

Staff Student Liaison Group (Years 1 and 2)

Terms of Reference and Membership

The Staff Student Liaison Groups report to the relevant Education Sub-Committee and are chaired by representatives from the ICSM Student Union. The role of these groups is to provide a forum for consideration of academic and non-academic issues raised by staff and/or students regarding the MBBS/BSc programme.

The Group's specific responsibilities include:

- 1 To consider academic and non-academic issues and problems raised by student and/or staff concerning the relevant years of the course, to identify possible solutions and oversee remedial action, referring matters to the relevant Education Sub-Committee where appropriate.
- 2 To receive and respond to teaching evaluations as part of the quality assurance procedures.

Distribution list

President ICSM SU (Chair)	Mr David Smith
Deputy Principal and Director of Education	Professor Jenny Higham
Deputy Directors of Education	Dr Sue Smith and Professor Karim Meeran
Head of Year 1 and 2 and LCRS Theme Chair	Professor John Laycock
Science and Patient Theme Chairs	Professor Gary Frost
	Professor Karim Meeran
FOCP and Dr and Patient Theme Chair	Dr Elizabeth Muir
MCD Theme Chair	Dr Keith Gould
LSS Theme Chair	Professor Mary Morrell
Relevant ICSM SU reps	
• Welfare	Miss Gayathri Rajasooriar
• Academic Officer (Yrs 1 and 2)	Mr Ali Hosin
• Year 1 Reps	Mr Yannis Reissis
	Mr Kyung-hoon Moon
	Mr Nikhil Patel
	Ms Aiysha Puri
	Mr Sybghat Rahim
	Mr Chengyuan Zhang
	Mr Steven Tran
	Mr Rahul Ravindran
Senior Tutor (Yrs 1 and 2)	Dr Mike Emerson
Sub Board Chair (Year 1 Assessment)	Dr Paul Kemp
Sub Board Chair (Year 2 Assessment)	Dr Martin Goodier
Head of Learning Resources	Dr Mike Barrett
Head of Quality Assurance & Enhancement	Professor Karim Meeran
Library Representatives	Ms Jacqueline Cousins and Ms Kate Perris
Curriculum Administrator (Yrs 1 and 2)	Ms Jo Williams

Ex Officio Members – to receive papers and attend as appropriate

Course coordinators for courses which have recently run or those with an interest in a specific agenda item are invited to relevant meetings.

Faculty Education Officer (FEO)
Student Services Manager
Senior Learning Technologist
Quality Management and Educational
Business Manager
Examinations Manager
Examinations Officer (Years 1 and 2)
Learning & Technical Services Manager

Ms Susan English
Ms Janette Shiel
Ms Maria Toro-Troconis
Mr Paul Ratcliffe

Ms Erika McGovern
Ms Margaret Rodger
Ms Michele Foot

Staff Student Liaison Group (Years 1 and 2) meeting

19th May 2010

13.00

128, SAFB

South Kensington Campus

Minutes

Present:, Mr A Chopra (Chair), Dr M Barrett, Ms R Campbell, Ms L Chow, Dr M Emerson, Dr M Goodier, Dr K Gould, Mr A Hosin, Dr C John, Dr P Kemp, Professor J Laycock, Ms E McGovern, Dr E Muir, Ms K Perris, Miss G Rajasooriar, Ms R Ramjan, Mr P Ratcliffe, Mr R Ravindran, Ms J Shiel, Dr S Smith, Mr D Thakker, Mr S Tran,

In attendance: Ms J Williams (secretary)

Apologies: Professor G Frost, Professor J Higham, Professor K Meeran, Ms S English, Ms M Foot, Ms J Shiel, Ms E McGovern, Dr M Morrell, Ms M Rodger, Mr V Sounderajah, Ms M Toro-Troconis, Ms M Foot

