

**EXTERNAL EXAMINER’S ANNUAL REPORT**

**ON MBBS, BDS & INTERCALATED PROGRAMMES OF STUDY**

**2024-25**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of external examiner |  |
| External Examiner’s Institution |  |
| Programme(s) being examined  (e.g. MBBS Pt 1) |  |
| Examination board(s) attended  (e.g. MBBS Pt 1 19/05/25) |  |

Your completed report should be submitted by e-mail to Alice de Havillan, Quality and Standards Officer, at [qualityandstandards@qmul.ac.uk](mailto:qualityandstandards@qmul.ac.uk?subject=2024/25%20External%20Examiner%20Report) within 30 days of the main examination board meeting.

We can accept hard copies by post, and you may need to enlarge the text boxes before printing. Please send any hard copy reports to:

Governance and Legal Services (External Examiners)

Queen Mary University of London, Dept W,

81 Mile End Rd,

London

E1 4UJ

Your report is intended for internal use only and will contribute towards aspects of Queen Mary’s quality assurance and annual reporting procedures. Your report will be read widely, and will be made available to students; **please do not include personal information (such as your home address) or identify individual students.**

If you would like to raise any issues of a sensitive nature directly with the Principal, please feel free to do so. The address is Principal, Queen Mary University of London, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS. Please do NOT use this form for this purpose.

This template is updated annually; The most recent version and associated guidance is available at: <https://www.qmul.ac.uk/governance-and-legal-services/quality-assurance/external-examiners/external-examiners-resources/#Reports>

Your comments will also be used to ensure Queen Mary’s adherence to the [OfS ongoing conditions of registration](https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/for-providers/registering-with-the-ofs/registration-with-the-ofs-a-guide/conditions-of-registration/). The relevant condition has been cited in square brackets for clarity.

**1. Programme structure**

*Reflecting on OfS condition B1, please comment upon:*

* *any particular strengths and weaknesses of the programme (or modules under your review);*
* *the balance and content of the degree programme(s) followed by students is up-to-date [B1.a];*
* *the coherence of programmes, and the appropriateness of the core/compulsory modules in relation to the skill, aims and intended learning outcomes [B1.c & e];*
* *the methods and the effectiveness of teaching to ensure educational challenge, as reflected by the standards achieved by the candidates [B1.b & d].*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**2. Standard of student performance**

*2.1 In your view, are the standards of student performance comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK higher education institutions with which you are familiar?*

***YES / NO*** *(if ‘no’, please state the reasons they fall short)*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

2.2 *Reflecting on OfS condition B5, concerning sector-recognised standards, and B4, on the credibility of awards, are there any other points on student performance that you wish to raise?*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**3. Assessment Process**

3.1 *In your view, are the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards sound and fairly conducted?*

***YES / NO*** *(if ‘no’, please state the reasons they fall short)*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

3.2 Reflecting on OfS condition B4, please *also comment for Queen Mary on:*

* *strengths and weaknesses in the assessment process for assessing students effectively [B4.a];*
* *the reliability and validity of assessment methods used (i.e. examinations, OSCEs, etc) to test programme learning outcomes, and the balance between them [B4.b];*
* *the marking scheme, and the scheme for the award of honours (including weighting in final assessment between years of the programme and in relation to the number of modules completed);*
* *the quality and achievements of the candidates.*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**4. Other Issues of Quality**

*If the answer is ‘no’ for any of the following questions, please give details in the comment box at the end of the section*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Examination Papers** | | | **Delete as appropriate** |
| 4.1 | Were you satisfied with the arrangements for consulting you on the structure and content of the examination paper(s)? | | **Yes / No / Na** |
| 4.2 | Were your comments on the examination paper(s) properly taken into account? | | **Yes / No / Na** |
| **Marking and Moderation** | | | **Delete as appropriate** |
| 4.3 | Were you satisfied with the arrangements for your review of assignments? | | **Yes / No** |
| 4.4 | Did you have sufficient information on the marking scheme(s)? | | **Yes / No** |
| 4.5 | I reviewed the examination performance of the borderline candidates: | | **Yes / No** |
| 4.6 | The pass-standard mark in each examination was set at the appropriate level: | | **Yes / No** |
| 4.7 | Did you feel that you could fairly assess the quality and consistency of the marking? | | **Yes / No** |
| 4.8 | Was the quality of the marking satisfactory? | | **Yes / No** |
| 4.9 | Were you satisfied that all scripts were double-marked internally (where required)? | | **Yes / No / Na** |
| 4.10 | Were you satisfied with the arrangements to review any practical work? | | **Yes / No / Na** |
| 4.11 | Were you happy with the arrangements for conducting oral examinations/ presentations (where used as part of the assessment for a module)? | | **Yes / No / Na** |
| **Clinical/Practical Examinations** | | | **Delete as appropriate** |
| 4.12 | Was a clinical/practical examination (e.g. OSCE or OSPE) held? | | **Yes / No** |
| 4.13 | The materials and facilities for the clinical/practical examination were: | **Good / Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory / Not reviewed by me** | |
| 4.14 | On the basis of the candidates' performance, I judged that the clinical/practical course had been: | **Good / Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory / Not reviewed by me** | |
| **The Examination Board(s)** | | | **Delete as appropriate** |
| 4.15 | Were you satisfied with the arrangements for, and conduct of, the examination board meeting? | | **Yes / No** |
| 4.16 | Were you satisfied with the decisions and recommendations of the examination board meeting? | | **Yes / No** |
| **Assessment** | | | **Delete as appropriate** |
| 4.17 | Was the standard of assessment consistent with that of the national university system, so far as you could tell? | | **Yes / No** |
| *Please detail any concerns regarding 4.1 – 4.17 above.* | | | |

**5. Issues of procedure**

*If applicable, how did procedures/arrangements compare this year with previous years? Were suggestions that you made last year acted upon? (if not applicable, please go to question 6).*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**6. General Comments**

* 1. In your view, are the standards set for the awards appropriate for qualifications at this level in this subject?

**YES / NO** *(if ‘no’, please state the reasons they fall short)*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* 1. Are there any other points that you wish to raise? In particular, Queen Mary would welcome your comments on any aspects of exemplary practice in the subject area for which you act as external examiner.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* 1. If appropriate, please provide a short statement or bullet points of any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Signed: Date:**

**Thank you for completing this report and for your contribution to assuring standards and quality at Queen Mary University of London. Please return your report to the address/**[**e-mail address**](mailto:qualityandstandards@qmul.ac.uk?subject=2024/25%20External%20Examiner%20Report) **given on the front page of this pro-forma. You will receive acknowledgement of the receipt of your report from Governance and Legal Services.**