
STUDY GUIDE / SEPTEMBER 2026

Your learning route

A practical starting check, a clear study sequence and guidance on pacing your work.

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	Starting check — try before reading the feedback	3
02	Starting-check feedback and repair route	4
03	The sequence and the evidence to carry forward	5
04	Three readiness checkpoints	5
05	Keep case boundaries clear	6
06	Time: a planning budget, not a race	6

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.

Use this once before C01, then return at the checkpoints below. The aim is increasingly independent, usable work within a defined scope—not memorising a model or becoming qualified to advise in every jurisdiction. This is a study aid, not a validated admissions test or the proposed longer foundation bridge.

If you are new to this specialism but already comfortable with legal reading, attempt the starting check and use it to identify gaps. If you are new to legal study, work through the check and core with support and a slower pace. The six core units do not supply the full foundation of a law degree. Persistent difficulty with source interpretation or basic contract/entity concepts calls for further foundation study before a specialist pathway, not more speed.

Starting check — try before reading the feedback

Use fictional material only. Try these four stations without generative AI so you can see what you already understand. A calculator and labelled text calculations are fine. Keep one short working note; there is no separate graded submission or numerical pass mark. Count this work inside your C01 study time. Take a break or seek an accessible format when needed; speed is not the criterion.

1. Read a clause, then read the evidence

Original exercise clause: “The project owner shall give written acceptance only after all four named report tests pass. Pilot use is not acceptance.” A test log records three passes and one duplicate-row failure. The supplier's email says “delivery complete.” The owner says “start the pilot; please fix the failed report.”

Write two supported facts, one conclusion not established, and one next action. Do not decide an entire dispute from this extract.

2. Check what a real source supports

Open Companies Act 2006 section 43, including subsection (2), from the reading index. A draft note claims: “The statute means any manager can sign for the company, regardless of authority.” Identify the subsection relevant to a person acting for the company. Record source, jurisdiction/scope, pinpoint, a correction and one fact the statute cannot supply. If you cannot access the source, record that access problem and seek an authorised copy; do not pretend to have read it. [Companies Act 2006, section 43](#)

3. Follow the units and the recipient

All figures here are GBP, not £000. A service costs £800 per month for twelve months plus £1,200 implementation. The approved commitment budget is £11,000. Calculate the commitment and budget headroom. Then use a separate express price formula: enterprise value £100,000 – included debt £20,000 + included cash £5,000, with no other adjustment. What is a 60% secondary payment? Who receives a separate £10,000 primary subscription? Show formulas, not just results.

4. Make a usable decision note and preserve the record

Your exercise mandate permits recommendations only. Version 2 of a draft contains a twelve-month term; version 3 changes it to twenty-four months. Finance approved version 2 only. In at most 80 words, tell the supervisor what changed, what can continue, what decision is needed and who should act. Keep v2, label v3 and record the change. Use a text note if document comparison software is unfamiliar.

Starting-check feedback and repair route

1. Evidence: three tests passed and one failed; the owner's message permits a pilot. Written acceptance under the supplied procedure is not established. Request correction and a retest, preserving the messages. "Everything delivered" ignores the failed test; "nothing useful happened" ignores the three passes. If difficult, revisit C01's fact/assumption method and C04's chronology before expanding the exercise.
2. Source: section 43(1)(b) concerns a person acting with express or implied authority; it does not grant authority to every manager. Subsection (2) also matters to applicable formalities. A completed record might say: "England and Wales company-contract context; CA 2006 s43(1)(b) and (2); manager's actual authority and contract-specific formalities still require evidence." C01 develops this distinction. Finding a real link without reading it is not source verification.
3. Numbers: $800 \times 12 + 1,200 = \text{£}10,800$; headroom = $11,000 - 10,800 = \text{£}200$. Price-model equity = $100,000 - 20,000 + 5,000 = \text{£}85,000$; secondary payment = $85,000 \times 0.60 = \text{£}51,000$ to selling holders. The separate $\text{£}10,000$ subscription goes to the company. None of those calculations establishes approval or actual payment. If percentages are difficult, write $60\% = 60/100 = 0.60$ and repeat with 50% before C03. If the recipients are unclear, draw two separate arrows.
4. Communication: "Version 3 extends the commitment to twenty-four months; finance approval covers v2 only. I can compare the changed terms and update the exposure model, but cannot approve or communicate acceptance. Please ask the designated finance approver and sponsor to review v3's full commitment before release. I have retained both versions and recorded the change." C05 develops this decision-first approach; A18/B20 later test the release rules.

Use the results to choose support, not to label yourself "ready" from four answers. Correct a weak station, then try a different figure or changed fact without its feedback. Take the original and corrected note to your reviewer. If studying alone, label that evidence self-review; it is useful but not independent assessment.