Meeting commenced at 13.00

1. **Minutes of the Meeting held on 17th March 2010**
RECEIVED: [Paper SSLG1,20910-10]
AGREED: a) that the Minutes were approved.
2. **Matters arising**
 - 2.1 **Web streaming**
REPORTED: a) that the process is being discussed at College Level.
 - 2.2 **Wireless facility in Drewe**
REPORTED: a) that due to the size of this lecture theatre the cost of such an exercise would be high.
b) that there was the possibility that if this was provided, misuse of the internet during could increase.
 - 2.3 **Exam Stress Clinics**
REPORTED: a) that these were oversubscribed and not always run at the best time for medics. It was hoped that next year site specific clinics could be held.
AGREED: b) students were reminded that they needed to register for these courses early and this would be emphasised next year.
Action: ICSMSU Welfare Rep
3. **Year 2 Summer Term Courses**
 - 3.1 **Science and Patient**
RECEIVED: [paper SSLG1,20910-11/12] had been circulated to all course leaders
REPORTED: a) that specific points relating to the new Science and Patient course should be fed back to the Theme Leaders who were not able to attend the meeting.
NOTED: b) that although students appreciated the effort that had gone into this new course, they still felt some anxieties relating to understanding exactly what was expected of them. The Head of Year attempted to relieve concerns and it was agreed that all comments would be considered when the course was reviewed for next year.
AGREED: c) the format of the exam although with new elements had been thoroughly explained and there was opportunity for formative

experience within the course.

3.2

FOCP Exam

NOTED:

- a) that students felt they had insufficient time for useful reflection in the exam and that they believed there might be a better way to test ethics than in current format.
- b) that it was pointed out that it was important to realise that the preparation carried out prior to the exam was an important part of what was being tested.

AGREED:

- c) that comments would be passed onto the course leader

Action: Ethics Course Leader

3.3

MCD Exam

NOTED:

- a) that some students reported that they felt the cancer section of questions had been underrepresented in terms of the amount of time spent on teaching this topic.
- b) that it was pointed out that all courses had been represented fairly in the number of questions set and that an exam would only ever be a sample of what needed to be learnt.
- c) that there had been some confusion over one of the microbiology questions where students felt they had been given misleading information.

AGREED:

- d) that questions were carefully scrutinized before the papers were set and the Exam Board would review performance and amend if they saw fit.

3.4

LCRS Exam

REPORTED:

- a) that some students had felt confused as regards where to write the different answers.
- b) that there had been some confusion over HLC questions set following the cancellation of some lectures.

AGREED:

- c) that the quality of some of the brain diagrams was poor
- d) that it was pointed out both on the starting script and papers and was very clear, although disappointing for those students who had not followed these instructions carefully.
- e) that the course and theme leader had apologised for the confusion over the HLC questions and confirmed that this question had been removed from the paper so that students would not be disadvantaged.
- f) that in future it would be clearly stated that students could be examined on any parts of the course whether the lecture took place or not and that they should ensure the whole year were aware of this.
- g) that the quality of the brain diagrams would be investigated and if need be the question modified.

Action LCRS Theme Chair

3.5

General Queries

REPORTED:

- a) that students would welcome having the Year 2 exams more spread out and this would be considered by the Exams team but would be dependent on timetabling.
- b) that the ongoing noise in the Lecture theatre was a problem and that this would need to improve.

AGREED:

- c) that every effort would continue to be made to limit lectures being cancelled at short notice.

4. RECEIVED: **Year 1 Summer Term Courses**
[paper SSLG1,20910-11/12] had been circulated to all course leaders
- 4.1 REPORTED: **Alimentary System**
a) that AS feedback had been sent to course leaders for consideration.
- 4.2 NOTED: **Urinary System**
a) that some students felt that there had been insufficient help available for the tutorials requiring calculations, although many of the staff present who had been involved felt that this was not the case.
NOTED:
b) that students needed to accept that the resource was there but the responsibility for raising issues was with students.
c) that answers should not be provided on the intranet as this was not seen as helpful and the benefit of this exercise could only be achieved by students learning how to do calculations.
- 4.3 NOTED: **Anatomy of the Abdomen**
a) that there had been some clinical examples provided in the first lecture slides which were not labelled.
b) that some students requested additional voluntary drop in sessions be provided for those who would like to develop their anatomical skills further.
c) that due to staffing and timetabling difficulties this would be unlikely, although students should approach some of the student societies eg Surgical Society and Muslim Medics who organised these
AGREED: d) that Year Reps should circulate contact details for these societies.
Action: ICSM SU Year 1 Reps
- 4.4 NOTED: **Skin**
a) that students asked if the lecture slides could be posted more quickly.
b) that this would be taken up with the course leader and that last year's slides were available currently and could be used.
Action: Years 1 and 2 Administrator and Skin Course Leader
- 4.5 NOTED: **Respiratory**
a) that students had found the acid base topic challenging and would appreciate some further small group work on this next year if possible to aid learning.
b) that it was agreed that this would be looked at for next year
c) that it was also hoped to integrate the Resp, CVS and US systems teaching next year
AGREED: d) that although a brief summary lecture was given on the Lung Mechanics session when the original was cancelled, some students sought additional help with this topic and it was agreed that they should ask the course leader and that the ICSMSU Ed Rep (Yrs 1, 2 & 4) would also organise a tutorial on this.
Action: year Reps and ICSM SU Ed Rep (Yrs 1, 2 & 4)
- 4.6 NOTED: **Patient Contact Course**
a) that the quality of the posters had been very good and that although some students found working on this currently a distraction from the revision, it was pointed out that this was a useful skill to acquire at this stage.

