



NEW JUSTICE PROGRAM

INDEPENDENT, EXTERNAL, ON-SITE ASSESSMENT OF LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY AT THE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY “ODESA LAW ACADEMY” SCHOOL OF ADVOCACY

ASSESSMENT REPORT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY

Contract No. **AID-121-TO-16-00003**

Authors:

Delaine R. Swenson, PhD in LAW (USA), Department Head of the Chair of International and American Law at the Faculty of Law of John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Center for Advancing Legal Skills Director, Lublin, Poland
Thomas H. Speedy Rice, Professor of Practice at Washington & Lee School of Law's Transnational Law Institute in Lexington, Virginia, USA
Mariia Tsypiashchuk, Instructor at the I.Malynovskyi Institute of Law of the National University of Ostroh Academy, Head of Ostroh Legal Clinic "Pro Bono", Board Member of the NGO "Association of Legal Clinics of Ukraine"
Ivan Romashchenko, Lecturer at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Faculty of Law, Legal Expert, External PhD Candidate at Leiden University, the Netherlands

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	4
II. Executive Summary	6
III. Methodology	13
IV. Background	15
V. Findings and Recommendations to the Law School	17
VI. Recommendations to Government	50
Appendix 1 – Assessment Team Member Biographies	52
Appendix 2 – Schedule of Experts’ Activities During Site Visit	54
Appendix 3 – Survey Results	62
Appendix 4 – Classroom Observation Protocol	129

INTRODUCTION

The USAID New Justice Program (New Justice) builds upon the successes, relationships and efforts of the USAID Fair, Accountable, Independent, Responsible Judiciary Project (FAIR) and works to support the Judiciary, the Government, the Parliament, the Bar, Law Schools, Civil Society, Media and Citizens to create the conditions for an independent, accountable, transparent, and effective justice system that upholds the rule of law and to fight corruption in Ukraine. In achieving this overarching goal, New Justice focuses on the following objectives:

Objective 1: Judicial Independence and Self-Governance Strengthened.

Objective 2: Accountability and Transparency of the Judiciary to Citizens and the Rule of Law Increased.

Objective 3: Administration of Justice Enhanced.

Objective 4: Quality of Legal Education Strengthened.

Objective 5: Access to Justice Expanded and Human Rights Protected.

An independent survey in 2013 found that only five of 120 higher legal education institutions in Ukraine received more than 20 points on a 100-point performance scale by graduates, employers, and experts. In addition, job market survey reports indicated that only one in seven law school graduates found a job in the legal field.

To address these challenges and support the Ukrainian government and law schools' efforts to strengthen legal education quality, FAIR designed the pilot project implementation to provide expertise in external legal education quality assessment in a selected law school. Upon its initiative and agreement, FAIR chose the Law School of the Ivan Franko Lviv National University (LNU) as a pilot site for an assessment in May 2014. One year on, the Law School of the Yuri Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University (CNU) agreed to be a second pilot site for this assessment. The assessments resulted in reports with recommendations on how to improve the quality of legal education at the pilot law schools specifically and highlighted, where relevant, issues and recommendations stemming from the national system of legal education more generally.

The experience of previous assessments shows that both LNU and CNU benefited from the assessments and a constructive, thought-provoking dialogue between different groups of law school stakeholders aimed to improve legal education quality at respective law schools as well as follow on projects to improve the quality of the law schools strategic planning, academic integrity, teaching, and testing.

In October 2016, New Justice succeeded FAIR and the National University "Odesa Law Academy" (NUOLA) requested New Justice to conduct an independent, external, on-site assessment of legal education quality at the NUOLA School of Advocacy using the Methodology. After the Methodology was developed and piloted at LNU and CNU a new, updated version of the ESG was adopted by the European Ministers responsible for higher education in the European Higher Education Area in May 2015.

New Justice engaged two international and two local experts to amend the Methodology in light of the new edition of the ESG. Then, based on the amended Methodology, to assess the NUOLA

School of Advocacy in March of 2017.

Current assessment of legal education quality at NUOLA demonstrates that a number of issues related to every key element that were found during the two previous assessments at LNU and CNU are applicable to the NUOLA School of Advocacy as well. So, the recommendations set out in the relevant reports may also be useful and implementable by the NUOLA and School of Advocacy administration with regard to the specificity of this university and the law faculty.

The team of experts had the following tasks:

- Revise the Methodology for Independent, External, On-Site Assessment of Legal Education Quality (Methodology, 2014) in light of the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area approved at the Yerevan Ministerial Conference in May 2015.
- Based on the amended Methodology, prepare for the independent, external assessment of legal education quality at NUOLA by analyzing (a) the NUOLA website, (b) other publicly available information about the NUOLA in general and its School of Advocacy in particular, and (c) the information specifically provided to the team of experts in relation to the upcoming assessment as well as conducting and presenting the results of an anonymous online survey of NUOLA stakeholders, including law students, alumni, faculty, administrators, and legal employers.
- Using the amended Methodology, conduct a comprehensive independent, external, onsite assessment of legal education quality at NUOLA in general and its School of Advocacy in particular. In the end of the onsite assessment, debrief the NUOLA leadership on the assessment work conducted and provide the outline of a draft Assessment Report. Based on the assessment findings, prepare a draft Assessment Report with recommendations on improving legal education quality at the NUOLA School of Advocacy, NUOLA as a whole, and in Ukraine in general, discussing existing legal education-related policies, procedures, and practices and their compatibility with the national requirements for legal education as well as international and European standards, guidelines, and best practices of legal education quality assurance. The draft Assessment Report should also, as appropriate, provide recommendations for further improvement of the Methodology.
- Proofread the Ukrainian translation of the draft Assessment Report and work with the NUOLA representatives to receive a detailed feedback on the draft Assessment Report with Recommendations to be clearly communicated to the assessment team in writing, considered and taken into account as appropriate.
- Finalize the Assessment Report with recommendations, taking into account and commenting on the feedback received from the NUOLA leadership. Make sure the Ukrainian translation of the Assessment Report adequately reflects the English version.
- Based on the Assessment Report, develop a Power Point presentation of the key findings and recommendations to be used for the purposes of publicly presenting the Assessment Report to the NUOLA leadership and community
- Present the final Assessment Report to the NUOLA leadership and community
- Perform other assignments relevant to the tasks under this general scope of work.

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is the outcome of an external quality assurance assessment of National University Odesa Law Academy School of Advocacy conducted by a group of International and Ukrainian experts. The project was undertaken by the New Justice Project under funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The purpose of this project was twofold: first, to further pilot and develop the USAID FAIR and New Justice Projects methodology for external assessment of Ukrainian law schools, and secondly, to conduct an assessment and to develop concrete recommendations for the improvement of legal education at National University Odesa Law Academy and its School of Advocacy as well as other Ukrainian law faculties.

