

\_\_\_\_\_



# **Collaborative Report**

Exam board meeting: 15-Sep-2017

**MSc in Veterinary Epidemiology, 2016/17**

Lead examiner: Dr Rob Christley

**1.5 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the Programme**

The programme has been running for many years and is clearly well "tried and tested". The content is excellent and should give students an excellent grounding in epidemiology.

**Response from college requested:**



## Assessment Procedures

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

3.1 Assessment MCIS3.13.1 Ass

### 3.4 Standard of marking

Marking was fair and objective. In one or two instances the marks of the 1st and 2nd markers diverged considerably, but the agreed mark was usually appropriate. In one instance the agreed mark was somewhat lower than we would have expected.

One student received very divergent marks from the two markers for her project dissertation. It is recommended that all examiners be reminded of, and use, the marking guidance.

**Response from college requested:** **NO**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Julian Drewe**

#### **Course Director Response:**

While it was initially a surprise that some students received initially quite different marks from the 1st and 2nd marker, it was noticeable that the agreed mark (or in one case, the mark of the third marker who was sought) were considered to be very appropriate. This suggests the marking system works well as it does not rely on one marker's opinion. The divergent marking was not a result of markers being unfamiliar with the mark scheme but rather because of them having different areas of expertise and therefore different perspectives to which they attached differing levels of importance in their marking. The externals were satisfied with the marking overall and did not wish to overrule any. Nonetheless markers will be reminded of the marking guidance (although this might be a good place to suggest the 17-point scheme is overhauled so that different descriptors are provided for all marks, not just every second or third one as is currently the case).

### **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)**

Yes. Procedures were sound and fairly conducted.

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

The role of the external examiners has changed for this year, with EE observing, rather than participating in viva voce examinations. This worked well and enabled the external to remain a more impartial observer of the assessment process. We recommend this continues, with the two viva voce examiners being drawn from the course directors and the examiners of the dissertation, where possible.



## 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:



**Action Deadline:**

01-Jul-2018

**Action assigned to:**

Exams officer Lauren Christian

**4.10 I have received sufficient information to carry out my role (where information was insufficient, please give details)**

