

Overview

In my view the LSC learning outcomes have all been met. In this I rely on the two mean scores, which are slightly lower than in 2016 but still commendable. On the written paper the figure is 70% and on the oral test it is 74%.

I have been assisted by the helpful collation of data into spreadsheets.

The question paper in relation to the learning outcomes of the course (IPLC1 Written examination)

The spread of marks was 31 (52%) to 54 (90%), the lower mark just above the pass mark of 30. There were no fails. There should be no assumption that a good assessment paper should generate a proportion of fails, especially where the candidates, as here, are motivated professional people. I am of the opinion that the question paper was a very effective vehicle for testing the LSC learning outcomes. The paper clearly succeeded in differentiating candidates. The 'rank order written' document supplied to me is especially helpful in identifying harder questions by the zeros recorded for candidates who did not score on those questions. I confirm that those harder questions were fair. There is no bunching of marks, and a good spread.

I reviewed the script of the lowest scoring candidate. I confirm the recorded mark and the candidate's passing of the paper.

In my view the learning outcomes were well tested by this paper.

The oral examination in relation to the learning outcomes of the course (IPLC 2 Oral examination)

The spread of marks was 13 (60%) to 20 (100%). I reviewed the video recording of the lowest scoring candidate. I confirm the recorded mark and the candidate's passing of the oral test. In my view the learning outcomes were well tested by this exercise in delivering a closing speech, taking in the review of evidence, and applying the test in *Vertical Leisure Ltd v Poleplus Ltd*. It clearly succeeded in differentiating candidates' advocacy skill. There is again no bunching of marks, and a good spread.

Outcomes of the marking

I note that three standardisation scripts were appropriately chosen and used by the examiners to finalise the mark scheme prior to marking. Minimal alterations to the scheme were made on question 17 during this process.

Only two questions invited discussion at the end of the first marking. Question 1 was reviewed for its fairness, and this was confirmed, with no requirement for extra credit to be given.

The other was question 12 where credit was given to candidates who delivered an answer in a differently framed way from its appearance on the mark scheme.

As per rule 5.5 the chief examiner reviewed scripts within 3 marks of the pass mark, which this year was only one. I did the same. The candidate's mark is confirmed.

Legibility of scripts did not affect the discharging of the written examiners' task.

Examiner selection, training, instructions, supervision, and appraisal were not discussed at the meeting.

It was confirmed by all present that that no marker had conflicts of interest and that there was no hint of malpractice by the candidates.

Proceedings at the awarding meeting were followed by the independent monitor.

I approve the marks. The outcomes of the marking process itself are all met in my view.

Quality assurance of the course (face to face and on-line).

The content for both modes, which I have seen, is well designed, presented and (evidently from the marks awarded) well delivered.

Recommendations

At this stage in the iterations, the assessment process and its QA are well refined. I have no recommendations as far as assessment goes.

My standing recommendation, as always, is to maintain a rolling review of course materials to ensure they keep pace with the tide of procedural change which has become such a feature in recent years of this field of litigation.