



EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT FORM

SECTION 1: Details of External Examiner			
Name (with title)			
Position		Institution	
Contact Number		Email Address	
Field of Expertise			
Address for Correspondence			
Professional Registration (if applicable)			

SECTION 2: Details of Programme			
Year		Date of Visit	
Department			
Programme Name			

SECTION 3: Review / Comments / Suggestions	
1. Programme Overview (MQF Requirement)	
<p>Please comment on whether the programme: (1) Clearly states its Programme Educational Objectives (PEOs), (2) Has Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs) aligned with MQF Level Descriptors (Level 6: Bachelor Degree; Level 7: Master; Level 8: Doctor of Philosophy), (3) Demonstrates appropriate progression from basic to advanced learning, (4) Matches the intended qualification level and discipline (5) Implements effective mechanisms for measuring PEO and PLO attainment.</p>	
<p>Areas for Improvement:</p>	

<i>Poor (1)</i>	<i>Fair (2)</i>	<i>Good (3)</i>	<i>Very Good (4)</i>	<i>Excellent (5)</i>
2. Programme Structure				
Please evaluate whether the programme: (1) Demonstrates overall curriculum design and coherence, (2) Balances fundamental, core, elective, research, and practical components effectively (3) Distributes credits appropriately in accordance with established guidelines.				
Areas for Improvement:				
<i>Poor (1)</i>	<i>Fair (2)</i>	<i>Good (3)</i>	<i>Very Good (4)</i>	<i>Excellent (5)</i>
3. Curriculum Content				
Please comment on whether the programme: (1) Ensures relevance to industry practices and current disciplinary trends, (2) Provides appropriate depth and breadth suitable for the programme level, (3) Covers essential domains including knowledge, skills, ethics, communication, teamwork, and problem-solving, (4) Includes interdisciplinary, sustainability, and innovation elements within the curriculum, (5) Integrates emerging technologies (e.g., AI, Automation, IR 4.0/5.0) into the core modules.				
Areas for Improvement:				
<i>Poor (1)</i>	<i>Fair (2)</i>	<i>Good (3)</i>	<i>Very Good (4)</i>	<i>Excellent (5)</i>
4. Course Files & OBE Implementation				
Please evaluate whether the programme: (1) Defines clear Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and maps them appropriately to Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs), (2) Uses appropriate assessments to measure CLO achievement, (3) Applies rubrics and transparent marking criteria to ensure fairness and consistency, (4) Provides evidence of Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) in teaching and learning practices (5) For engineering programmes, highlights CLOs aligned to relevant Graduate Attributes.				
Areas for Improvement:				

<i>Poor (1)</i>	<i>Fair (2)</i>	<i>Good (3)</i>	<i>Very Good (4)</i>	<i>Excellent (5)</i>
5. Teaching & Learning Approaches				
Please comment on whether the programme: (1) Applies appropriate teaching methods for the discipline and academic level, (2) Incorporates active learning strategies such as discussions, case studies, or problem-based learning, (3) Utilizes blended learning, laboratory sessions, and project-based work effectively, (4) Provides adequate research supervision to support student development, (5) Engages industry involvement where applicable to enhance relevance and practical exposure.				
Areas for Improvement:				
<i>Poor (1)</i>	<i>Fair (2)</i>	<i>Good (3)</i>	<i>Very Good (4)</i>	<i>Excellent (5)</i>
6. Academic Staff				
Please evaluate whether the programme: (1) Has adequate staff numbers and expertise to deliver the curriculum effectively, (2) Ensures staff qualifications are appropriate for the programme level, (3) Maintains professional registration where required (e.g., BEM registration for engineering staff), (4) Demonstrates active research involvement and capacity for supervision, particularly at Master's and PhD levels.				
Areas for Improvement:				
<i>Poor (1)</i>	<i>Fair (2)</i>	<i>Good (3)</i>	<i>Very Good (4)</i>	<i>Excellent (5)</i>
7. Students & Workload				
Please comment on: (1) Student readiness and capability to undertake the curriculum, (2) Workload appropriateness (credit hours versus actual learning time), (3) Student performance and quality of learning output, (4) Student development opportunities through activities and support centres.				

