

External Examiners' Report

Please note that the completed report form will be made available to students and staff therefore please do not identify individual students or staff by name or candidate number. If you wish to bring to the attention of the University issues pertaining to a confidential matter, please do this separately by contacting the Academic Registrar at the University of Law.

2c: Please comment on each of the following with examples:

Whether the assessments (formative and summative) were well-designed, valid and reliable;
 whether they assessed appropriately the learning outcomes set for the programme;
 whether they were sufficiently challenging for students in the context of the subject matter and the course.

Design of Assessments – my subject responsibilities are all assessed via different formats but within the individual contexts I felt each was designed well and provided a valid, reliable method of testing knowledge and understanding. The *extended essay* gave a good range of varied styles of questions on different subjects. The *graduate and employability skills (G&ES)* encouraged reflection on strengths and weaknesses. *Wills and succession* followed the ‘standard’ assessment format; the advance facts were well-designed to be informative without allowing for ‘question-spotting’.

Learning outcomes – each of my subjects assessed the course learning outcomes. The *extended essay* developed skills in research and analysis in different subjects; *G&ES* encouraged skills in critical reflection and management; *wills and succession* required students to analyse and critique facts then apply their knowledge and understanding to resolve issues.

Sufficiently challenging – all three subjects challenged students in different ways. The *extended essay* fully tested research and footnoting skills and the ability to apply results in support of arguments; many students found the reflection and self-management aspects of *G&ES* very challenging as this was possibly the first time they had attempted to use these skills. The question encouraging reflection on issues such as the fairness of taxation or testamentary freedom in *wills and succession* fully stretched all students.

Standard of Student Performance

3. Please comment on the following:

From the student work you sampled, whether the standards of student performance were comparable with similar programmes and subjects in other UK higher education institutions with which you are familiar.

Over all, I felt the standards of student performance were comparable with similar subjects in other institutions with which I am familiar.

The *extended essay* reflected the endemic issues with the art of referencing I have seen across difedefwhils12 72 202 Tw e02 7(os)4(98.8]TJ /TTe di)6(f)12J ET Q BT 0. essi &

4a: Did you receive:	Y	N
A sufficiently broad sample of scripts across the marking range?	Y	
Sufficient time for external moderation?	Y	
Data to show whether marking was consistent across marking teams?	Y	
If “No” to any of the above, please comment:		
<p>4b. Please comment on each of the following with examples:</p> <p>Whether the method and general standard of marking was credible, consistent, fair and robust; whether the marks awarded were reflective of the standards expected at that particular level and for all students; whether the marking criteria was presented clearly and appropriately differentiated across bands; whether the standard of work that you sampled was comparable across different locations (e.g., ULaw campuses and/or partnerships in the case of collaborative provision).</p>		
<p><i>Marking methods and standards across all my subjects were consistent, fair and robust. There was clear dialogue between the internal markers and moderators showing adherence to the marking scheme/points to note and justification for choice of the grade band was very apparent.</i></p> <p>I felt the marks fully reflected the standard for all students working at the respective level of each of my subjects. Again this was illustrated by dialogue between the markers and moderators.</p> <p>The marking criteria and grade band descriptors were excellent. The itemised criteria (and the reference to them by markers and moderators) made it very clear to see where credit had been given.</p> <p><i>The adherence to mark bands and dialogue between markers and moderators in each Centre, together with the lead moderator's reports for all my subjects, demonstrated there was a comparable standard of student work throughout the University.</i></p>		

C o n d u c t o f t h e E x a m i n a t i o n / A w

--	--

5b: Conduct of the Board:

Date: 25/07/23

Please return this report by email to Head of Awards & Standards Assurance at the University of Law, Carl Anderson (carl.anderson@law.ac.uk) following the final Examination Board. Following receipt of this report you may then claim your annual fee.