

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.

If you are responsible for more than one programme, we request that you use a separate template for each programme as appropriate.

Academic Year covered by report	22/23
--	-------

Name of External Examiner	Prof Penny Carey
Home Institution	University of Hertfordshire
Programme being examined	LPC
Modules examined	Solicitors Accounts, Employment Law, IP
Date of Report	5/11/23

Information and Guidance

1. Did you:	Y	N
-------------	---	---

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.

For all three modules I was satisfied that the assessments were well designed, valid and reliable, assessed the learning outcomes effectively and also provided sufficient rigour and challenge for students studying at this level. There continues to be good use made of transactional approaches to assessment strategy mirroring situations likely to be found in practice. In Solicitors Accounts there is a good balance between ledger and narrative assessment questions.

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.

As in 21/22 the overall performances of students remains in line with comparable programmes at other institutions, and for some Centres would be above (I have discussed this with the Centres and could be linked to different cohorts of learners). There were some individual instances of differential performance between one centre and another for individual assessments, as notified when confirming the standard of marking as fair and appropriate (Online performance is generally lower than elsewhere and I raised questions on several occasions about lower marks at London Bloomsbury), but no significant concerns arise. Students generally performed across the full range of marks available, especially in solicitors accounts, which clearly demonstrates the assessment mechanism is effective in stretching and challenging the most able students, but also ensures rigour in relation to students not yet at pass standard.

Marking and Moderation

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	
<p>If “No” to any of the above, please comment:</p> <p>On occasion samples arrived later than advised but this was always notified to me and related to genuine delays through ill health of markers for example.</p>		
<p>4b. Please comment on each of the following with examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). 		

As noted in 3 above I thought that the marking was fair and consistent. In the rare

5b: Conduct of the Board:	Y	N
Were the Boards you attended conducted in accordance with the University Assessment Regulations, including procedures relating to students with concessions?	Y	
Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?	Y	
If “No” to any of the above, please comment below:		

Academic Standards of the Programme

6a. Do the modules that you sample allow students to develop relevant skills (e.g., cognitive skills, practical skills, transferable skills and professional competences)? If “No”, please comment:	Y	N
<i>Type your text here</i>	Y	

6b. Is the module/programme design, delivery and assessment informed by up-to-date research or professional practice and/or by current developments in teaching and learning,

Areas of Good Practice

7a. Are there are particular features of student assessment that you would like to highlight as being innovative?

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. Annual fees are paid on receipt of this report.