

Collaborative Report

Exam board meeting: 10-Sep-2024

MSc in Veterinary Education (Part-Time), Year 1, 2023/24

Lead examiner: Professor Susie Schofield

Collaborating examiner(s): Dr Luisa Wakeling

The Programme

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

1.1 Course content

The course content was attractive and relevant to the topic.

Dr L.W

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

The learning objectives were suitable to the course and at the right level for a masters. The range of marks showed good discrimination on extent to which they were met

1.3 Teaching methods

These were suited to a part time distance learning course where the participants are combining this with work. Assessments were authentic to the workplace.

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

There was a good range of resources easy to access, and students were also encouraged to find their own additional resources, as would be expected at masters level.

1.5 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the Programme

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 was at an appropriate stage.

2.2 Quality of candidates' knowledge and skills, with particular reference to those at the top, middle or bottom of the range

The top students were excellent and the bottom students well-supported, with feedback that was clear, not misleading on their level but also encouraging. For example in ACITVE reflective assignment it was clear why students had been awarded the marks they had with a large difference in quality of the submission at 52% compared with the 82% submissions.

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Elizabeth Chan

Course Director Response:

Thank you for noting the support provided for lower-achieving students. We know we have a student population from a range of education backgrounds, including some who do not have an undergraduate degree, and also that there is a significant range in time and resources available for students to engage with the course, as most participants are in full time work and many have significant caring responsibilities.

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

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

The offer to discuss feedback provided was supportive. It would be interesting to know how many took up this offer and if anything could be learnt re. faculty and assessment design from these discussions

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Elizabeth Chan

Course Director Response:

At Diploma and MSc level it is usual for students to take up this offer. For Diploma students, the need for this discussion tends to arise most frequently when students have joined our programme after completing a Certificate elsewhere. We are creating some additional materials for such students to help them bridge the gap between their Certificate and the RVC Diploma.

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

3.1 Assessment methods (relevance to learning objectives and curriculum)

There was a good range of assessment methods, aligned to the los and authentic to the needs of the students in the workplace. We particularly liked the first two sections of the dissertation: contribution and response to the examiners. These were felt highly relevant to publishing work.

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Elizabeth Chan

Course Director Response:

Thank you. This addition has been implemented to help students to engage with their written feedback, and appears to be working well.

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

3.2 Extent to which assessment procedures are rigorous

The procedures were rigorous, with good moderation processes followed. There was good use of rubrics. The increase in merit numbers was examined and no grade inflation found. One of the EEs was fortunate enough to observe a faculty development event relating to assessment - the content and delivery was of a high standard, and a safe environment for discussion cultivated.

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Elizabeth Chan

Course Director Response:

Thank you for checking for grade inflation. We have also noticed an improvement in students' attainments so it is valuable to have this input.

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

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

The level was consistent with FHEQ.

3.4 Standard of marking

The standard of marking and feedback was high. The scoring and feedback annotations were aligned. The tone of feedback continues to be supportive and gives the sense that the assessor sees the student as a colleague. There was excellent use of feedforward.

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)

The procedures were sound and fairly conducted. We felt supported and welcome.

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

The word document for links was very much appreciated by both external examiners.

3.7 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the procedures

It was good to see encouragement of publication for suitable pieces of work. The use of subheadings in feedback was helpful. The oral presentation feedback showed that students were demonstrating a very good understanding of their work.

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Elizabeth Chan

Course Director Response:

Thank you. Support for publication of MSc projects has been a recent focus of attention for us and appears to be working well.

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

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:

4.2 An acceptable response has been made

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

4.3 I approved the papers for the Examination

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was 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:

The videos were not available. However the feedback given was aligned to the marks given.

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:

4.6 Candidates were considered impartially and fairly

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

From one of the examiners: there was one case discussed where there was a little confusion over which student it was due to anonymity. Ultimately I don't think the student was impacted but I do worry sometimes that we bend over backwards to redact / anonymise in a safe, confidential and professional environment.

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:

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:

4.9 I have received enough training and support to carry out my role

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was 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:

4.11 Appropriate procedures and processes have been followed

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

4.12 The processes for assessment and the determination of awards are sound

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

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:

At the exam board we weren't sure what happened with late submissions. A commentary on this would have been helpful. We were sent some marks to check later and that may well have been those submissions.

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Elizabeth Chan

Course Director Response:

Most of the late submissions represent students who have requested an extension to the assessment deadline. Extensions are approved according to the RVC's policy on this, which requires a student's reasons for the request to be unforeseen. Some students occasionally submit late without an extension approved; this is for a variety of reasons (difficulty with the technology, sometimes confusion over time zones) and marks are deducted by the examinations office following grading.

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

5.2 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)