

Subject Examination Committee (SEC) Chair examination checklist

Subject:

Year:

Examination level (Fellowship/Membership):

Head Subject Examiner:

SEC Chair:

Paper 1 Paper 2 Practical Oral *please circle relevant component/s*

Checklist	Yes/No	Any comments? (pls include Paper and Q number)
Breadth and level		
Are the questions focused on middle to higher level tasks that may involve creation, evaluation, analysis and application?		
Are the questions at the right level of difficulty?		
Do the questions* provide the right breadth of coverage and relative weighting of the learning outcomes in the subject guidelines? <i>(*across all the examination components)</i>		
Examination structure		
Do the examination materials follow the exam structure format as described in the current guidelines?		
Does the content come from the recommended reading list?		
Are marks allocated to each question and separate subpart?		
Are the marks allocated to each question and each sub-part appropriate (factoring in the complexity of the question and the time required to answer)?		
Do the marks add up to the expected total?		
Is there sufficient time to answer all the questions?		
No more than 20% of the short or long answer questions in this written or practical examination are substantially similar to questions offered in the previous three examinations for this subject.		
For multiple choice questions no more than 50% may be reused per examination cycle.		

Checklist	Yes/No	Any comments? (pls include Paper and Q number)
Question structure		
Is it clear for each question what is required in terms of scope?		
Does each question contain an instructional verb that explains the task required to the candidate?		
Are the questions worded as a statement? (ie. Aside from MCQs, there should be NO question marks in the written papers).		
Does each question avoid the use of the second person (you/your)? NB. Allowable exceptions include 'Justify/explain your approach'.		
Is signalment provided and complete for clinical scenarios?		
Is each question worded so that it can be answered by candidates living either in Australia or NZ?		
Have prompts/cues been appropriately planned for the oral examination?		
If oral exam spans multiple days, do the questions on subsequent days cover different aspects of the <u>same</u> learning objectives?		
Are any ancillary materials used (images, radiographs, histopathology slides etc) fit for purpose, clear, legible and of good quality?		
Are radiographs, ultrasounds, CT/MRI images displayed on a black background and correctly oriented with only 1-2 images per slide?		
Are images appropriately de-identified and labelled (eg L/R markers on radiographs, magnification of cytology slides)?		
Are all the images relevant (ie. Are they required to answer the question)? If not, suggest removing them as they may be distracting.		
If there are multiple choice questions:		
Do they comply with the College MCQ Policy?		
Do they comprise less than 50% of the marks for each exam component?		

Checklist	Yes/No	Any comments? (pls include Paper and Q number)
Do they assess higher learning outcomes?		
Is there a clear testing point for each question (ie the MCQ should not be a series of multiple true-false questions)?		
<p>Are the questions worded positively?</p> <p><i>NB. MCQs should not ask 'which is not' the right answer as candidates may be able to identify the incorrect answer without knowing the correct answer. The exception is asking which therapy is contraindicated.</i></p>		
All references to the second person (you/your) have been removed?		
Are all distractors plausible?		
Are the options in each key homogeneous in content and length?		
Are the questions and options clear and unambiguous?		
Do they pass the 'cover test' (ie. The question should be answerable without needing to read the options)?		
Have all 'clues' been removed from the stem (ie. Avoid repeating terms in both the stem and key)?		
Is there only one correct answer (and no option to select all/none of the above)?		
Do you agree with which answer is correct?		
Marking guides		
Is a marking guide provided which indicates the agreed standard by which candidates' answers will be judged and marks awarded?		
Does the information provided in the marking guide address the question that is being asked (ie. Does the model answer match the question posed)?		
Is the minimum requirement for a pass clear within each marking guide?		
Do you agree with the marking guides?		

Checklist	Yes/No	Any comments? (pls include Paper and Q number)
Have holistic marking rubrics been included for higher order questions (to factor in logical approach, clinical reasoning, contradictory information etc)? <i>NB. Please note that this is mandatory for all questions/subparts worth 6 or more marks (Membership) and 10 or more marks (Fellowship).</i>		
Grammar and spelling		
Is the language used in each question clear and grammatically correct?		
Are there any spelling mistakes (particularly discipline-specific words)?		
Are units given as SI units?		
Are any numerical values used realistic and correct?		

If any of the above responses are 'No', please flag these issues with the HSE.

Signed: _____ **SEC Chair**

Date: _____

The SEC Chair should complete one of these forms and return it with suggested corrections to the Head Subject Examiner after review of the examination. [\(also available on the College website\)](#)

This form can be completed and submitted electronically.

Please submit this completed checklist to the College Examinations Officer once the examination is finalised.