examiners are published on the College’s website. Please only use this box to add any comments that you wish to remain confidential, if any)

Response from college requested: NO