The assessment used the Methodology for External On-Site Legal Education Quality Assessment developed by FAIR Justice consultants in 2014, and updated in 2017 by New Justice consultants in accordance with European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) of 2015. This methodology identifies five key stakeholder groups that should be involved in the assessment: administrators and faculty leadership; teachers; students, graduates and legal employers. In line with the updated methodology the team employed a variety of research methods during the assessment process, including online surveys; individual interviews; focus group discussions; classroom observations; and the review of relevant documents, examinations, student papers and textbooks.

The associated criteria for quality assessment used as a part of this process are adapted from the revised European Higher Education Quality Standards. They are grouped under ten key elements that provide the framework for both key findings under that element, and specific recommendations that emerge as a consequence of these findings, both for the university and a School of Advocacy specifically, and for the Ministry of Education (which administers the system of higher education in Ukraine). The ten elements are: 1) Policy and Procedures for Internal Quality Assurance; 2) Design and Approval of programs; 3) Student-centered Learning, Teaching and Assessment; 4) Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification; 5) Teaching Staff; 6) Curriculum, Learning Resources and Student Support; 7) Information Management and Administration; 8) Public Information; 9) On-going Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programs; 10) Cyclical External Quality Assurance.

The assessment team was fascinated with the openness and detailed preparation of the Administration, Faculty, Staff and Students of the NUOLA School of Advocacy as well as of the University itself. The positive environment allowed the assessment team to see many commendable attributes at NUOLA and to fully explore all subject areas of the assessment in order to prepare a comprehensive report. They were especially impressed with the readiness of faculty and University administration to improve the quality of legal education they provide. This was evident from the fact, for example, that the School of Advocacy conducted its own internal quality assurance assessment in November 2016, based on the Methodology of 2014,

and provided the team with report on the results of assessment. Data of such assessment were also used to finalize this Report.

The detailed findings and recommendations are contained in the full report proper, but key recommendations under each element are summarized here:

Element 1: Policy for Internal Quality Assurance

University structure should be constructed in the way to effectively exercise all the needed functions to provide quality higher education and to avoid any duplication of various structural elements.

Faculties and institutes should be given more powers to deal with their internal affairs by amending properly the University Charter and establishing faculty councils in particular. Faculty councils may be empowered with the rights to approve educational programmes, topics of research, decide issues regarding methodology of teaching, organisational and tutoring issues.

To ensure that Division on Quality Legal Testing and Centre for Higher Education Quality operate effectively and may put into effect tasks set for them – it is of crucial importance to appoint independent and full-time staff for these divisions.

Legal clinic course should be introduced and students, who work at legal clinic as consultants have to gain credits for this. Street Law component should also be developed and implemented by legal clinic.

Professional ethics and human rights issues should be considered by the University administration throughout its all policies and strategy – both, relating to administrating its staff and institution as whole and as an orienting element of the curricula and educational syllabi non-depending on the particular subject of the course or program.

The University shall encourage students to take a more active part in students' self-government and all processes of university activity, such as: quality of teaching and assessment methods, curriculum and schedules, facilities and support etc. University and the faculty should ensure that the students must be overwhelmingly aware of their rights and opportunities to take part in these processes.

Under the Strategic Plan there should be a practical and specific operative plan with consequent steps, deadlines, responsible persons and controls to implement the strategy.

University and a faculty should seek to and take consequent steps to establish solid and dynamic alumni community. Alumni might also be involved into various processes of the institution activities, such as: membership for special students scholarships and awards; practice and internship bases etc.

Element 2: Design and Approval of Programs

Students should be more involved in the process of amending the curriculum and providing more feedback on class development. Flexibility should be inherent in the process of curriculum development especially in terms of developing the knowledge required for each subject area in light of frequent changes in the law.

As a key part of the requirements of the program in the Faculty of Advocacy legal skills should be a mandatory component. Legal skills including oral and written advocacy skills, legal reasoning and analysis, negotiation, client interviewing and counselling skills and a understanding of court process. This requirement is particularly important to the mission of the department.

Legal skills should be incorporated into classes and identified as a key aspect of the curriculum. As a key aspect of this inclusion students should be graded and receive credit on activities involving development of legal skills. This includes appropriate credit for work in the legal clinic and other experiential learning.

The curriculum and individual class syllabi should be reviewed to see where elements of legal ethics and human rights can be included. This should be done in a comprehensive way with recognition of what elements of ethics and human rights knowledge students should have on graduation.

The system of selection of ‘specializations’ in the faculty should be changed to allow students a substantial opportunity to choose individual classes as electives. The University should look into how to make it easier for students to choose elective courses from other departments and receive full credit within their only faculty.

Element 3: Student-centered Learning, Teaching and Assessment

Creating of an internal supportive program for encouraging active student participation in the learning process needs the benefit of new ideas and concepts that flow from domestic and international exchange opportunities. The demonstrated openness and creativeness of the NUOLA leadership supports the possibility for creation of an Institute for Creative Legal Education, focused on developing innovative teaching and active student participation in the learning process. An Institute for Creative Learning should start for the first year or two as a faculty division. NUOLA faculty who wish to participate would meet regularly to discuss, and think-through and agree on creative teaching methodologies and courses, which would then be demonstrated to the full faculty. It would explore what is being done at law schools around the world and how that would interface with Ukrainian legal education. Once it was comfortable with the process and benefits it could become an Institute which adds workshops for other law faculties from around Ukraine and promotes publication of its work. An Institute like this would put teaching at NUOLA on the cutting edge of the evolution in teaching that technology and the internet’s access to ideas are creating and position NUOLA as a leader in Creative / Innovative teaching for Ukraine. NUOLA could expand its legal clinical offerings or develop more student assigned work through the practicum model.

Using concepts of student-centered learning, students could be given more independent study opportunities that promote their critical thinking and support innovative course development by allowing students to propose research topics for approval.

Practical ethics education requires students' introduction to real-life and on-going attorney and client ethical dilemmas by integration of the common and relevant ethical issues as they apply within each subject matter. An important development for the school and its regional goals would be focusing more learning on critical thinking, with refinement of practical and analytical legal logic abilities.

Anonymous examination should be incorporate into student assessments. This will address a fundamental flaw inherent in oral exams that knowledge of the student's identity and external issues or opinions can affect the oral assessment process and grade. Likewise, abolishing the student monitor system and using common text messaging systems would promote a greater sense of equal treatment based on course academic performance.

There is no interference with the issue of feedback between students and teachers when the assessment is anonymous. Firstly, all the assessment criteria should be well explained beforehand as described in issue 4.1. Secondly, anonymous assessment should be built in a way, that each student has his or her coded indicator (letter, number, etc.). So, later there won't be a problem to define the student in order to provide feedback.

Practical oral communication skills are one important skill for the job of an attorney, however there are other important skills such as critical thinking, application of facts to the law, and written communication that should be tested as part of the educational process. Restricting most exams to one method precludes an in-depth examination of these important skills.

