
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	BT1 Corporate technical assessment: diligence and deal responses	7
05	BN1 Corporate transaction negotiation assessment	8
06	BT2 Corporate financing and completion assessment	9
07	BP1 Corporate final work-product capstone	10
08	BO1 Corporate 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.

BT1 | Corporate technical assessment: diligence and deal responses

Candidate brief

Individual, open source, five-page report plus evidence annex. This task contributes 10%. Use Meridian M01–M11 with these assessment changes: the proposed secondary acquisition is 60%; enterprise value £9m; included debt £2m; included cash £0.3m; working-capital shortfall £0.2m. Anchor Customer's agreement still requires consent for a change exceeding 50% of voting control. The primary subscription remains a separate proposal with unresolved issuance terms.

Submit a reference price bridge, ownership/authority questions, five prioritised diligence findings and three proposed transaction responses. Include one specific disclosure question and one specialist referral. Distinguish supplied extracts from a full legal review. Explain why lender support is not final consent and why a contractor invoice is not sufficient evidence of every IP right.

Submission and criteria

Marking: analysis/materiality 30; evidence and numbers 25; deal responses 25; writing/limitations 15; process 5. There may be several defensible responses; assessors reward reasoning and appropriate scope, not a fixed preference for indemnities or conditions.

BN1 | Corporate transaction negotiation assessment

Candidate brief

Individual performance in a 25-minute buyer/seller simulation, followed by a 15-minute debrief.

Contributes 15%. The facilitator assigns private mandates and one changed customer or financing fact.

Preparation can use approved tools; the observed exchange is unaided by live AI.

Prepare six issues, identify linked concessions and authority, and negotiate a coherent proposal. Keep factual diligence questions separate from risk-allocation choices. Submit individual preparation, decision log and 500-word handover. Ending without agreement can be the correct professional result.

Submission and criteria

Marking: preparation 20; factual clarification/listening 20; integrated proposals 25; authority and conduct 20; handover 15. Assessors should test whether a concession in one document was reflected in related provisions. Written accommodation is available with equivalent individual evidence.

BT2 | Corporate financing and completion assessment

Candidate brief

Individual, open source, spreadsheet and closing pack plus 1,000 narrative words maximum. Contributes 10%. Use a separate simplified financing exercise: 800,000 issued shares and 200,000 included option shares form a 1,000,000 pre-money denominator; pre-money value £5m; primary investment £1.25m; no other dilution, debt conversion or fees. This is not a resolution of Meridian's inconsistent option records.

Calculate price/share, new shares and post-money percentages for a founder holding 400,000 shares. Then prepare Meridian's approval/consent checklist, version-bound closing workflow and sources/uses commentary using the base case, identifying unresolved funding arrangements. Include tests for an unsigned consent, changed document, missing authority and revised payoff figure. No real transfer or filing is allowed.

Submission and criteria

Marking: financial accuracy and assumptions 30; corporate/closing analysis 25; evidence and control tests 25; handover 15; process 5. A balanced model does not prove valid corporate approvals. Credit requires explaining both mathematical and legal/operational limitations.

BP1 | Corporate final work-product capstone

Candidate brief

Individual, weeks 21–24, five-page diligence report plus indexed annexes. Contributes 25%. Use Meridian and the facilitator's event packet. Permitted AI must be disclosed and reviewed; all numbers, source references and recommendations remain your responsibility.

Submit: transaction structure; issued/option/fully diluted reconciliation; reference price and sources/uses; prioritised diligence report and evidence; acquisition-risk matrix; disclosure/consent questions; corporate approvals and closing checklist; controlled document index/workflow; supervisor handover; tool-use and change record. Record unresolved questions precisely. Do not supply a tax opinion, certify regulatory clearance or manufacture missing instruments.

Submission and criteria

Two assessors use: substantive analysis 30; document/data accuracy 25; commercial options 15; communication/handover 15; process/AI accountability 15. Proposed threshold 75%, required competency evidence and no unresolved critical integrity/safety failure. Case contradictions must be preserved and investigated, not silently repaired into a fictional certainty.

BO1 | Corporate oral defence

Candidate brief

Individual, 30 minutes, no live AI. Contributes 10%. Explain your structure and priority issues, reconstruct one calculation, respond to an unseen fact and describe the necessary specialist/authority limits. You may refer to your submitted pack. An accessible equivalent can change the communication method while preserving individual reasoning and response.

Suggested allocation: five-minute overview; ten minutes on substantive/numerical questions; ten-minute variation; five-minute reflection. Explain uncertainty and useful next steps rather than inventing an immediate legal conclusion.

Submission and criteria

Marking: individual ownership/reasoning 35; changed-fact analysis 30; evidence/control awareness 20; clarity and professional boundaries 15. Proposed threshold 70%. The record identifies the questions asked, observed evidence and reasons; it must not rely solely on automated scoring or an AI-content detector.