

# External Examiners' Report

2021-2022

Proforma

General details	
Subjects	Contract Law (GDL & MA in Law) Contract Law (Law Conversion Courses) Mergers & Acquisitions (LLM (SQE 1 & 2))
Name of external examiner	Ian King
Date of report	29 <sup>th</sup> July 2022

1 Academic Issues	
1.1 Were the standards of the questions set at the appropriate level?	<b>YES</b>
<p>Please comment.</p> <p>The Contract Law modules are assessed in slightly different ways for the GDL and MAL compared to the new conversions courses. The latter includes a 45 minute single best answer question exam comprising 40% of the module mark whilst the former are assessed purely by way of a 3 hour unseen exam (online this year as last due to Covid). In both types of assessment the standards of the questions were entirely appropriate for the level of study.</p> <p>The Mergers &amp; Acquisitions module on the LLM (SQE) programme has a varied suite of assessments, with two pieces of coursework and an oral presentation. Again, the standards of the questions in all assessments were at an appropriate level.</p> <p>There was appropriate depth and coverage in all the assessments that I looked at for all programmes. As last year and the year before, the arrangements for online time limited exams (and for Mergers &amp; Acquisitions, the oral assessment) due to the Covid-19 pandemic worked well and, in my view, did not impact upon the fairness or rigour of the assessments.</p>	
1.2 Were the assessments well-designed? i.e. did they assess appropriately the learning outcomes set for the course.	<b>YES</b>

Please comment.

The assessments on all programmes contained a good mix of questions and were challenging but fair to the students. They covered a good variety of topics and provided suitable coverage of the learning outcomes.

Overall, assessment design remains a strength of the UoL programme, subject to the comments made below regarding the Contract assessment for the new programmes.

1.3 Was the standard of performance attained by candidates in general at an appropriate level?

**YES**

Please comment

As referenced above, there was a minor issue regarding the student performance on Contract in the May assessment for the new programmes this year. Performance was clearly lower overall than in the January assessment and in other programme modules. Performance was also weak in comparison with previous GDL assessments. The team identified that there had been an issue in relation to Part A of the exam and I was happy to agree their proposal for a small uplift in the marks to achieve a fairer outcome for students. The module designer and National Programme Director have discussed the issue and agreed a strategy to alleviate this for future students.

The standard of performance in GDL and MAL Contract across all centres was good, with most centres achieving mid 90% 1<sup>st</sup> attempt pass rates, the only exceptions being Hong Kong at 86.5% and Reading at 87.5%. These are very good results and an improvement on last year.

The standard of performance for the Mergers & Acquisitions module was fairly mixed, with some strong performances and some much weaker and quite a high number of non-submissions. This is quite typical for an online module. This was the first occasion that the module has been delivered so no comparisons can be made with previous cohorts, but it will be interesting to see how next year's cohort performs.

Overall, I am happy that the standard of performance attained by the students was consistent with similar programmes.

1.4 Was the method and general standard of marking satisfactory and consistent?

**YES**

Please comment

The marking standards across the different programmes and centres were very consistent and the general standard entirely appropriate for programmes at this level. The internal moderation process works very effectively in this regard.

**2 Administrative Issues:** please make any comments you wish to make on:

2.1 The process of setting assessments.

2.1 The assessments setting was, as in previous years, rigorous and efficient with good internal scrutiny which is very helpful for an external examiner. I received most draft assessments in a timely manner providing me with plenty of opportunity for scrutiny, although this year there were a small number of draft assessment received late possibly due to the introduction of new programmes.

2.2 The administration of assessments.

2.2 Administration of the assessments has generally been very efficient. The admin teams at the different centres were generally efficient in sending me sample scripts for moderation and dealing with any queries that I had.

2.3 The moderation process.

2.3 There was clear evidence of internal moderation on the scripts that I received . The number of scripts received was quite low from each centre but overall constituted a representative sample and makes the workload manageable.

2.4 The conduct of the Examination Board.

2.4 I attended two boards for the new programmes this year, the March Concessions and Results Board on 15 March 2022 and the July Results and Awards Board on 12 July 2022. As always, business at the boards was dealt with efficiently and thoroughly. Decisions on concession applications were made fairly and after thorough discussion and the views of external examiners were fully considered.

Unfortunately this year I was unable to attend any

2.5 Procedures relating to candidates with special needs/concessions	of the GDL/MAL boards.  2.5 The boards I attended dealt with concessions fairly and after thorough discussion and consultation with the external examiners.
2.6 Any other procedural issues.	2.6 No additional comments

<b>3 Quality Assurance Issues</b>	
3.1 Were assessment policies and your duties as external examiner adequately explained to you?	<b>YES</b>
3.2 Did you have adequate briefing and guidance sufficient for you to fulfil your role effectively as an external examiner?	<b>YES</b>
3.3 Did you have adequate access to any material needed (including assessment regulations, student handbook, programme specification and module descriptors) to make the required judgements?	<b>YES</b>
3.4 Were your comments during the assessment process and at the Examination Board considered appropriately	<b>YES</b>
3.5 Has appropriate action been taken in respect of comments made in your last examiner's report?	<b>N/A</b>
Please make any comments you wish to make on the above points.  <b>No further comments.</b>	

<b>4. Areas of good practice</b> Please provide a description or bullet point list of any particular areas of good practice in relation to standards and assessment processes that would be worthy of dissemination to a wider audience.
---

Members of both academic and administrative staff are extremely efficient, helpful and responsive.

**5. Other comments**

Please comment on any other issues which you wish to raise

**N/A**

Signed: Ian D King