Students should have the possibility to anonymously evaluate the courses and teachers, on a regular and systematic basis, as it is extremely helpful to teachers continually seeking teaching improvement, provides a regular and standardized method for students to participate in course development and teacher improvement..

Appeals on improper student, staff or faculty conduct should center on the respect for privacy while at the same time demonstrating transparency to promote trust in the process. Appeals on a grade are much more difficult. NUOLA will benefit from establishing an inclusive committee (faculty, staff, administration, students and alumni) to discuss these difficult matters and determine what process and standards are best for the entire school community.

NUOLA should capitalize on the willingness among faculty, administration and students to discuss, draft, adopt and implement a community comprehensive code of conduct or honor system. A comprehensive code, recognizing that integrity and ethical conduct are universal in the law school community with each group having an active role in enforcing and honoring the code is the most successful and sustainable method.

Element 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification

The University should take care of providing transparent and meritocratic procedures of students admission and progression at various levels of studying. Each program or course needs to have clear and well-explained criteria of admission, if relevant. But what is even more important - these should include a description of the students progress in this particular program or course -

i.e. pre-defined and reasonable grading system, assignments types illustrations etc. These procedures must be communicated directly to students and fairly beforehand, so that a student knows exactly what he or she is expected to do, to know and to demonstrate when being assessed in order to enter and complete particular course or program. Such requirements and criteria should be developed based on the purpose and goals of the discipline and strongly correspond to them.

Where possible, the University should define and consolidate reasonable criteria for students recognition, considering the provisions of the Lisbon Recognition Convention and explanatory documents related to it.

When designing the assessment (evaluation) form – either for particular course, or any other assessment or monitoring – one should consider and identify the purpose of such testing first and then choose the method which best fits to achieve it.

The University and a faculty should encourage participation of students in various law students competitions by supporting them academically, financially where possible. Also the University should consider the possibility of giving credits for some participants for brilliant performances.

Element 5: Teaching Staff

The University should develop a program for all faculties on modern interactive teaching methods. This program should include: training in modern interactive teaching methods for all faculty; expectation of the University and the Department that these methods should be used in all classes; support for faculty in developing these skills; requirement that new faculty undergo appropriate training when hired; and inclusion of teaching method use in faculty evaluation.

As resources become available projectors and computer equipment should be made available in all lecture rooms in the department.

Additional opportunities should be made available for International Teaching and Research opportunities for faculty, more language training made available, and faculty should be encouraged to participate in these programs. Where possible, additional University resources should be made available to facilitate International experiences for faculty.

The University and the Faculty should discuss the creation of additional opportunities for faculty to be involved in chair, department and University governance.

Element 6: Curriculum, Learning Resources and Student Support

NUOLA needs to encourage and promote diverse teaching methodologies in teaching practices (not necessarily technology) that respect diverse talents and ways of learning. NUOLA has a strong library and library staff, a talented IT department, strong faculty and very bright students. The pieces are all there for the creation of very innovative, effective learning in each classroom.

Understanding legal theory is essential but equally essential is how that theory interfaces and instructs the application of laws to society and the effective role of lawyers. Hard skills such as learning laws, research, oral advocacy, writing advocacy, including proper use of forms are among the hard skills that NUOLA can enhance or incorporate into its existing curriculum and course objectives, at the same time soft skills are growing in importance.

The job fairs should be expanded, as there was meaningful enthusiasm among the students, alumni and Council of Advocates. NOULA should consider programs of regular on-campus interviews and additional job fairs perhaps focused on special practice areas if the demand is determined.

NUOLA needs to develop better resources to support faculty/student development, which in turn promotes teaching development and better student engagement, which in turn will attract better students and improve faculty satisfaction.

Element 7: Information Management and Administration

Courses taught in foreign languages should be included into regular curriculum and students shall receive credits for completion of such courses along with those which are taught in Ukrainian or Russian

University and the Faculty should involve and encourage all stakeholders of the educational process to actively use LMSs (such as Moodle, EduBrite etc.) for various processes of study process, including but not limited to communication and contacting between students and teachers staff, publishing syllabi and submitting written tasks etc.

Programs (syllabi) should be comprehensive, well-structured and correspond to actual teaching process. Volume of supporting materials needed for particular class must be realistic for a student to deal with.

Element 8: Public Information

University web-site should be organized in the way that all important documents were well grouped and easily accessible.

Of vital importance is to develop, publish and duly update clear and comprehensible description of the university programs and courses, what will include at least the following elements: curricula and syllabi detailed and specific information about educational content and plan of studying, methods of teaching, admission and assessment criteria, credit amounts, expected outcomes.

Element 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programs

The University should explore additional mechanisms that would allow peer review and program development on the Faculty level in a way that allows all the chairs of the faculty of Advocacy to act together in programming input and design.

Methods to increase student involvement in program review and development should be implemented by the University, especially on the Chair and Faculty level consistent with and in partnership with increased peer and faculty member involvement in the process.

Element 10: Cyclical External Quality Assurance

The University should continue to engage in external assessments as a tool to enhance University advancement. In addition, the University should develop mechanisms to implement and evaluate any recommendations as a result of this or other external assessments.

The assessment team expresses its deep appreciation to NUOLA Rector Volodymyr Zavalniuk and NUOLA School of Advocacy Dean Mykola Stoianov, administrators, teachers, students, graduates and their employers and the staff of New Justice program for their kind support and assistance in the assessments implementation and the level of their commitment to the modernization of legal education quality in Ukraine.

II. METHODOLOGY

To conduct pilot external legal education quality assessment at LNU and, CNU Law Schools the Methodology¹ based on international standards and comparative best practices, notably the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) was developed and adapted to the Ukrainian context. That methodology was designed by USAID FAIR Justice Project consultants in 2014. As the ESG were updated in 2015, methodology for legal education quality in Ukraine was amended consequently in 2017 as the School of Advocacy has been assessed within the project of USAID New Justice Program. External methodology sought to demonstrate best practices for conducting such assessments, using a collaborative approach to engage law school leadership and stakeholders in a constructive dialogue focused on quality improvement, and providing a basis for future assessments in Ukraine.

This report is the main outcome of the third pilot assessment and the first result of using the updated methodology based on the new 2015 ESG. It is designed to be clear, concise, and readily accessible to the intended readership, providing practical recommendations for the improvement of the quality of legal education mainly addressed to the pilot School of Advocacy and to a certain degree to the national system of legal education generally, where the school is unable to implement respective recommendations due to the existence of imperative rules introduced by state authorities. The overall legal education quality of the university is considered using ten key elements and forty corresponding institutional criteria based on and adapted from the 2015 ESG. The research and subsequently the whole report are structured around these ten elements and forty associated criteria.

