

Report Question	([WHUQDO] ([DPLQ] comment in 2017/18	Course Directors response and actions	Update in 2018/19 & 2019/20	Update in 2020/21
1.3 Teaching methods	Students' approach to answering questions in an examination may not necessarily reflect a problem-based approach as taught in the clinics, which is disappointing.	<p>The problem-based approach that is taught at the RVC is explicitly assessed in this finals exam as well as the 4th year exam. The issue with the patchy use of it by some students (or total lack of familiarity by a few) is likely to relate to inconsistent reinforcement in clinical scenarios and rotations and students failure to avail themselves of the extensive learning support material available. We recognise that the approach may need some modification for farm-related questions and will seek guidance from the production animal teaching team.</p> <p>Action Required:</p> <p>Discussion with production animal teaching team about how to modify the problem-solving approach taught for individual animals to enhance a problem-solving approach that is suitable for production animal/herd level problems.</p> <p>Action Deadline:</p> <p>01-Sep-2018</p> <p>Action assigned to:</p> <p>Jill Maddison</p>	This discussion has occurred	As indicated ±this discussion has occurred and the production team continue to work on this issue. Next action would be to assign this to Richard Booth for further comment.

Report Question	([WHUQDO] ([DPLQH] comment in 2018/19	Course Directors response and actions	Update in 2019/20	Update in 2020/21
1.3 Teaching methods	The response from the College to comments from last year relating to students' approach to answering questions in an examination			

	<p>this finals exam as well as the 4th year exam, and an action for the College was to discuss particularly with the production animal teaching team about how to modify the problem-solving approach taught for individual animals to enhance a problem-solving approach that is suitable for production animal/herd level problems.</p>	<p>down cow, define and refine setup as an example but overlay the above on top of this. This is just an example, but shows how the students need to consider</p> <p>this when we are discussing population medicine with them</p> <p>3. This is repeated in year 4 (may not be appropriate to keep repeating this but last year this ensured that everyone got it) and again in the exam prep sessions that were held during Electives</p> <p>5. Farm staff have been asked to signpost this process within their teaching where appropriate</p> <p>6. Clinical decision making is used in rounds (in particular) at both Synergy and Endell when cases are discussed on the final days of both rotations. A lot of these are scenarios that are potential exam questions and both practices play a hand in writing the questions knowing that they are teaching the students in this way.</p> <p>7. The farm questions are made a little more complex as we are trying to add in VPH/economics into some and these won't always fit into the clinical decision-making frameworks but often the first part of the question will depend on the question structure.</p> <p>8. All of the farm finals questions were developed with clinical vets (in practice), so are common conditions and scenarios that they see.</p>		
--	---	--	--	--

Report Question	([WHUQDO ([DPLQH comment in 2019/20	Course Directors response and actions	Update in 2020/21
<p>2.2 Quality of knowledge and skills, with particular reference to those at the top, middle or bottom of the range</p> <p>FDQGLGDWHV ¶</p>	<p>Clinical and Professional reasoning examination (Part II) did discriminate overall student performance: the cohort were reasonably distributed. However, two of the three compulsory questions did</p>	<p>Yes - 81.624 72(os)gETQq142.22 35.76 146</p>	

have a distorting effect on overall grades.

No students failed one of these questions while ~24% failed one of the other two questions (in turn about half of this 24% were graded as '48'). Further statistical analysis will no doubt assist in determining significance.

As would be expected, student performance in optional CPR questions was better than in the compulsory questions.

It remains possible for a student to fail a particular species CPR question (or number of Qs) quite badly (35%) but still pass overall.

Is the RVC still considering the introduction of minimum thresholds (e.g. a student must achieve >40% in all questions and not fail more than 2 questions) to pass overall ?

final year in February 2020 prior to the results of this examination).

Action Deadline:

01-Jun-2021

Action assigned to:

Brian Catchpole, John Sanger, Jill Maddison

Collaborative Report

Exam board meeting: 15-Jun-2021

Bachelor of Veterinary Medicine, Year 5, 2020/21

Lead examiner: Dr Joseph Cassidy

Collaborating examiner(s): Dr Harold Bok, Dr Amanda Boag, Professor Gayle Hallowell, Professor Nicholas Jonsson

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Jill Maddison

Course Director Response:

Thank you. It should be noted that the integrated assessment of clinical and professional decision making starts in the BVM4 exam so students have had experience of this method of assessment before entering rotations and then Finals.

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

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

On-line proctoring remains a challenge - this year proctoring software (Proctorio) was utilised.

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Jill Maddison

Course Director Response:

Proctorio was used for other examinations at the RVC in 2020-2021 but not for Finals.

Action Required:

Action Deadline:

Action assigned to:

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

Student performance is comparable with that in our 'home' institutions.

We note and welcome the introduction of minimum thresholds in Finals Part II to be implemented in the 2021-22 academic year. This should mitigate against the small number of academically weaker students who compensate for weaknesses in particular species using marks attained on questions on other species. An example at this assessment was a student who passed overall having failed three of the four Finals part II clinical and professional decision making questions.

The objective of this modification is to assist in maintaining the goal of 'potential omnicompetence'. Given that students have a somewhat limited question choice in Finals part II it will be important to carefully review the impact of this modification.

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Jill Maddison

Course Director Response:

The performance of this student cohort is broadly reflective of that in our home institutes.

The externs considered that the phrasing of the vignette in the compulsory equine question (Q3) was somewhat ambiguous resulting in a considerable proportion of students following an incorrect course of action in answering the question, potentially disadvantaging them. This ambiguity (and its potential consequences) had been pointed out when the question had been initially reviewed by externs but this advice was not acted upon. Only limited remedial action could be taken given the time available once marking was complete to address the negative impact on student performance - this resulted in one less student failing overall. There were likely impacts on many student grades within the greater cohort. Perhaps such a situation could be avoided in the future if some form of arbitration was in place prior to finalising questions?

Externs had some discussion as to how the common grading scheme is applied to questions containing multiple sections - presumably a degree of judgment is used by assessors experienced in using this scheme?

COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Jill Maddison

Course Director Response:

Thank you for your comment and we will ensure that all comments from external examiners are considered formally in the future, arbitrated when appropriate and that a formal response is provided by the assessor should they not agree with feedback provided by the external examiner. We apologise if this did not occur this year. The issue was discussed in some detail by the examiners and myself and the relevant.96 T39.6 611.5 170.93 4.92 reW* n

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

3.7 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the procedures

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

Yes

4.6 Candidates were considered impartially and fairly

Yes

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:

