

# 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.*

<b>Academic Year covered by report</b>	2021/22
--	---------

<b>Name of External Examiner</b>	Penny Carey
<b>Home Institution</b>	

## Information and Guidance

1. Did you:	Y	N
Receive adequate access to any material needed		

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

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

I was satisfied that the dissertation module was well designed, valid and reliable, and assessed the learning outcomes in the module descriptor effectively and also provided sufficient rigour and challenge for students studying at this level. The module assessed the specific learning outcomes of independent study, knowledge and conceptual understanding, research strategies critical analysis, communication of complex concepts and principles and an ability to use initiative and management of a significant 60 credit research project

**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.

The overall performances of students was in line with comparable programmes at other institutions. There were some individual instances of differential performance between one centre and another for individual dissertation assessments, as notified when confirming the standard of marking as fair and appropriate, but no significant concerns arose. I did ask, in a number of instances for the overall results for one student to be compared to another at a different centre, and received assurance that this had been undertaken prior to the Board of Examiners.

**Marking and Moderation**

<b>4a: Did you receive:</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>
A sufficiently broad sample of scripts across the marking range?	<b>y</b>	
Sufficient time for external moderation?	<b>y</b>	
Data to show whether marking was consistent across marking teams?	<b>y</b>	

**If “No” to any of the above, please comment:**

The dissertation samples took considerable time to review given their length and the need to review the oral presentation component as well.

**4b. Please comment on each of the following with examples:**

- x Whether the method and general standard of marking was credible, consistent, fair and robust;
- x whether the marks awarded were reflective of the standards expected at that particular level and for all students;
- x whether the marking criteria was presented clearly and appropriately differentiated across bands;
- x 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).

Generally student performance in the dissertation was excellent, with a number securing marks of distinction level standard. Those students had clearly undertaken significant amounts of work and demonstrated excellent achievement of the learning outcomes.

**Conduct of the Examination/Awards Board**

<b>5a: Did you:</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>
Attend the examination/awards board?	<b>y</b>	
<b>If “Yes”, how many and which ones?</b> July 2022 Board		
<b>5b: Conduct of the Board:</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>
Were the Boards you attended conducted in accordance with the University Assessment Regulations, including procedures relating to students with concessions?	<b>Y</b>	
Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?	<b>Y</b>	
<b>If “No” to any of the above, please comment below:</b>		

## 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 b 3(nf)2(or)-2(m)-2(e)-5(d b 3(nf)2(or)-2(m)-2(e)-5(-5(d b 3(nf)2(or)-p/MCID 10 >>BD

---

The quality assurance mechanisms are extensive and ensure considerable confidence in quality assurance standards having been met. I would commend very highly the quality and detail in guides for markers and moderators plus instructions to students. At the Board I was interested to hear supervisors feedback on the process and whether any changes are proposed for 22/23. I noted a preponderance of dissertations on family law and wondered if this imposed any undue impact?