In accordance with the methodology, based on the experience of two previous pilot assessments, this assessment drew on a variety of primary and secondary research sources. Surveys were used to generate data concerning perceptions of legal education quality at the pilot school among five respondent groups: current students, law school graduates, teachers, law school administrators and employers. Distribution of surveys took place a week in advance of the site visit via email lists offered by the school, but due to the fact that the number of respondents was not high before the beginning of the site visit a reminder was sent to the indicated emails. The surveys were filled anonymously using an online system to encourage frank and constructive responses. Questions were structured around the agreed criteria and indicators, and designed to allow comparison across respondent groups. The five point “Likert Scale” (participants state whether they strongly agree, agree, are neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree with the posited statement) was used to allow simple aggregation and comparison of responses. Additionally, students were asked about the year of their education, graduates - on when they graduated, and teachers - on the length of their teaching experience. At the end of each survey were a small number of open

¹ Delaine Swenson, Finlay Young (2014). Methodology for Interdependent On-Site Legal Education Quality Assessment / http://www.fair.org.ua/content/library_doc/External_Assessment_Methodology_ENG.pdf

ended questions about the strengths and weaknesses of the school. For teachers a special open ended question was about the interactive methods they used.

In total, 86 surveys were returned from the five respondent groups at the faculty of advocacy, with 65 students (although electronic invitations were sent to more than 300 students), 11 graduates, 16 teachers, and 8 administrators returning completed surveys. Unfortunately, only 2 employers returned completed surveys; the notable survey findings reflect results of surveys among all respondent groups, but in case of employers the results are not sufficiently representative.

During the site visit, key informant interviews were also conducted with participants from the five stakeholder groups: administrators, teachers, students, graduates, and legal employers. Over thirty individuals were interviewed during the site visit. The interviewed individuals included representatives of local bar association and judiciary. These interviews were semi-structured, using a mixture of standardized close-ended questions and standardized open-ended questions. Semi-structured interviews allowed for non-standardized follow-up questions so as to further explore key points arising in surveys and questionnaires. Focus group discussions (FGDs) were used to gather more detailed information about particular issues and themes arising from the surveys and interviews. These FGDs were designed to consist of 6-10 persons. Five FGDs were conducted. Classroom observations were used to assess teaching methodologies within the school. A simple assessment protocol, containing among others questions on the methods used by instructor, was utilized to ensure consistent analysis of classes. Six different classes were observed by the team. The institution's legal clinic and library were inspected.

III. BACKGROUND

Ukrainian legal education may be characterized as transitional. Soviet legal education was mostly based on memorization rather than the development of skills, but since Ukraine gained its independence the approach has been shifting to more skills-oriented forcing law schools to rebuild their programs and to make them more competitive and practical. While before programs in law schools extensively approached the issues of theory of state and the exercise of governmental powers, the approach based on philosophy, principles of law and human rights protection has gained more importance nowadays.

However, substantial deficits in legal education quality endure. While there are currently higher education institutions (HEIs) graduating lawyers in Ukraine, according to the independent rating system only five of these institutions were awarded over 20 points on a 100-point scale by graduates, employers, and experts. At the same time, government reports state that nationally, as few as one in twelve law school graduates finds a job in his/her field of expertise².

Legal education is offered by both public (state) and private law schools. Some public law schools are subordinate to the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (MoE) while others are departments of universities governed by other ministries (such as the Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Health Protection, and the Ministry of Agriculture). However, all law schools operate based on a license received from the MoE. This license serves as a state permission to enroll a certain number of students in the law school. The licensing procedure is established by government regulations and is characterized by quantitative and very formal criteria and requirements³. Alongside licensing, there is also an accreditation process for law-schools. Formally, the accreditation process is a confirmation of the ability of the law-school to provide quality education. However, in practice the accreditation process is a duplication of the licensing process, as it is still based on the same quantitative criteria⁴.

There are three sources of legal education funding in Ukraine: state allocation by MoE whereby students are enrolled to be funded by state, state allocation by other ministries and bodies of local self-government, and private funding. There are no clear and transparent criteria or procedures established governing the state allocation of funding. The MoE has full discretion to change the state allocation in any year for any law school. As a result, in most law schools the state funding allocation coexists with the private funding of legal education.

Under the new Law “On Higher Education” in Ukraine lawyers undertake both the Bachelor's and Master's degrees. Since 2015, previously offered “Specialist’s” degrees, part of the Soviet approach to higher education, have been abolished. Almost 100% of Bachelors students proceed to Master’s level study because graduates can only gain access to the legal profession – whether in legal practice or academia - with both the Bachelor's and Master’s degrees.

² See, e.g.: <http://www.osce.org/uk/ukraine/108309?download=true>.

³ See <http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1556-18/page2>.

⁴ See in particular: <http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1556-18/page2>.

In 2016 the pilot independent assessment for students willing to enroll in Master programs was organized by the USAID Fair Justice Project, the OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine and the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine. The assessment used the examination techniques previously tested during entrance exams for Bachelor programs and consisted of two exams: ‘Law’ and ‘English language’. 9 leading Ukrainian law schools participated in the assessment so that in future it may be held on a regular basis.

There is currently neither a guaranteed standard for legal education, nor a legal profession qualifications framework. The content of legal education offered is guided, to a large extent, by the draft standard for legal education developed in 2004, and is stipulated in a curriculum - a higher education institution's regulatory document. The system of student assessment in Ukraine is being transferred under the European standards – from a five-grade scale to the European 100-grade scale (ECTS) (though sometimes law schools combine elements of both systems). The new Law “On Higher Education” requires that higher educational institutions apply internal quality assurance. This requires the establishment of principles and procedures, monitoring and review of training programs, evaluation of students and faculty members, training for faculty members, publicity, and combating plagiarism (Art. 16). However, most law schools lack their own system of internal quality assurance.

Overall, the following problems have been identified in legal education in Ukraine: absence of unified standards, unnecessary disciplines in curriculum, insufficient practical basis of education, need in highly qualified teaching staff, lack of orientation towards foreign best practices, use of old techniques as a doctrinal basis, insufficient number of teachers knowing foreign languages, need in new ways to present information, excessive quantity of higher educational institutions for lawyers and need to improve the assessment process of students and graduates⁵.

⁵ Bila knyha z reformuvannia ukrayinskoyi yurydychnoyi osvity / Edited by: Roman Melnik, Olena Shabliy, Bernhard Shloer. - Kyiv, 2015. - p. 18-36 (available at: http://zdr.knu.ua/images/2015/2015-06/26/Bila_knyga.pdf).

IV. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE LAW SCHOOL

Element 1: Policy for Internal Quality Assurance.

Element 1. Notable Survey Findings (beginning).

