

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	2021-2022
--	-----------

Name of External Examiner	Andrea J Cochrane
Home Institution	Derbyshire County Council
Programme being examined	PgDL/MA Law (Conversion)/MA Law (SQE1)
Modules examined	Administrative Law and Human Rights; English Legal System and Constitutional Law;
Date of Report	31 August 2022

Information and Guidance

1. Did you:	Y	N
Receive adequate access to any material needed (including assessment regulations, student handbook, programme specification and module descriptors) to make the required judgements?		
For newly appointed External Examiners:		
Were assessment policies and your duties as external examiner adequately explained to you?		

Did you have adequate briefing and guidance sufficient for you to fulfil

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.

- In my subjects, the assessments comprised a mixture of SBAQs and coursework. Both of these were clearly-written and used a good variety of question styles (problem-type and deeper analytical questioning).
- The content and range of questions fully covered the learning outcomes set for my subjects.
- The SBAQs and course work for each of my subjects were sufficiently challenging as students were expected to analyse and reflect on various issues before making their response. For the coursework questions, students were required to carry out a wide range of research tasks; each question had two parts the second of which demanded analysis and reflection on the subject-matter.
- I felt a good range of topics was covered by all the questions and fully tested students' knowledge and application of the course content.

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 with any subject assessment, stronger candidates produced excellent answers with clear analysis and very good application of learning and research. Weaker candidates tended towards being more descriptive and often did not fully meet the assessment brief.

Over all I felt that students' performance was appropriate for the level of study and was directly comparable to similar programmes and subjects in other institutions with which I am familiar.

Marking and Moderation

4a: Did you receive:	Y	N
A sufficiently broad sample of scripts across the marking range?		

Sufficient time for external moderation?		
Data to show whether marking was consistent across marking teams?		
If “No” to any of the above, please comment:		
<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). 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each subject I received the ‘points to note’ detailing areas where additional credit might be given and issues that may cause concern and how these should be dealt with to ensure maximum fairness across all students at each sitting. The lead moderator’s report detailed all the steps taken to ensure issues encountered during marking had been consistently and fairly dealt with. • From the samples of coursework I saw, I felt there was consistency of marking throughout the mark bands and as noted in my response to Q.3 above, the marks reflected the general standard I would expect at this level of work in a ‘new’ discipline for these students. • I thought the descriptors in the level 7 assessment criteria were clear to follow with sound differentiation between each band. This in turn was reflected within the ‘points to note’ so it was easy to see the rationale behind students’ attainment. The markers’ comments further supported the choice of mark banding. • Over all I received a good range of scripts drawn from across most of the Centres so it was clear to see the consistency of marking. I appreciated that some Centres had been appointed as the central point to handle assessments from their region and the majority had chosen examples from across their Centres to include within my moderation sample. This made it easy for me to check consistency of marking and confirm my approval across the board of all regional Centres. Regrettably Nottingham omitted to include scripts from Birmingham for moderation in the May sitting of English Legal System and Constitutional Law. In my feedback I suggested moving forward that I would welcome a selection from both Centres for the next assessment period. 		

Conduct of the Examination/Awards Board

5a: Did you:	Y	N
Attend the examination/awards board?		
If "Yes", how many and which ones? To date I have attended one board which was the main assessment board on 12 July 2022.		
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?		
Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?		
If "No" to any of the above, please comment below: 		

6d. How well does the programme/module, in your opinion, prepare graduates for employment or further study?



I understand that this report (in full or part) will be available to students and staff.

Date: 31/08/22

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.