Areas for Improvement:				
<i>Poor (1)</i>	<i>Fair (2)</i>	<i>Good (3)</i>	<i>Very Good (4)</i>	<i>Excellent (5)</i>
8. Examination & Assessment				
Please evaluate whether the programme: (1) Ensures quality, clarity, and fairness of examination papers or assessment tasks, (2) Covers Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and programme-level skills appropriately, (3) Implements a moderation process to maintain consistency and reliability, (4) Applies rubrics and marking criteria consistently to ensure fairness, (5) For engineering programmes, provides evidence that assessments address design, analysis, problem-solving, and professional practice.				
Areas for Improvement:				
<i>Poor (1)</i>	<i>Fair (2)</i>	<i>Good (3)</i>	<i>Very Good (4)</i>	<i>Excellent (5)</i>
9. Project / Dissertation / Thesis				
<i>(Only for programmes with research components)</i> Please comment on (1) Quality of research output, (2) Originality and depth (especially at Master/PhD level), (3) Methodological rigour, (4) Supervisory quality, (5) inclusion of ethical AI usage and its practical application within the discipline (where appropriate)				
Areas for Improvement:				
<i>Poor (1)</i>	<i>Fair (2)</i>	<i>Good (3)</i>	<i>Very Good (4)</i>	<i>Excellent (5)</i>
10. Resources & Facilities				
Please evaluate the adequacy of (1) Laboratories, studios, workshops, equipment, (2) ICT tools, software, library resources, (3) Research facilities (for postgraduate programmes), (4) Safety and compliance (especially for engineering labs), (5) virtual learning facilities (for ODL program)				

Areas for Improvement:				
<i>Poor (1)</i>	<i>Fair (2)</i>	<i>Good (3)</i>	<i>Very Good (4)</i>	<i>Excellent (5)</i>
11. Industry Engagement				
Please comment on the (1) quality of industrial training, internship, or practicum, (2) Industry-linked assignments, seminars, or collaboration, (3) Relevance to current industry needs.				
Areas for Improvement:				
<i>Poor (1)</i>	<i>Fair (2)</i>	<i>Good (3)</i>	<i>Very Good (4)</i>	<i>Excellent (5)</i>
12. Alumni Involvement				
Please comment on alumni involvement in the programme and its impact on industry linkages, curriculum and/or student development.				
Areas for Improvement:				
<i>Poor (1)</i>	<i>Fair (2)</i>	<i>Good (3)</i>	<i>Very Good (4)</i>	<i>Excellent (5)</i>
13. Graduate Employability				
Please comment on the (1) Graduate employability trend of the graduates from this program (2) Activities conducted by the program to increase the graduate employability				
Areas for Improvement:				
<i>Poor (1)</i>	<i>Fair (2)</i>	<i>Good (3)</i>	<i>Very Good (4)</i>	<i>Excellent (5)</i>

14. Strengths of the Programme
(List key commendable aspects.)
15. Overall Conclusion
State whether the programme meets MQF standards for the respective level; (If engineering:) The programme aligns with EAC expectations. Please also provide the conditions, concerns, or suggestions for enhancement.

SECTION 4: Acknowledgement	
Prepared by	
Signature	
Date	

APPENDIX A

*(*Applicable for Undergraduate Engineering Programme Only)*

An engineering programme must have the eight (8) components of the qualifying requirements.

No.	Components	Yes	No
1	A minimum of 135 Student Learning Time (SLT) credits of which 90 SLT credits must be engineering courses offered over a period of four (4) years		
2	Integrated Design Project (IDP)		
3	Final Year Project (FYP) (minimum six (6) SLT credits)		
4	Industrial Training (minimum of eight (8) weeks)		
5	Full-time academic staff (minimum of eight (8)) with at least three (3) Professional Engineers registered with the BEM or its equivalent.		
6	Academic Staff: student ratio 1: 20 or better.		
7	External Examiner/Advisor report. (one (1) in every two (2) years)		
8	Programme Educational Objectives (PEO) and Programme Outcomes (PO)		