

University of Oxford External Examiner Report - 2024/25

📄 Response ID: cmfpk1kze01xrjv02hyrhi7lk

📅 Submitted: 18 Sep 2025 4:17 PM

🕒 Duration: 00:17:39

EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT for the academic year 2024/25

1. Please check your title is correct, and select another option if needed

Professor

2. If you entered other, please specify

No response

3. Please check your first name(s) is correct, and amend if needed

Graeme

4. Please check your last name is correct, and amend if needed

Gooday

5. Please enter the name of your home institution

University of Leeds

6. Please check the course level of the course(s) you acted as external examiner for is correct, and select another option if needed

Postgraduate

7. Please check the Division(s) responsible for that the course(s) that you acted as external examiner for comes under are correct, and amend if needed

Humanities Division; Social Sciences Division

8. Please check the Faculty/Department(s) responsible for that the course(s) that you acted as external examiner for comes under are correct, and amend if needed

Faculty of History

9. Please check the course(s) that you acted as external examiner for are correct, and amend if needed

JESH: Master of Science in Economic & Social History; JSMT: Master of Science in History of Science, Medicine & Technology; HESA: Master of Philosophy in Economic & Social History Year 1; HESH: Master of Philosophy in Economic and Social History (Year 2); HSMT: Master of Philosophy in History of Science, Medicine & Technology; TSMT: Master of Philosophy in History of Science, Medicine & Technology

10. Please select whether you have just completed your first year of your term of office as external examiner, whether you have now completed your entire term of office, or whether you are in another year of your term of office

Other year of term of office

11. Please check the date the final Examination Board took place is correct, and amend if needed. If you acted at external examiner for multiple courses which had separate Examination Board meetings, please check the correct date for the latest Examination Board meeting is showing, and amend if needed.

18 September 2025

Part A

12. Are the academic standards and the achievements of students comparable with those in other UK higher education institutions of which you have experience?
(Please refer to paragraph 15 of the Guidelines for External Examiner Reports)

12.1 A1. i) Academic standards of students

Yes

12.2 A1. ii) Academic achievements of students

Yes

13. Do the threshold standards for the programme appropriately reflect:
(Please refer to paragraph 16 of the Guidelines for External Examiner Reports)

13.1 A2. i) The frameworks for higher education qualifications?

Not applicable

13.2 A2. ii) Any applicable subject benchmark statement?

Not applicable

14. In relation to the academic process:

14.1 A3. Does it measure student achievement rigorously and fairly against the intended outcomes of the programme(s)?

Yes

14.2 A4. Is it conducted in line with the University's policies and regulations?

Yes

15. In relation to the information and evidence provided to you:

15.1 A5. Did you receive it in a timely manner to be able to carry out the role of External Examiner effectively?

Yes

16. Regarding your previous report, please indicate whether you:

16.1 A6. Received a written response to your previous report?

Yes

16.2 A7. Are satisfied that comments in your previous report have been properly considered, and where applicable acted upon?

applicable, acted upon?

Yes

Part B

17. B1. a) How do academic standards achieved by the students compare with those achieved by students at other higher education institutions of which you have experience?

Certainly the overall standards achieved by students taking the MSc and MPhil in History of Science, Medicine and Technology (the programmes for which I am the specialist External Examiner) were very good. I would defer comment on the MSc and MPhil programmes in Economic and Social History to the relevant specialist External Examiner.

18. B1. b) Please comment on student performance and achievement across the relevant programmes or parts of programmes and with reference to academic standards and student performance of other higher education institutions of which you have experience (those examining in joint schools are particularly asked to comment on their subject in relation to the whole award).

For the MSc in History of Science, Medicine and Technology there was a significantly higher proportion of Distinction and Merit awards than is commonly achieved elsewhere: 3 Distinctions and 4 Merits out of a cohort of 13, is impressive even with three candidates work as yet unavailable for marking and classification). Again I would defer comment on the MSc and MPhil programmes in Economic and Social History to the relevant specialist External Examiner.

19. B2. Please comment on the rigour and conduct of the assessment process, including whether it ensures equity of treatment for students, and whether it has been conducted fairly and within the University's regulations and guidance.

For the MSc and MPhil in History of Science, Medicine and Technology it was clear that the standard marking criteria were properly and fairly used, with qualitative evaluations clearly reflecting the standards laid out in the 'Exam Conventions ESH / HSMT' supplied to all examiner. It was not clear to me, however, whether the Economic and Social History assessors were using those marking criteria.

20. B3. Are there any issues which you feel should be brought to the attention of supervising committees in the faculty/department, division or wider University? If you acted as external examiner for multiple courses, please indicate whether the issues related to all or selected courses.

See B2 above for the question of whether Economic and Social History assessors were using the established marking criteria.

21. B4. Please comment/provide recommendations on any good practice and innovation relating to learning, teaching and assessment, and any opportunities to enhance the quality of the learning opportunities provided to students that should be noted and disseminated more widely as appropriate.

It is clear that the markers for MPhil and MSc in HSMT gave high quality feedback to students, judiciously highlighting the key areas of good academic analysis, and also where candidates could have achieved better results (and how so).

22. B5. a) Please provide any other comments you may have about any aspect of the examination process. Please also use this space to address any issues specifically required by any applicable professional body.

It would be helpful to have more than 48 hours to look over all the candidate scripts and assessors comments - perhaps an earlier deadline for assessors to submit their marks to the Faculty Office would be helpful?

23. B5. b) Now that your term of office is concluded, please provide an overview here.

No response

Thank you for completing your 2024/25 external examiner report for the University of Oxford