In November 2016 the Centre of Quality Assurance of Higher Education of the National University 'Odessa Law Academy' internally surveyed key stakeholder groups, except administrators, in accordance with the Methodology for Independent On-site Legal Education Quality Assessment based on 2005 Standards and Guidelines for European Higher Education Area. The lone fact of the internally conducted survey should be appreciated as it demonstrates the law school's aspiration to assure quality of legal education. The key differences between the internal surveys carried out in 2016 and the present survey are, firstly, related to the questions themselves, as in the present survey the extended list of questions was prepared according to the updated Methodology based on 2015 new Standards and Guidelines, and, secondly, to the number of respondents. During the internal assessment 352 students, 9 graduates, 21 teachers and 15 employers were surveyed, while in this survey the numbers of respondents are as follows: 65 students, 11 graduates, 16 teachers, 8 administrators and 2 employers. As evident from the numbers of surveyed people, the numbers of graduates and teachers do not differ considerably, but there are far more internally surveyed students (352 to 65) and employers (15 to 2). For some reason many students and employers in the present assessment who were invited to go through the surveys have not done it. The notable survey findings presented in this report mostly reflect the results of the present external assessment, with some data shown in comparison with the internal assessment surveys.

While the majority of students either agree, or strongly agree, 47.7% and 35.4% respectively (36.4% and 36.4% for graduates), that the law school values quality legal education, their answers are less positive to more specific questions within this element. More than 18% disagreed, with 6.2% who have strongly disagreed, to never being discriminated against on any ground by administrators, faculty, support staff and law school community members. Similarly, 18.5% do not agree that there are opportunities to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education. In case of graduates the responses are mostly neutral for that statement (54.5%). From teachers and administration the responses are more positive, which might be partly explained by the self-serving nature of questions.

Element 1. Notable Survey Findings (continuing).

Although in general most students shift to giving positive feedback on the availability of strategy, policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education (more than 60% of administration's responses here are 'strongly agree'), and the monitoring of the quality, there is a high percentage of students who show neutral feeling in this regard, namely more than 30% (more than 36% in case of graduates). A slightly lower number of respondents answer neutrally on whether there is respect of academic integrity and freedom (29.7%), and a considerably higher number of students (41.6%) are neutral on whether there is an effectively implemented Code of Conduct/Honor Code. Many teachers (40%) also responded neutrally to the statement on whether there is a relevant Code, while 25% of administration's answers are negative. The reason for neutral answers in the latter case may be linked to students' unawareness about relevant documents and procedures, as well as to the issues with their implementation and practicability. The graduates' responses are more critical to the mentioned statements, as, for instance, 36.4% strongly disagree the law school respected academic integrity and freedom. Among teachers positive feedback prevails in this regard, but still 13.3% strongly disagree to the statement about the respect of academic integrity and freedom.

1.1. Institution has clear policies and associated procedures, structures and processes for the assurance of quality.

Key Findings:

In general, the University has rather developed policies for the assurance of quality of higher education it provides. These policies and procedures are set in the number of its internal regulations: University Statute, 5-year Strategic Plan, Regulation on the Organization of Educational Process, some ethics regulations and documents which outline the functioning of the two quality assurance structures: Division on Quality Legal Testing (Psychometrics Division) and Centre for Higher Education Quality.

Noteworthy is the fact that University has also recently established the single coordinating Center for Organization of Educational Work, Informational and Analytical Support, which brought together and harmonized the functions of the five already existing departments (Analytical Division, Teaching Methodologies Division, Information and Coordination Division, Public Relation Relations and Preparatory Division) and two newly established divisions: Division on Quality Legal Testing (Psychometrics Division) and Centre for the Higher Education Quality. All but the latter two have their own staff. At the same time, the complicated University structure hampers the mobility of quality assessment processes, bears inconsistencies between stipulated criteria and reality - especially regarding curriculum review, teaching methods and student-centered learning policy.

During the on-site visit to the University, experts were told by School of Advocacy representatives that there existed an obstacle to send budget students for the annual curriculum practice to the private legal sector because of Ukrainian legislation. In the process of this Report development we saw a TV program, where the School's of Advocacy Dean Mr. M. Stoianov has announced that the Ukrainian Bar Association and NUOLA have signed the Memorandum and this allows the sending of all students for the practice at the bar offices. This definitely demonstrates the desire and factual steps taken by the University and School of Advocacy in order to improve the quality of education, in particular – to promote higher level of practical legal skills for the students. Besides, this also shows a positive tendency of the University and the Faculty to popularize the institution and attract prospective students. Thus, we consider it as a very good example to follow.

Two new structures were established by the University recently: Division on Quality Legal Testing (Psychometrics Division) and Centre for the Higher Education Quality. However, these subdivisions do not have permanent staff and their functions are supposed to be performed by teachers at the time which is free from their primary jobs.

There is a legal clinic in the structure of the University, which was established in 1998. Students are selected by filling in the form. People who apply for legal aid have to arrange a meeting with a consultant. The legal clinic is now trying to have more effective data collection and information processing by introducing digital registration (Google form) and a database of legal clinic cases. It also looks like the clinic is providing a profound amount of legal consultation (considering the amount of registered applications), however, little attention is paid to legal clinic student training – in particular on the subject of client interviewing and consultation and other lawyering skills. In addition, an important part of legal clinical education, Street Law is missing. No credits are given to students who work for legal clinic, except for those who are performing their annual curriculum practice on the basis of LC. PhD students are obliged to perform practice in legal clinic during their studying. There is no separate teaching course on legal clinics or legal consultation.

Recommendations:

University structure should be transparent and coherent. There should be clear distinction of powers and duties between different structural elements of the University in order to avoid duplication (e.x.: functions of the Center for Organization of Educational Work, Informational and Analytical Support and functions of separate University chairs or their employees etc).

Distinct (full-time) staff should be appointed for the Division on Quality Legal Testing and Centre for Higher Education Quality to make them function. The University should also ensure that these structures possess particular independence, adequate tasks-related powers and real possibility to perform these powers.

Students who work as legal clinic consultants should be given appropriate credits and a special course on legal clinics and legal consultation should be introduced for students. In addition, it might be useful for the clinic to develop the component of Street Law in its program.

1.2. Institution has a culture that recognizes the importance of quality, and quality assurance in education and this quality strongly depends upon individual staff members' and students' responsibility for it.

Key Findings:

According to the University Statute and other internal regulations – the Academic Council and the President are assigned with major competences of shaping and approving the University internal policy. Faculties, Institutes and other University divisions and subdivisions are represented at the Academic Council. However, the decision-taking process seems to be too centralized and faculties may barely influence and operate effectively their internal affairs. Teaching staff members have a very vague understanding of how the University is being operated and of the decision-taking process.

It is remarkable that the University pays significant attention to the issue of professional ethics – both, of teaching staff and students. At the same time, our monitoring shows that the Committee on Ethics has not reported even once since its establishment in 2015, even though it is required to report every three months according to the University's internal regulation.