The sequence and the evidence to carry forward

Do the core once, then choose one specialist pathway. Topic IDs identify teaching units, not competency awards. The "First pass" and "Move on" guidance at each unit identifies a smaller start and an observable check; it does not lock the platform or confer a pass.

Stage	What changes in the learning	Keep and improve
C01–C04: foundation	Read one source or record; follow a completed example; attempt a changed fact	Scope note, chronology, source table and labelled calculation
C05–C06: connect	Turn analysis into a decision and test a tool/manual process	Corrected memo, bounded clause and error/control record
A07–A12 / B07–B12: apply	Use the core on a connected matter, initially one issue at a time	One versioned Lantern or Meridian matter file, with source/decision links
A13–A20 / B13–B20: integrate	Negotiate, model and test interactions; reduce dependence on examples	Updated documents, calculations, decisions, operational tests and handover
A21–A24 / B21–B24: demonstrate	Recheck the full file, respond to an event and explain the work unaided	One final indexed pack plus accurately labelled transfer and defence evidence

Before reading a worked answer, attempt the guided change. After feedback, correct your own work and explain why. At the next relevant unit, retrieve the earlier distinction or calculation from memory, then check the source. Re-reading alone can feel fluent while leaving application gaps.

Three readiness checkpoints

Before specialist study: without a model answer, explain one C01 authority distinction, apply C02 to a changed email, rebuild a C03 calculation with a different input, preserve C04's fact/inference distinction, improve a C05 clause and explain C06's two metric denominators. Use your actual core work, not six new essays. A reviewer should be able to identify the decision and reconstruct your reasoning. If a material error remains, revisit that unit and repeat a variation. K1/M1 specimens supply further practice; a two-question quiz does not replace this evidence.

Before the capstone: explain one connected issue across your documents, numbers and operating controls. Complete the shorter Northfield or Junco transfer exercise without opening its feedback, then record the correction. These are disclosed exercises, not unseen tests. Check both directions: block unsupported action and close a resolved issue or recommend a permitted step when the supplied evidence supports it. A18 and B20 include permitted-step variations.

Before claiming proficiency: locate the sources, reconstruct the calculations, justify a commercial choice, respond to an unfamiliar fact and correct a material inconsistency without someone supplying the answer. Independent observed work, appropriate legal review and moderated assessment are needed to substantiate that claim. Self-study can produce evidence worth reviewing; consuming all pages cannot guarantee readiness for a role. The intended main target is usable routine transaction-support work with ordinary professional review, not senior expertise or practising authority.

Keep case boundaries clear

Work in one folder per matter and a separate folder per assessment attempt. Named worked examples are not additional facts for Lantern or Meridian. A technical brief's replacement figures apply to that attempt only; they do not amend the base case. Save the brief and a short "what changes" note with each attempt. A proposed clause is not an agreed term merely because you drafted it.

Within the same base matter, reuse and improve your own prior work with its version history. Point to unchanged work in an index; do not repeatedly rewrite it. Incorporate source cards, participation corrections and assumptions into that same working record unless a brief expressly requires a separate output. Keep the final pack self-contained: a reviewer must not have to find your old submissions. Public practice does not authorise importing a disclosed answer into a controlled assessment; its permitted-material rules govern separately.

Time: a planning budget, not a race

The proposed ten hours per unit and 240 per pathway include the starting check, guided practice, source work, assessment preparation/attempts and corrections. They are unvalidated planning estimates, not a guarantee or an extra workload allowance. Word/page limits are ceilings, not targets.

Weeks/units	How to avoid a second workload
Core 1–6	Start M1 preparation from C02/C05 learning, using Cedar's actual brief. Spread preparation across the core. In week 6 reserve K1's 90-minute attempt inside the budget; do not add it after a full ten-hour C06 task.
12 and 14	Use the short technical/negotiation rehearsal for feedback, then the separate specimen. Reuse your own method and corrected preparatory work where allowed; apply the specimen's changed facts.

Weeks/units	How to avoid a second workload
17–20	Build the data/model/workflow incrementally. T2 brings those components together; it is not an instruction to rebuild an unchanged prototype. Reserve fresh evaluation records before testing if the brief requires holdouts.
21–24	Treat four weeks as a shared 40-hour planning envelope. Develop P1 through the checkpoints; use week 24 mainly for consistency, correction and defence, not the first full draft. P1/O1 and transfer practice sit inside that envelope.

Log actual time and the point of difficulty. Pause between reading, calculation and drafting when helpful. If the budget is insufficient, extend the calendar and request support or an agreed assessment date; do not omit essential source checks or invent attendance. A supported slower route must meet the same evidence standard. A timed assessment's conditions may change only through the agreed adjustment process, not by silently altering your attempt record.