- 5.
- REPORTED: **Quality**
a) that students would welcome photos of staff on SOLE to remind them when they come to completing.
b) that they also requested that SOLE be opened earlier in their term and allow students to fill it in as they went along and not all in one go.
c) that currently SOLE was run along College lines but that this might be possible in the future and in the meantime the SOLE proformas should help
- AGREED:
d) that the Quality Management and Educational Business Manager would take this suggestion to the user group.
Action: Quality Management and Educational Business Manager.
- 6.
- REPORTED: **Assessment**
a) that it had been agreed that the Merit system had been amended and that the Exams team would ensure that the details were posted on the intranet, together with a statement of equivalents.
Action: UMO Exams Manager
b) that students requested that the Year 1 exams be further separated if possible as had occurred with MCD this year and the Exams team would consider this.
Action: UMO Exams Manager
- 7.
- REPORTED: **Library**
a) that the new quiet area in the CX Library was working well
b) that St Marys library gallery would have extended opening hours (7am – midnight)
c) that Chelsea and Westminster had new training rooms
d) that the Ref Works sessions for Year 2 students had been well received.
- 8.
- REPORTED: **Welfare**
No report
- 9.
- REPORTED: **Any other Business**
a) that the ICSM SU President, Education Rep and Year Reps were thanked for their support during the year.

Meeting
closed at
2.45pm

AC/JW
May 2010

To: Staff Student Liaison Group (Years 1 & 2)
Date: Wednesday 8th December 2010

Presented by: Year 1 & 2 Representatives

Written by: Ali Hosin - ICSMSU Academic Officer (Years 1, 2 & GEP)

Autumn Term Student Feedback

1. Introduction

Below is feedback gathered by the Year 1 & 2 Reps from liaising with their peers during the Autumn term

2. Recommendations

The committee is invited to consider, and respond where appropriate, to the student comments below.

3. Year 1 Feedback

General Course Feedback

- Lectures that are interactive are appreciated – could this style be adopted more often (e.g. clickers, questions)?
- Students appreciate the timetabled tutor sessions; however some students have had minor issues meeting them.
- Students would find it beneficial to revision if lectures were recorded and put onto the intranet, upon completion of the course
- Would it be possible for photos of lecturers to be included on the SOLE proforma, to aid its completion?
- Students feel that the new rotations system is a huge improvement over previous years. Would it be possible for rotations of the individual courses to be included?
- Noise levels in lectures

Foundation Course

- The Introduction to Anatomy was found to be enjoyable, especially exposure to the dissection room. Dr Wing May Kong was found to be especially engaging and her lecture was well-received.
- The Foundation course was found to be useful on the whole. Would it be possible for students to be made aware of the timetable prior to the start of term?
- Could IT and Library sessions be delivered together, and could all students have the E-portfolio tutorial earlier on in the term?

MCD

- The practicals were found to be interesting and enjoyable – especially blood taking!
- Tutorials were found useful for supplementing what was taught in lectures (e.g. Krebs Cycle), however there have been reports of varying consistency between tutor groups.
- Some lectures were found to be image-heavy and lacking text/explanation, which students are finding difficult to revise. Could these have more detail?

- Students would find it easier to fill out the SOLE proformas if they were in the lecture notes booklet rather than the course guide.

Sociology

- The videos were enjoyable
- Students find it useful when the clinical relevance of the taught concepts is emphasised

Clinical Communication

- Students appreciated the opportunity to have hands-on interviewing practice
- Would it be possible for the first lecture session to be condensed, or delivered in a small group format?

Epidemiology

- Dr Aylin's lectures were found to be especially engaging.
- Students have found the small-group teaching extremely beneficial. Could more of these be timetabled?

PBL

- PBL has been enjoyable - especially the diagnostic approach to some cases.
- More links to MCD would be appreciated
- Different groups have had varying experiences with their tutors and their involvement and guidance during the discussion.

FCA

- The early patient contact is really appreciated, and the tutorials are well-taught.
- Some students have had difficulty reaching their allocated patients.