Students self-government is represented in three key areas: students' trade union which mostly covers cultural and social aspects of students being; students' academic community – set to involve students into scientific and academic research; and students' council – mechanism of actual students self-government which acts through students councils and is supposed to involve students into the decision-taking process and - thus – contribute to education quality assurance in particular. While the first two elements are actively developed and popular, we could see that students' self-government is lacking efficiency and coordination. For instance, students at the School of Advocacy are poorly aware of their School Students Council activity and powers. There were also not many graduates who communicated with student's self-government during their education.

Recommendations:

Faculties and institutes should be given more powers to deal with their internal affairs by amending properly the University Charter. To do this special Statute changes may be incorporated. Faculty councils may be empowered with the rights to approve educational programmes, topics of research, decide issues regarding methodology of teaching, organisational and tutoring issues. Establishing faculty councils will ensure access for every teaching staff member in taking an active role in the overall process of education quality assurance.

Professional ethics along with the issue of human rights are key values for higher legal education. More control and attention should be given to functioning of the existing University mechanisms – in particular - the Committee on Ethics. To make it effective, this body and a person in charge of it shall be quite independent and have immunities from control by the University administration.

Respect for human dignity and rights shall be an integral part of any University internal policies and curriculum for law students, without regard to specialization.

The University shall encourage students to take a more active part in students self-government. There shall be comprehensive and mutual understanding of the scope of students' self-governmental bodies' competences and procedures associated with them. These competences and mechanisms for their exhausting should be clearly communicated to every student.

1.3. Institution has a formal and publicly available strategy, policy and procedures for the continuous enhancement of quality, including a role for students and other (external) stakeholders.

Key Findings:

The University has a 5-year Strategic Plan where the strategic goals, objectives and indicators of progression are defined. These indicators include "implementing an effective system of education quality assessment". However, this plan barely shows the clear framework of quality enhancement, as well as participation of students and other, including external, stakeholders.

Students and teaching staff are not given the possibility to anonymously assess the quality of teaching/administration and other components of University life on a systematic basis. Some surveys are conducted from time to time, but there are no procedures on how to process the collected data and take further steps for quality enhancement.

There are sporadic attempts at the University and Faculties levels to organize annual meetings of graduates. Neither University, nor the School of Advocacy has sufficient consolidated data about graduates' employment, spheres of their legal or other practice. Alumni society is not really developed. Discussions with the School of Advocacy graduates show an interest among former students to be attached to University life and the educational process. However, based on the information received from the University since 2016-2017 the counting of graduates has been performed again according to the Order of the University Rector.

Recommendations:

Under the Strategic Plan there should be a practical and specific operative plan with consequent steps, deadlines, responsible persons and controls to implement the strategy.

Students' society should be more actively involved in the process of education quality assessment: alike the procedures of this external monitoring - students shall be proposed on regular and systematic bases to pass anonymous surveys about the quality of teaching and assessment methods, curriculum and schedules, facilities and support etc.

The University shall provide students with the real possibility of sounding out their opinions on how the quality of education may be enhanced and these opinions shall be considered. It is important that students are well aware of these processes.

More attention should be given to establishing an active alumni society. An Alumni association may be involved in various spheres: membership in different committees on appointment of students' special scholarships and awards; network and contacts to set effective platforms for current students practices; pool of trainers and invited experts in some specific legal areas, etc.

Element 2. Design and Approval of Programs:

Element 2. Notable Survey Findings.

While students mostly agree to the fact that programs have explicit intended learning outcomes, many of them give neutral feedback (38.1%). More than 45% of graduates agree to this statement, but many (36.4%) also disagree. Teachers overwhelmingly give positive feedback.

As to whether there is sufficient involvement of students and other stakeholders in the design of programs/courses one may notice a high percent of disagreement (21.9%) among students, which is a signal to involve external stakeholders more actively. Some teachers also disagreed to this statement (26.7%). There is also a number of students who disagreed to the statement on the well-structured placement opportunities in law school programs/courses (20.3%), with a few teachers (13.3%) and administration's representatives (25%) showing dissatisfaction. From the side of graduates there is in both instances a high level of disagreement exceeding 45%. This is one of the rare cases when all groups of respondents equally disagree on a certain point, and consequently a reason to tackle this issue.

2.1 Institutions should have processes for the design and approval of their programs.

Key Findings:

The faculty has mechanisms for the approval, review and monitoring of programs. This review process is quite complicated and is inherent in the unique nature of the governance structure of the University and the faculty. The process involves individual professors, departments, the Faculty of Advocacy, Deans, Vice Rectors and the University Scientific Counsel. Student involvement in the process is limited.

Recommendations:

Students should be more involved in the process of amending the curriculum and providing more feedback on class development. This should happen at the Chair and Faculty level and should be consistent with greater involvement of faculty members on these levels as indicated in Element 5.

2.2 Institutions should design their programs according to the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes, and expected student workload.

Key Findings:

Course contents and teaching materials are established in response to a prepared taxonomy or list of knowledge for each general subject and this list is subject to periodic review. The ability for professors to vary from this taxonomy is limited.

While the taxonomy of classes in terms of legal substantive knowledge has been clearly delineated, there has been little thought to the skills components that are a necessary part of the learning process. As a result skills are not systematically incorporated into the curriculum and examination process. There are limited dedicated skills based courses and skills development is not a significant factor in course design or implementation. For instance, due to the form of examination (oral exams) testing often fails to test abilities necessary for legal writing and other skills. In fact legal skills components are not graded nor credited to the students in the curriculum.

Recommendations:

Flexibility should be inherent in the process of curriculum development especially in terms of developing the knowledge required for each subject area in light of frequent changes in the law.

As a key part of the requirements of the program in the Faculty of Advocacy legal skills should be a mandatory component. Legal skills including oral and written advocacy skills, legal reasoning and analysis, negotiation, client interviewing and counseling skills and a understanding of court process. This requirement is particularly important to the mission of the department.

Legal skills should be incorporated into classes and identified as a key aspect of the curriculum. As a key aspect of this inclusion students should be graded and receive credit on activities involving development of legal skills. This includes appropriate credit for work in the legal clinic and other experiential learning.

2.3 Institution shall clearly specify and communicate the qualification resulting from the program and ensure the reference of such qualification to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area

Key Findings:

The Quality Testing Department and the Center of Educational Work are newly established institutions within the University but have begun their work in their respective areas. They have a good potential to assist the University and the individual faculties in their respective areas of responsibilities.

Recommendations:

The role of the Center for Educational Work and the Quality Testing Department should continue to be developed especially in relation to their work with the individual faculties and the expertise they can bring in their respective areas. As much as feasibly possible the process of curriculum development should be clarified and streamlined in relation to these new institutions.

2.4 Institution should incorporate throughout its curriculum the societal values in ethics and human rights.

Key Findings:

Legal Ethics and Human Rights are not systematically incorporated into the curriculum in a comprehensive way, although recent additions to the curriculum have attempted to address human rights issues.

