## 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	2022-2023
---------------------------------	-----------

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;

Data to show whether marking was consistent across marking teams?	Υ	
If "No" to any of the above, please comment :		
4b. Please comment on each of the following with examples:		

- 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).
- During each moderation period for both my subjects, it became apparent that
  a very consistent, fair and reliable system of marking was in place. The scripts
  were annotated with dialogue between the markers and internal moderators,
  showing application of the points to note and where credit had been given.
  Clear justification for that credit was provided, so enhancing the robustness of
  the whole process.
- The comments within the on-script dialogue clearly referred to the standards expected of all students at this level of study.
- The summary table of the marking criteria was very clear to follow and provided a good differentiation between the mark bands. The on-script annotations from markers and moderators (noted earlier) was very helpful in demonstrating how these descriptors had been applied.
- The on-script annotations and commentary on grade bandings was very helpful in my standardisation of work across all Centres. It was very clear to see full consistency of approach throughout all of the Centres.

## Conduct of the Examination/Awards Board

5a: Did you:	Υ	N
Attend the examination/awards board?	Υ	
If "Yes", how many and which ones? I attended 5 examination boards - 06/09/22; 26/10/22; 28/02/23; 03/03/23;	31/03	/23.
5b: Conduct of the Board:	Υ	

Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?		Υ		
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:	Υ	N
Type your text here	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, within the discipline or sector? If "No", please comment:	Y	N
Type your text here	Y	
6c. Does the curriculum design and assessment strategy enable students to meet the programme learning outcomes? If "No", please comment:	Y	Z
Type your text here	Y	

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

In both of my subject areas, students are encouraged to develop skills of critical analysis, assimilate a wide range of facts and apply knowledge to various scenarios. Taken together, all of these 0( enc)14(33a6 0.48 ol)6( of)11.9( t.36 2054(33n01 EMC )176 2054b4