Proposal: revised exam scrutiny process

Alan Smaill

10 March, 2017

The following fleshes out a proposal for a different exam scrutiny procedure, presented at the previous Teaching Committee. It takes some aspects from the current procedure at Dundee University.

Proposed revised process

Each exam has a nominated reviewer who knows the area covered in the exam. The reviewer goes through the draft exam, and makes comments. The setter makes appropriate changes, and the setter and reviewer agree a version of the exam. Subsequently a small group (year vetting group?) looks over the collection of exams, to monitor overall consistency, level of difficulty, watch for duplicate material between courses (but not to check the technical content). While comments would go to the course lecturer, I do not envisage that this would result in substantial further changes; this is for longer term consideration.

Timetable The ITO as currently to set out the overall timetable for events.

Reviewer We can make it the responsibility of course lecturers to arrange a reviewer at the start of the academic year — the information to be recorded at ITO. (Alternatively, lecturers could be asked to nominate courses they would review, and organise centrally based on this information.)

Tracking A record is kept of comments made by reviewer, date of agreement, comments by year vetting group, and this record is made available to external examiners. (The Dundee form can be adapted for this purpose.)

Year vetting In Dundee there are separate "discipline vetting committees" corresponding to degree programmes. This gives some consistency over the years of the programme, but is impractical in our situation. I suggest two or three people should be involved, recruited by the convenor of the Board of Examiners.