Recommendation:

The curriculum and individual class syllabi should be reviewed to see where elements of legal ethics and human rights can be included. This should be done in a comprehensive way with recognition of what elements of ethics and human rights knowledge students should have on graduation.

2.5 Institution should provide diverse and meaningful individual course electives for students to self-select that constitute or exceed the required minimum of 25% of electives.

Key Findings:

Students do not have an effective choice of electives for a minimum of 25% of their courses. Students are given a choice of ‘specializations’, after which all of the courses of the specialization are required, as stipulated in paragraph 6.1 of the Regulation on the Organization of Educational Process. Although the University has a system of specializations it is not truly elective, because a fully elective system provides that a course is elective by itself, rather than in combination with other courses. It provides students the opportunity to choose individual courses in a multi-disciplinary fashion, without being bound to a specialization.

While the possibility exists for students to take classes in different departments of the University, the system that exists makes it extremely difficult for students to do so. First, students generally are not allowed to treat these classes as electives and secondly there are substantial scheduling difficulties.

Recommendation:

The system of selection of ‘specializations’ in the faculty should be changed to allow students a substantial opportunity to choose individual classes as electives. The University should look into how to make it easier for students to choose elective courses from other departments and receive full credit within their only faculty.

Element 3: Student-centered learning, teaching and assessment.

Element 3. Notable Survey Findings.

The 2015 European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area have introduced this new element thus shifting the focus to students as the key beneficiaries of education. That is why the number of questions in surveys assessing indicators referring to this particular element is rather high.

According to students' and graduates' perceptions the law school has reached a high level in respecting and attending to the diversity of students, their cultural and personal needs (38.5% agree and 27.7% of students strongly agree, with similar numbers from the alumni), but flexibility in learning is lacking as 21.9% disagree that flexible learning paths are enabled, with 34.4% of neutral answers here from students. More than 45% of graduates in general agree or strongly agree about flexibility, but similarly neutrality is characteristic here (36.4%). Several negative responses were also received from faculty in regard to flexible learning paths (20%). Still more than three fourths of students find education interesting and intellectually stimulating (45.3% of 'agree' and 37.5% of 'strongly agree' answers), and more than two thirds agree that mutual respect in the learner-teacher relationships is in place (46.9% of 'agree' and 21.9% of 'strongly agree' answers). The same two thirds go for the thought-provoking discussions during seminars (72.2% of overall positive students' feedback). Graduates also mostly share positive feedback on these issues, but more modest as compared to students.

Overall, more than one third of surveyed students is satisfied with the feedback they receive, on how detailed, quick and clear it is (out of graduates more than 70% agreed the feedback was detailed enough). However, there are also increased numbers of neutral reactions from students to statements on detailed feedback and its speed, 36.8% and 43.1%, respectively, and a noticeable percentage of those for whom the feedback was not clear enough (18.5% of 'disagree' answers on the issue).

One fourth of students expressed clear dissatisfaction on the opportunity to appeal against the evaluation results, which seem to be incorrect or unfair (7.8% of 'strongly disagree' and 20.3% of 'disagree' answers). Several negative responses were also received from teachers (13.3%). Similarly, there is an issue with the availability of established complaints' procedures for students, as around one fourth of students react negatively (6.3% in strong disagreement and 18.8% in disagreement), with 42.2% of neutral responses to the statement. 36.4% even strongly disagree that appropriate complaints' procedures were in place. Even if assumed a formal procedure to deal with students' complaints is in place, there is still a need to make it more publicly accessible and have more people informed about it.

Element 3: Student-Centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment

3.1 Institution develops and delivers its programs and assessment in a way that encourages students to actively participate in the learning process.

Key Findings:

Meetings with teachers and students clearly showed an enthusiasm for both for teaching and learning, with positive comments from all interviewed. We observed a positive academic environment but one that is still constrained by a teacher dependent methodologies and highly dependent on the oral exam process.

Missing was evidence of the use of critical thinking exercises, including special written assignments for students and case analysis, student centered learning opportunities, student engagement in practical based skills and variable teaching methods within a course. Student critical thinking also includes the use of hypotheticals in class using a socratic method to force thinking about a subject but not with a memorized response. In written exams the professor can use fact based questions that do not have an easy answer and cannot be looked up in a book, but by applying the laws and material learned, the student has to think through what could be an answer to the question posed.

The workload for the teachers does not seem to allow the needed time for creative teacher development. Limited funding for multi-cultural and international exchanges, which would promote innovative teaching and assessments, is too low to create the critical mass necessary for self-sustaining internal innovation and improvements.

Based on the administrative flow chart and the hydra of legal departments care should be taken to a bureaucratic process that may stifle the innovation needed to promote better student active participation in the learning process.

The administration expressed the conviction that the current single legal clinic is sufficient, while students indicated that they desired practical focused education. It is true in all schools that students do not all want a legal aid experience. However, there are many other models, Clinics, Practicums, work assignments in a specific class, and simulation models that can be incorporated into the curriculum and courses without the intensive structure of the legal aid clinic. Examples would be a “small business clinic” to assist with small business and the many legal forms to be understood and submitted. Likewise, an Entrepreneur class with a workshop component for students to assist persons wanting to start a new business. There are many subjects where a practical component can be added in the course without the need for a full program like a legal

clinic.

We witnessed one courtroom class that uses criminal law for debates and students performing different roles of the profession. There is also programs that encourage upper level oral arguments. These programs would benefit from student participation in courses and competitions that also focus on non-oral communication skills and legal brief writing. A comment heard in several difference settings was that students and new graduates seldom know how to write well.

Recommendations:

Creating of an internal supportive program for encouraging active student participation in the learning process can start without increasing domestic and international exchange opportunities but will constantly struggle without the benefit of new ideas and concepts.

The demonstrated openness and creativeness of the NUOLA leadership supports the possibility for creation of an Institute for Creative Legal Education, focused on developing innovative teaching and active student participation in the learning process. An Institute for Creative Learning should start for the first year or two as a faculty division. NUOLA faculty who wish to participate would meet regularly to discuss, and think-through and agree on creative teaching methodologies and courses, which would then be demonstrated to the full faculty. It would explore what is being done at law schools around the world and how that would interface with Ukrainian legal education. Once it was comfortable with the process and benefits it could become an Institute which adds workshops for other law faculties from around Ukraine and promotes publication of its work. An Institute like this would put teaching at NUOLA on the cutting edge of the evolution in teaching that technology and the internet's access to ideas are creating and position NUOLA as a leader in Creative / Innovative teaching for Ukraine.

NUOLA administration expressed a desire to become a regional leader in legal education that can compete nationally with any law faculty in Ukraine and an Institute on Creative Legal Education could become an important vehicle to achieve that goal.

A less top down approach should be considered and more collaborative approaches including student participation through student council or teaching feedback group should be encouraged at the department level. The more collaborative the process among faculty and students, the more innovative and successful the results will be for NUOLA.