Sites & Services

- Broken seating in Drewe LT

4. Year 2 Feedback

General Course Feedback

- The new rotation system has been well-received. Students are extremely pleased with it and feel that it is a massive improvement over what they had before.
- Students are very pleased that some worksheet/tutorial answers have been made available on the intranet. They find it very beneficial to the learning process, and would appreciate it if this was done for all the courses (especially Pharmacology) - we feel that doing so would not discourage attendance.
- Students would prefer the slides to be uploaded prior to the lecture, if possible. Many students find it extremely useful to be able to review the slides prior to the lecture and annotate them during the lecture.
- There have been several lecture cancellations this term. Some advance notice of cancellations would be highly appreciated, especially as the course is busier and many students are commuting from further away.
- Some lecture slides have diagrams with few or no accompanying notes. It would be appreciated if some notes were provided in the course guide or on the slides, as students find that they do not have the time to all the necessary information down during the lecture.
- Some students have suggested maybe a 5 minute break during some of the more intensive/long lectures to aid concentration.

Science and Patient

- Students are finding the course interesting however would appreciate having some notes in the course guide for reference like the other courses.
- Students appreciated that an effort was made to give feedback on the questions on the journal papers but were disappointed it. We felt that the number emailed to us gave no indication of how we can improve. If more specific feedback cannot be provided then could a set of model answers be published on the intranet afterwards?
- The tutorials on the papers were helpful for students to learn what to look for; we would appreciate it if the tutors were briefed to teach us more general principles as well so we can apply it to other situations.

Endocrinology

- Students are on the whole very pleased with the Endocrinology course, especially with the structure of lectures followed by tutorials for consolidation.
- An observation regarding the tutorial format was that the diagnoses were very obvious. Students have suggested we could have more generalised/overview tutorials perhaps at the end of the course that could incorporate a variety of different problems which would need the students to mobilise more prior knowledge instead of being able to simply look back at the lecture.
- Students commented that they found that individual lectures which are delivered by two different lecturers somewhat difficult to follow when looking back on them. Would it be possible to give them as one cohesive lecture with one lecturer?
- Lecture 8 and Lecture 9 had much overlapping content

Musculoskeletal

- Students appreciated Paul Kemp's supplementary handout

Pharmacology and Therapeutics

- Overall a very positive response. The course is well structured – drugs are taught by class, each time following the ADME structure of the first lecture on Pharmacokinetics - and has been very well received by the year group
- There is a feeling that we have been nicely eased into the Pharmacology course.
- Lectures are concise and relevant. Dr Chris John and Dr Martin Croucher were particularly praised
- Practicals were fun, interesting and well taught, and tutorials were good for the consolidation of knowledge.
- Students would have appreciated a summary of what will be covered in the whole course, given before the first lecture so students know what to expect
- The drug metabolism lecture and tutorial was poorly received by a large proportion of the year group who were unsure what exactly we needed to know for the exams and to what extent we needed to know the diagrams, chemical structures and reactions.
- It has been suggested that exam style questions could be provided at the end of lectures and tutorials to help us to consolidate our knowledge
- If possible, it would be good to tie the relevant tutorial or practical closer to the lecture to consolidate learning. More practicals, if possible, would be greatly appreciated.

Anatomy of the Head, Neck & Spine

- Anatomy has been very well taught this term and students are very pleased with the quality of teaching in lectures. Students have really appreciated having the dissection room worksheet answers uploaded onto the intranet.
- A point has been raised by many people in the year about the varying quality of anatomy tutors vary in quality. Some are excellent but some have poor English and accents which are difficult to understand. Some lack anatomical knowledge.

If this cannot be remedied for whatever reason, then rotating tutors would be preferable to prevent people from being stuck with one tutor for the whole of anatomy teaching.

- More information would be appreciated for some of the diagrams/images on the slides - either on the slides themselves or in the course guides. Some images are not really explained very well.
- Some lecturers have not provided either their slides or any accompanying information in the course guides. Students find this difficult to work from – particularly as there is often not enough time to write everything down in the lecture itself.
- It would also be appreciated if the colour images/scans from the dissection room could be uploaded onto the intranet for students' use.
- Some people feel that dissection sessions are too short and students should be given more time with the cadavers, if possible, to learn at their own pace.

Clinical Communication

- The overwhelming majority thought CC was great this term. Two sessions is perfect.
- Good refresher of communication skills and a nice introduction to history taking
- Interviewing simulated patients in groups was fantastic - much better than last year where we were on our own. The learning experience is much better in groups and being able to playback the video straight away and see certain points is incredibly useful.

