

# 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	Ian Charles Brookfield
Home Institution	Formerly Cardiff University
Programme being examined	Graduate Diploma in Law Master of Arts in Law
Modules examined	Equity & Trusts
Date of Report	16 <sup>th</sup> November 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?	Y	
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 your role effectively as an external examiner?		
For existing External Examiners:		
Has appropriate action been taken in respect of comments made in your last examiner's report?	N/A	
If "No" to any of the above, please comment below :		

## Standards and Design of Assessment

2a: Did you receive:	Y	N
Draft assessments to comment on?	Y	
Acknowledgement that your comments had been considered appropriately? If "No", please comment below:	Y	
Type your text here		
<p>2b: Please comment on the following:</p> <p>Whether the standards of the assessments were set at the appropriate level in the discipline, and with reference to national subject benchmark statements, Apprenticeship Standard or PSRB guidelines (e.g., Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ), QAA subject benchmarks, and where relevant Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (e.g., SRA)).</p>		
<p>The questions were set at the appropriate levels, with the MA question papers being more demanding than the GDL question papers. The questions for both the MA and the GDL were properly rigorous and intellectually challenging, enabling the candidates to demonstrate their respective abilities.</p>		



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 example s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the method and general standard of marking was credible, consistent, fair and robust;</li> <li>• whether the marks awarded were reflective of the standards expected at that particular level and for all students;</li> <li>• whether the marking criteria was presented clearly and appropriately differentiated across bands;</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>		
<p>The method and standard of marking were credible, consistent, fair and robust. I found the marking clear, easy to follow and well judged. It was apparent where marks were awarded (and not awarded). The comments made and recorded by the markers were very helpful in considering the marking. Additionally, the final outcome agreed between the first marker and the second marker was well documented.</p> <p>The marks awarded were reflective of the standards you would expect at the particular level and for all students. The marks awarded were consistent with and in line with the marks awarded at other institutions.</p> <p>The marking criteria were very clearly presented. It was readily apparent from the marking and comments how the levels were determined and differentiated. Copies of the marking criteria were sent to me when I was first appointed and additionally were included when scripts were sent for review.</p> <p>The standard of the work which I considered was wholly comparable across the different locations. It was not possible to differentiate the work from one location from that of any other location.</p>		

Conduct of the Examination/Awards Board

5a: Did you:	Y	N
--------------	---	---

Attend the examination/awards board?	Y	
If "Yes", how many and which ones? Two: 7 <sup>th</sup> September 2021 and 21 <sup>st</sup> 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?	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	
Most definitely. As mentioned earlier, reciting the law without more is insufficient to gain marks. The candidates must process and		

Yes. The one naturally leads to the other.		
6d. How well does the programme/module, in your opinion, prepare graduates for employment or further study?		
Excellent. As well as being an academic programme which is intellectually challenging, this is a vocational, practical course. It provides the foundation for further legal study and assessment which in turn enables the candidates to qualify professionally.		

### Areas of Good Practice

7a. Are there are particular features of student assessment that you would like to highlight as being innovative?
Although not necessarily innovative, the realistic scenarios and the challenges for the candidates presented by them are, to my mind, to be commended.
7b. Are there are any particular areas of good practice in relation to standards and assessment processes that would be worthy of dissemination to a wider audience?

All examination boards, including concessions boards, were very professionally and properly conducted, with very thorough consideration being given as appropriate.

Signed: IC Brookfield

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

Date: 16<sup>th</sup> November 2022

***Please return this report by email to Head of Awards & Standards Assurance at the University of Law, Carl Anderson ([carl.anderson@law.ac.uk](mailto:carl.anderson@law.ac.uk)) following the final Examination Board. Annual f***