

External Examiner Annual Report: 2018/2019

Examiner's Name	DR GEORGE K. NDI	
Report for Programme(s) / Subject Area	BLI (formerly LSBM) UNDERGRADUATE (LAW) PROGRAMMES	
Lead Faculty Please tick appropriate box		
Faculty of Arts, Science & Technology (FAST)		
Faculty of Business & Law (FBL)	✓	
Faculty of Education & Humanities (FEH)		
Faculty of Health & Society (FHS)		

Modules covered – please insert module codes, e.g. ART4321

LSBM109	LSBM211	LSBM211 - LONG	LSBM214	LSBM313
LSBM316	LSBM317 (January)	LSBM317 (June)		

Delete **YES** or **NO** as appropriate below

Collaborative partnership provision

This report covers programmes or modules delivered by support providers/delivery organisations/partners other than the University of Northampton.

YES

Professional recognition

This report covers programmes subject to accreditation by a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body **YES**

Other awards

The report covers awards delivered under licence from Pearson Education Ltd (e.g. HNC/HND)

NO

Section A - Threshold Academic Standards

Please indicate [X] your level agreement with each of the statements in each section and comment in more detail in the space below.

A1. Maintaining Academic Standards	Strongly agree	Broadly agree	Broadly disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
1.1. The outcomes of the programme(s) and/or component modules are well-aligned with the relevant FHEQ descriptors and applicable subject benchmark statements.	X				
1.2. The curriculum is coherent and remains current.	X				
1.3. The programme reflects any additional PSRB requirements. <i>(also see question A5 below)</i>	X				
1.4. Assessments in modules of the same level are of a comparable standard.		X			
1.5. Assessment criteria and marking schemes are set at the appropriate level.	X				

Comment on Academic Standards:

Academic standards reflect standards at similar HE institution. Students' performance and achievement are satisfactory. The scripts were very well marked and commented upon with clear evidence of internal moderation. The markers' feedback comments reflected the grades awarded, but also 'fed forward' by identifying areas of weakness which students needed to address in the future. There was a slight improvement noticeable in this year's cohort as compared to the 2017/2018 academic year.

	Strongly agree	Broadly agree	Broadly disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
A2. Measuring achievement, rigour and fairness					
1.6. The types of assessment are appropriate for the subject, the students (taking proper account of the diversity of the student body), the respective level of study and the expected outcomes.	x				
1.7. The marking scheme/grading criteria have been properly and consistently applied such that internal marking is of an appropriate standard, fair and reliable.	x				
1.8. The assessment processes are carried out in accordance with the University's regulations and procedures.	x				
1.9. Procedures governing mitigating/extenuating circumstances, academic integrity/misconduct and borderline performances have been considered fairly and equitably applying institutional regulations.					x
1.10. The quality and quantity of written feedback to students on their assessed work is consistent and appropriate.	x				

Comments on the assessment strategy, processes and procedures:

The assessment strategy is consistent with standards for each level. Individual assessment tasks and marking criteria for each module are consistent with the levels at which modules are delivered, Assessment tasks are also appropriate and effective in developing the overall assessment strategy as well as developing in students the relevant employability skills which they would require in a working environment post-graduation. The marking has been fair and consistent throughout.

The administrative aspects of the assessment process have been conducted efficiently, and the processes and procedures consistent with standards at other HE institutions.

A3. Comparability of standards and student performance	Strongly agree	Broadly agree	Broadly disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
1.11. Based on my experience of other institutions, standards are comparable with other UK HEIs.	x				
1.12. Based on my experience of other institutions, student achievement is comparable with other UK HEIs.	x				
1.13. Standards and student achievement are comparable across the modules within my remit.	x				
1.14. Standards and student achievement are comparable across all cohorts and delivery sites. <i>(For multiple site delivery and/or delivery by different collaborative partners only - also see question A4 below)</i>	x				

Comments on the comparability of standards and student performance:

On the whole, the quality of students work have demonstrated the key academic skills and attributes expected of students at the various levels. The standard of students' work is consistent with the analytical skills expected for the level outcomes, and of future legal practitioners. I am therefore satisfied that the level of student achievement and performance are consistent with standards at other institutions where I have previously examined.

A4. Off-campus provision

We attach particular importance to the standards and quality of our modules and programmes delivered off campus.