PBL

- Students have mentioned that PBL is helpful for fine-tuning their presentation skills and other skills associated with the learning process. However, students feel that this was already gained to the full extent after year 1 – particularly after completing the year 1 exam, which people unanimously feel did not reflect the skills picked up from the PBL learning process.
- Students feel that the PBL cases are very well designed and interesting.
- Students feel that PBL learning objectives are varying in course relevance and there is discrepancy between assigned objectives. If possible, students would prefer PBL learning objectives that were all directly course relevant.
- There is also a discrepancy in the length of PBL sessions which has been raised by students with some groups having vastly longer/shorter sessions than others.

Neuroscience and Mental Health:

- Students thoroughly enjoyed the content of the course and found it an interesting and engaging topic. Students appreciated the tutorials and practicals that built on last year's topics. Students also appreciated the parallel teaching with the Anatomy of the Head and Neck.
- However students have brought up concerns about the last-minute cancellation of lectures. They appreciate that the FEO are not able to know exactly where each lecturer is but if it would be possible to confirm with them before that they are scheduled to be lecturing

MCD:

- Students felt that the course was well-taught but that some lectures could be condensed
- Students were wondering whether diagnostics could be taught in a tutorial? However the lectures were well interlinked and integrated

To: Staff Student Liaison Group Meeting (Years 1 and 2)

Date: 3rd November 2010

Presented by: Professor Mike Ferenczi, Head of Year 4 (BSc) and Chairman of Education Committee Year 4

Written by: Dr Antony Aleksiev, BSc Curriculum Administrator and Secretary of Esc 4

5% contribution of the Year 2 'Science and the Patient' course to the BSc degree classification

1. Introduction

In May 2008, the Education Committee Year 4 considered the introduction of 5% contribution of the mark from the Year 2 'Science and the Patient' to the BSc degree classification of Year 4 MBBS students. This proposal did not apply to external medical students undertaking an intercalated BSc and the Year 3 Biomedical Sciences students allocated to a BSc course in the Faculty of Medicine.

The Medical Studies committee considered this proposal and agreed to allow such contribution to be introduced from the 2011/12 BSc Year. Registry confirmed that the ensuing contribution of the 'Science and the Patient' course to both Year 2 final mark and the BSc mark is within College regulations.

However, because of the short time between the ratification of this contribution by the committees and the start of the 2009/10 Science and the Patient course, we are now proposing this to be introduced from the 2012/13 BSc Year (Year 4). This will require notifying the current, 2010/11 Year 2 students that the mark they obtain in the Science and the Patient course will contribute to their BSc mark.

In addition, the students should be made aware that the science taught in Years 1 and 2, outside of the Year 2 Science and the Patient course, as covered by the theme exams will also 'count' indirectly to the BSc in that they are required to pass these themes for progression to the next year of the MBBS/BSc course.

There are two drivers for suggesting the changes outlined above:

1. The purpose of the BSc Year is to form a new generation of clinical scientists. It is clear that some of the teaching in years 1 and 2 directly contributes to this goal. The Science and the Patient course in particular emphasises this aspect of teaching making this course count towards the BSc a reasonable objective.
2. The BSc is a qualification that should have a value in its own right (some students leave the medical course after the BSc). Inclusion of assessment in earlier years accentuates the progression to the BSc and may contribute positively towards compliance with the Bologna convention.

2. Recommendations

The committee is invited to:

- i. Consider and approve a 5% contribution of the Science and the Patient course, in the Summer Term of Year 2, to the BSc degree classification of the Year 4 MBBS/BSc students from 2012/13.

- ii. Consider and approve the following exceptions to this rule:
 - a) External intercalated medical students and MBBS/BSc students who are returning to the BSc from interruption of studies and have completed Year 2 before the introduction of the 5% contribution rule, should be exempt of the 5% contribution rule and hence their BSc mark will be based solely on the achieved in the Science Year
 - b) Year 3 Biomedical Sciences students undertaking the final year of their BSc in a Faculty of Medicine BSc course since their first and second years of study already contribute 35% to their final degree mark.

3. 5% contribution of the Year 2 'Science and the Patient' course to the BSc degree classification

The 'Science and the Patient' course, in the Summer Term of Year 2, already includes generic BSc (science) teaching as introduced from 2009/10. The course incorporates two weeks of the now discontinued BSc Foundation course, which used to be delivered in Year 3. The generic science teaching will be examined via both this course's in-course assessment and summative examination in June.

