
PRACTICE ASSESSMENT / SEPTEMBER 2026

Practice assessment specimens

Disclosed tasks for rehearsal and feedback. These are not unseen examination papers.

Careful reading. Applied work.
Accountable professional judgment.

INSIDE THIS PUBLICATION

Contents

Read in sequence or go directly to the section you need. The contents and PDF bookmarks link to each section.

01	Published assessment specimens	3
02	K1 Core knowledge and application examination	4
03	M1 Core professional memorandum	6
04	AT1 Contracts technical assessment: an integrated review	7
05	AN1 Contracts negotiation assessment	8
06	AT2 Contracts operations and AI evaluation assessment	9
07	AP1 Contracts final work-product capstone	10
08	AO1 Contracts oral defence	11

A note on this edition

These materials support an editorial learning pilot. Exercises use fictional matters and are not legal advice. No accredited award or practising qualification is offered. Read the stated scope and assessment conditions before you begin.

Published assessment specimens

These are disclosed practice tasks, not unseen examination papers. Formal delivery, conditions, parallel forms and standards require approval before consequential assessment.

K1 | Core knowledge and application examination

Candidate brief

Individual, 90 minutes, 100 marks. No generative AI, messaging, model answers or outside assistance. You may use the source-reading index and the specified legislation/judgments, but must write your own analysis. Reasonable adjustments are available. The facilitator records conditions; an unsupervised attempt is practice, not verified assessment. Use fictional facts only. This assessment contributes 15% of the proposed pathway result; the proposed K1 threshold is 70%, subject to academic approval before a real cohort.

1. Formation and scope — 20 marks. Brook offers five workshops for £10,000. Vale replies “agreed with recordings”; Brook replies “start date confirmed” and delivers one workshop. A purchase order refers to different terms, and no signed long form exists. Explain two plausible agreement/terms analyses, identify evidence needed and distinguish formation from breach. Do not conclude from absence of signature alone.
2. Company authority — 15 marks. A fictional operations manager approves a £40,000 purchase despite an internal £15,000 limit. Identify the intended company, evidence relevant to authority and the difference between internal approval and external binding effect. Explain why CA40/CA43 do not justify a conclusion without facts about the actor and transaction.
3. Finance — 20 marks. Under an agreed teaching formula, enterprise value is £5m, included debt £0.8m, included cash £0.2m and a working-capital shortfall reduces price by £0.1m. Calculate reference equity value and 60% secondary consideration. Explain how a separate £0.5m primary investment differs and why it cannot simply be added to seller proceeds.
4. Evidence — 15 marks. A support note says “settled”; the customer's email says “we accept the workaround without waiving our position.” Logs are due for deletion tomorrow. Prepare a neutral factual summary and prioritised next actions. Do not assume settlement or privilege from a label.
5. Drafting — 15 marks. Rewrite “Supplier will help quickly if the system fails” as a bounded educational service obligation using stated assumptions. Identify actor, trigger, action, timing, communication, evidence and a decision still needed. Do not pretend your chosen time is statutory.
6. AI evaluation — 15 marks. A tool flags 15 issues; nine are genuine, and the reviewed answer set contains 12 genuine issues. Calculate precision and recall, explain what they omit, and propose two tests or controls before any deployment.

Submission and criteria

Submit numbered answers, calculations and a short authorship declaration. Credit is given for accurate distinctions, application, usable next steps and explicit limitations. Unsupported certainty loses credit. A correct number without a visible method earns limited credit. No automatic professional certificate follows a quiz or exam score.

M1 | Core professional memorandum

Candidate brief

Individual, open source, 900 words maximum plus one table and a 150-word clause. Permitted AI assistance must be disclosed after your own initial issue analysis. You may discuss general methods, not exchange completed answers. This task contributes 15% of the proposed pathway grade.

Fictional Cedar Events receives an eight-session proposal for £16,000. It replies "agreed, including recordings." The supplier replies "dates confirmed," delivers two sessions without recordings and later misses a third. Cedar incurs £2,500 of documented replacement costs and claims £30,000 of reputational loss without supporting evidence. A purchase order says supplier standard terms do not apply; the supplier's acknowledgement refers to its own standard terms. The final contract set is uncertain.

Write to supervising counsel. Address the decision required, formation/terms alternatives, missing evidence, the missed-session issue, different loss assertions, options and a recommended next step. Propose one clause that would improve future scope/acceptance clarity; do not imply that a later draft alters the existing legal position. Attach a fact/assumption/source table and version log. Declare accepted/rejected AI suggestions if used.

Submission and criteria

Marking: legal/factual analysis 35; commercial options/prioritisation 20; writing and audience 20; proposed clause 15; evidence/process 10. The best answer need not choose a single final contractual conclusion where the record is incomplete. It must explain why uncertainty matters and what to do about it. Peer comments are permitted only on clarity and method; disclose them.

AT1 | Contracts technical assessment: an integrated review

Candidate brief

Individual, open source, 1,200 narrative words plus annotated extracts/tables. AI permitted only with fictional data, a process record and your own review. This technical checkpoint contributes 10% of the proposed pathway grade.