4a. HE Provision – working in partnership with others

If you are examining provision involving total or partial delivery at a partner organisation(s), please comment on any trend, from year to year (where possible), or between centres, and on the comparability of the quality of learning opportunities, standards, marking practices and internal moderation across sites where appropriate. **Please specify which delivery site(s) you are referring to**, and distinguish between centres where relevant.

4b. Provision delivered by University of Northampton staff at other venues

If you have examined any provision delivered by the University at other locations, **please comment on the comparability of standards, achievement and the student experience between different cohorts.**

I have not examined any 'on-campus' modules delivered on campus at Northampton.		
I have only examined modules delivered at Bloomsbury Law Institute, formerly London School of Business and Management (LSBM).		
<i>For modules delivered at more than one location Not applicable</i>	YES	NO
I confirm that I received an adequate sample of work from students at all delivery sites		

A5. Professional, statutory & regulatory bodies

We attach specific importance to the standards and quality of our provision regulated by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies. If you are examining this type of provision please comment on standards in relation to assessment of practice, supervision of practice and support for practice assessment.

Please specify which PSRB(s) you are referring to.

The Solicitors regulation Authority (SRA)
The Bar Council: for the bar Professional training Course (BPTC).
The undergraduate law provision meets the requirements of the two professional bodies for a Qualifying Law Degree (QLD) by virtue of incorporating the 'seven foundations of legal knowledge' into the course curriculum.

A6. HNC/HND Awards (delivered under the Pearson HE Licence Agreement)

If your remit includes work leading to HNC/HND awards *in addition to* University of Northampton degree programmes, please comment here on the comparability of standards, achievement and the student experience between different cohorts.

Not applicable

SECTION B - Quality and Enhancement

Please comment and/or provide recommendations (*the text boxes will expand as you type*)

B1. Identification of good practice relating to learning, teaching & assessment that you have observed

The curriculum incorporates a good range of assessment tasks which provides students with a range of opportunities to develop employability skills.

B2. Opportunities to enhance the quality of learning opportunities provided to students

Poorly performing student could perhaps be offered more academic support as per my comments addressed to the Chairperson for the examination board the previous year.

--

B3. Please comment on any meetings you have had with students on the programme(s) / modules in your remit during the year (including 'virtual' meetings, if relevant)

Not applicable

B4. Please note any issues requiring attention **by the Faculty and/or University**

Not applicable

B5. Your previous report (where applicable). Please state whether issues raised in your previous report(s) have been / are being addressed to your satisfaction.

There were no specific issues raised in last year's report.

B6. The University does not wish to limit the issues on which an external examiner may comment. If you wish to raise any points other than those listed above, please do so in the section below. In particular, if during the academic year you have been asked to consider minor amendments to the curriculum, you may wish to comment on these in this section.

Not applicable

B7. Please indicate here if you would like to be forwarded a copy of the Annual Review Final Rolling Action Plan for the provision for which you are appointed as external examiner when it is produced.

Yes

No

B8. *(For external examiners in the final year of their period of office)*

The University is grateful for the contribution of external examiners to the ongoing work of the institution. Please provide here a brief overview covering your term of office.

Not applicable

Checklist

Programme materials - Did you receive:	Yes	No	n/a
A. Programme handbooks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
B. Programme regulations (these may be in the programme handbook)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
C. Module descriptions (these may be in the programme handbook)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
D. Assessment briefs / marking criteria	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Draft exam papers	Yes	No	n/a
A. (i) Did you receive all draft papers?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
A. (ii) If not, was this at your request?			
B. (i) Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
B. (ii) If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Marking examination scripts	Yes	No	n/a
A. (i) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
A. (ii) If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
B. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
C. Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Dissertations / project reports	Yes	No	n/a
A. Was the choice of dissertations appropriate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
B. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Coursework / continuously assessed work	Yes	No	n/a
A. Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
B. Were the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Orals / performances / recitals / appropriate professional placements	Yes	No	n/a
A. Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct orals and/or moderate performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Final examiners' meeting	Yes	No	n/a
A. Were you able to attend the meeting?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
C. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Please add any further comments on administration and communication:			
<p>The administrative arrangements for the moderation of assessments were adequate and satisfactory in terms of communication, notification of board meetings and timings. The handbook, programme specifications, draft assessment tasks and marking criteria were communicated to me in good time and I had ample time to review them and provide feedback/ suggested amendments. On the whole I found the administrative arrangements satisfactory and in line with my expectations.</p>			

Date completed: 03 July 2019