The agreed examination structure of the 'Science and the Patient' course is as follows:

- In-course assessment contributing 20% of the overall mark in the course
- An examination paper in June that will contribute 80% of the overall course mark, will cover all 5 main course themes: *Water & electrolytes, exercise, drugs & hospitalised patient, normal & abnormal nutrition, physiology of infection*, and will comprise two sections:
 - 5 short answer questions (SAQs) – 50 min
 - 1 essay from a choice of 2 – 55 min

The following categories of students will be exempt from the 5% contribution of the mark obtained in the Year 2 'Science and the Patient' course to the BSc degree:

- External intercalated medical BSc students (this exemption has already been agreed by the Education Committee Year 4 and ratified by the Medical Studies Committee)
- Year 3 Biomedical Sciences BSc students taking Faculty of Medicine BSc courses (this exemption has already been agreed by the Education Committee Year 4 and ratified by the Medical Studies Committee)
And a new category,
- Imperial MBBS/BSc students returning to the medical course from an interruption of studies who have completed Year 2 before the introduction of the 5% contribution rule

To: Staff Student Liaison Group – Years 1 & 2
Date: Wednesday 8th December 2010

Presented by: Year 2 Representatives
Written by: Year 2 Representatives & ICSMSU Academic Officer (Years 1, 2 & GEP)

Distinction in Medical Science Award

1. Introduction

At present, only those students who attain a Distinction in each of Years 1 & 2 (by achieving an average exam mark in each year which falls in the top ~20% of the cohort) are eligible for the award of 'Distinction in Medical Science'. However, under the current system, students who narrowly miss out on a Year Distinction are ineligible for the Distinction in Medical Science award, even if their average score over the two years is in the top ~20%.

Students who narrowly missed out on a Distinction in Year 1 are disadvantaged by the current system, as they have no chance of a 'Distinction in Medical Science' even if they were to score exceptionally well in the subsequent year. These students would have less of an incentive to excel in Year 2, which is the more challenging year, and which provides a vital foundation for their clinical years.

2. Recommendations

The committee is invited to consider and discuss the proposal below to extend the award of Distinction in Medical Science based on the average exam score over both of Years 1 and 2.

3. Discussion

Awarding the Distinction in Medical Science to students whose average score over the first two years is in the top ~20% would be of tremendous advantage to a number of students who narrowly missed out in scoring a Distinction in first year. It would motivate these students to strive for excellence in the following year instead of feeling unmotivated. A change in the system would encourage us to work harder as a year group and learn the content even more thoroughly, which can only be good for the Medical School.

When the Distinction in Medical Science is awarded it suggests that the individuals are some of the select few within the year group that have the greatest amount of preclinical aptitude. Under the current system it is possible for an individual to have greater preclinical knowledge by scoring a higher overall percentage over the two years than someone who had managed to scrape a distinction in both years, yet the individual who has scored higher preclinically will not be rewarded as greatly as someone who didn't.

People are sometimes unable to perform to the best of their ability in one of the years, due to difficulty settling into university, or extenuating circumstances that may

have lowered their mark from a Distinction to a high merit. This change would offer them a chance to get the recognition they deserve.

In practice, this proposed system would still continue to primarily reward those who consistently performed well. We imagine that there would be very few students who perform poorly in one of the years and exceptionally high in the other year to secure a Distinction in Medical Science. The proposed suggestion would give those who marginally missed a Distinction in one year the encouraging chance of being awarded one overall. One counterargument that we expect to face is that the award is given not just for individual year excellence, but is designed to reward consistency as well. We suggest that people should score at least a Merit in both years in order to be awarded the overall distinction. We believe that this strikes the balance between consistency and excellence.

Having proposed this to the year group after a lecture there seemed to be a lot of backing from everyone. The vast majority of the year raised their hands when asked if they were in support of the idea as a change for our year group, and we urge you to consider implementing this new system as soon as possible in order to make the awards fairer for everyone.

Finally, we would all appreciate more *clarity* in how Distinctions are actually awarded. Nobody seems to be able to answer what percentage of the year get them, or a merit, or if they are published on our exam certificate, or if they count towards the UKFPO applications, or if they help us with our BSc choices. These are just a selection of questions that we feel we should know the answer to. If possible, we would like to collate questions and have a 'Distinctions/Merits FAQ' section on the intranet. This would be welcomed by the year group as everyone is interested in knowing these details.