Use Lantern L01–L10 with these assessment facts replacing the relevant base values: the order is for 80 named users, £7,500 per month for 12 months after acceptance, and £15,000 implementation. The draft MSA still says 24 months and £12,000 monthly from signature. The sponsor's approved first-year budget is £120,000. Four reports are essential at launch, two may follow only if separately approved. Supplier confirms an independent contractor wrote the connector but supplies no assignment. Support access outside the UK is proposed but locations are incomplete.

Submit: an entity/scope/price conflict table; a reasoned redline addressing agreement architecture, acceptance, liability, IP, data and exit; a first-year cost model; and a concise approval/referral note. Identify legal questions separately from proposed commercial concessions. Do not present an unsigned draft as agreed or import base-case financial figures silently.

Submission and criteria

Marking: legal/commercial analysis 30; coherent drafting 25; price/data accuracy 15; prioritised advice 20; transparent process 10. Evidence must connect conclusions to the case and relevant sources. A privacy schedule pasted without relation to the activity is weak work. Do not certify legal compliance or enforceability.

AN1 | Contracts negotiation assessment

Candidate brief

Individual performance in a paired or small-group exercise: 25 minutes of negotiation and 15 minutes of debrief. Preparation may use approved tools; no live AI assistance during the observed exchange. A structured written exchange is an equivalent by arrangement. This task contributes 15%.

You receive a private buyer or supplier mandate from the facilitator. Keep it confidential from the other side. Prepare interests, options, dependencies and authority limits. Negotiate scope, acceptance, commercial commitment and one risk issue. A changed fact will be introduced. You may stop for instructions; agreement is not required.

Submit your own preparation sheet, concession/status log and 500-word handover. Distinguish proposed, provisionally agreed, approved and unresolved positions. Do not claim a peer's work as your own or fabricate approval. A learner without a facilitator may practise with visible case assumptions but must not describe the result as observed academy assessment.

Submission and criteria

Marking: preparation 20; listening/clarification 20; coherent proposals 25; authority/ethical discipline 20; handover 15. Assessors judge individual contributions, not how forcefully someone speaks or whether the other side conceded. Confidential role packets and event variations are held in the protected instructor materials.

AT2 | Contracts operations and AI evaluation assessment

Candidate brief

Individual, open tools, 1,000 narrative words plus outputs. This task contributes 10%. Use Lantern's fictional legacy data, a proposed agreed-for-exercise position clearly identified, and no real client records.

Deliver: an untouched input dataset, cleaned output, schema, exception log, obligation register and a tested intake/approval workflow. Include at least eight tests: incomplete request, duplicate, missing source, conflicting dates, changed approved version, unavailable approver, denied access and hostile instruction in a document. A manual/rules-based alternative is permitted if it meets the same functional tests.

Evaluate one bounded extraction or routing task against a reviewed expected-output set. Record actual observations, errors, severity, time and limitations. Use at least two holdout records not used to improve the process. Recommend deployment, narrower use, further testing or rejection. Never claim that a small simulation establishes general productivity or legal accuracy.

Submission and criteria

Marking: data reliability 25; usable workflow and controls 25; evaluation method/results 25; post-award handover 15; individual explanation/process 10. You must preserve uncertainty rather than silently filling missing fields. The assessor may change an input or role to test your implementation.

AP1 | Contracts final work-product capstone

Candidate brief

Individual, weeks 21–24, maximum 2,500 narrative words plus documents and tables. This task contributes 25%. Use the Lantern casebook and the facilitator's event release. Peer discussion is limited to methods and disclosed clarity feedback. AI assistance is permitted within the handbook's data/tool rules.

Deliver one indexed pack: scope/authority note; evidence/issue register; clean and marked-up agreement extracts; financial/credit calculations; negotiation/decision record; tested approval workflow; post-award and exit handover; AI/process log; and unresolved questions with accountable next steps. Reconcile the whole package after the event. Do not invent signatures or acceptance.

Submission and criteria

Rubric: substantive analysis 30; document/data accuracy 25; commercial priorities/options 15; communication/handover 15; process and accountable AI use 15. Two assessors review the work. The proposed capstone threshold is 75%, with no unresolved critical integrity/safety failure and the required competency evidence. Numeric thresholds require faculty calibration before live credential use; the software does not automatically award the certificate.

AO1 | Contracts oral defence

Candidate brief

Individual, 30 minutes, no live AI or outside help. This task contributes 10%. You may refer to your submitted pack. The assessor asks you to explain a material choice, test a changed fact, locate evidence and identify a limitation. Reasonable adjustments preserve the competency being assessed without requiring a particular accent or presentation style.

Structure: five-minute overview; ten minutes of substantive questions; ten-minute unseen variation; five-minute reflection and limits. You are not expected to give immediate definitive advice on every unfamiliar legal question. You are expected to recognise what changes and what additional review is needed.

Submission and criteria

Marking: ownership/reasoning 35; response to variation 30; evidence/control awareness 20; clarity and professional limits 15. Proposed threshold: 70%. The assessor records reasons, not merely a pass/fail label. A self-recorded practice presentation does not count as independently observed O1.