NUOLA could expand its legal clinical offerings (areas might be family law, criminal law, housing and social rights, and even one for small business legal assistance) or more student assigned work through the practicum model (hybrid between class academics and practical skills training) can expand upon existing classroom subjects.

Promoting students in classes to engage in written legal grade work product would address the lack of writing concern and promote student active participation in the learning process. Using concepts of student centered learning, students could be given more independent study opportunities that promote their critical thinking and support innovative course development by allowing students to propose research topics for approval.

3.2 Students are taught and trained in a way that responds the demands of professional legal ethics.

Key Findings:

NUOLA has an ethical course but there was not a method of integrating relevant ethical/integrity lessons into each subject matter.

It was noted that constant amendments to law makes practical teaching very difficult unless immersed in the practical day to day of that area of law.

A number of teachers are adjuncts from the practicing bar but it was unclear how much freedom and encouragement they have to develop course materials and teaching methodologies that would train in practical skill and thinking.

Recommendations:

While ethics is a stand-alone subject, its practical application in the legal profession requires students' introduction to real-life and on-going attorney and client ethical dilemmas. The best way to do this in by integration of the common and relevant ethical issues as they apply within a subject matter.

Adjunct teachers from the practicing bar bring in practical experience. They will benefit from course design freedom and encouragement to develop course materials and teaching methodologies that would train in practical skill and thinking.

Legal academic Professors can have some classes co-taught with practicing alumni for the specific purpose of introduction and discussion of relevant ethical materials.

3.3 Institution respects and attends to the diversity of students and their needs, by enabling flexible and varied pedagogical methods, balancing between the autonomy in the learner and adequate guidance support from the teacher and promoting mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship, including paper topic selections.

Key Findings:

We observed mostly top down and directed learning.

Student assessment is still rooted in the older traditional system of oral exams. Some professors expressed a belief that that it is the only way to actively explore knowledge as some students may not express an issue well, and only with additional questioning can the professor gauge the value difference between a poor expression but actual knowledge verses poor expression due to weak knowledge. Likewise, commonly expressed was the view that oral presentation is an essential lawyering skill and students must be well trained in that skill.

Recommendations:

NUOLA current well-developed academic teaching will benefit from a balanced focus on student-centered and student directed learning with research assignments that require analysis of facts, laws and statutes to arrive at a legal conclusion or opinion. An important development for the school and its regional goals would be focusing more learning on critical thinking, with refinement of practical and analytical legal logic abilities. Student critical thinking also includes the use of hypotheticals in class using a socratic method to force thinking about a subject but not with a memorized response. In written exams the professor can use fact based questions that do not have an easy answer and cannot be looked up in a book, but by applying the laws and material learned, the student has to think through what could be an answer to the question posed.

While flexibility to explore depth of knowledge and oral advocacy skills are both considerations in support of oral exams, they are not exclusive to the testing and skills necessary in legal education. Diversity in assessment is more essential as it includes the above oral skills but also allows for different skills to be tested, an emphasis on multi-level learning and thinking, and the demonstration of different student strengths through diverse assessment methods.

3.4 Institution students are assessed using published criteria, regulations and procedures which are applied consistently and take into account mitigating circumstances.

Key Findings:

As noted above, student assessment is still rooted in the older traditional system of oral exams. The published criteria for oral exams in not complex and professors and students seem to understand the system.

The oral exam process is not anonymous and appears cantered around the exam-delivering teacher. Consistency becomes very individual and therefore very difficult to assess across the department or school. Likewise, accounting for mitigating circumstances seems to be determined by the teacher, which inhibits a consistent application in a school-wide manner.

Examiner access to the grade-book before a grade is given clearly affects the grade determination. “First year the student works for the book, and after that the book works for the student”, was raised several times and highlights the biased, overt and unintentional, which creates an unfair playing field for students who actually improve their knowledge and skills during law school

Students reported that how mitigating circumstances are taken into account is biased toward the “favoured” students getting greater leeway with mitigation.

In a number of student meetings it was very clear students greatly enjoy their courses and professors, and the overall school environment. It genuinely demonstrated that students felt valued and individually recognized.

An issue of some concern was the continuing use of the student “monitor” system. As understood, one or two students who are considered “reliable” are designated as the class “monitor.” The teacher gives instructions to the monitor who is responsible for getting the instructions to the rest of the students in the class. This places one or two students in the class in a favoured position with the teacher, who will also be giving the non-anonymous oral exam. Students openly said it can result in “help” and when pressed, said that if they are doing poorly on the exam, the professor can be “helpful” to the monitor so they can get a better grade.

Recommendations:

Complete standardization of any exam format is not possible but diverse student assessment, some done through blind grading would allow for better assessment integrity.

Anonymous examination corrects a fundamental flaw inherent in oral exams that knowledge of the student’s identity and external issues or opinions can affect the oral assessment process and grade.

There is no interference with the issue of feedback between students and teachers when the assessment is anonymous. Firstly, all the assessment criteria should be well explained beforehand as described in issue 4.1. Secondly, anonymous assessment should be built in a way, that each student has his or her coded indicator (letter, number, etc.). So, later there won’t be a problem to define the student in order to provide feedback.

Practical oral communication skills are one important skill for the job of an attorney, however there are other important skills such as critical thinking, application of facts to the law, and written communication that should be tested as part of the educational process. Restricting most exams to one method precludes an in-depth examination of these important skills.

Mitigation bias is often unintentional but inherent, bias can be reduced if a neutral and consistent process for presenting and weighing mitigation was established by the NOULA.

While one can see the historical reasons for the student “monitor” system, in today’s academic environment with group e-mail, group texting, and other group based on-line messaging, the monitor system seems outdated and unnecessarily promotes a system of favouritism, unfairly affecting grades and class performance. Abolishing the monitor system and using common text messaging systems would promote a greater sense of equal treatment based on course academic performance.

3.5 Students have possibility to anonymously evaluate the courses and teachers, on a regular and systematic basis.

Key Findings:

NUOLA uses a random method of course and teacher evaluation that has been helpful when applied and in specific circumstances but anonymous evaluations are not done on a regular and systematic basis. The current evaluation system seems helpful and well used with newer teachers to assess teaching performance and on a case by case basis and should not be discarded but they are inadequate as a systematic evaluation method.

Recommendations:

Students should have the possibility to anonymously evaluate the courses and teachers, on a regular and systematic basis, as it is extremely helpful to teachers continually seeking teaching improvement, provides a regular and standardized method for students to participate in course development and teacher improvement. Most law schools use a standardized method, either on-line or on paper, that is applied to every class and every teacher, regardless of length of tenure. It has proven to be respectfully used by the students and its strengths and weaknesses are well understood by each teacher. Some individual evaluations are discarded as not helpful but the majority do a good job at assisting a teacher in understanding what they are doing well and where there can be some improvement. Many samples are available for faculty consideration.

3.6 Institution secures appropriate and formal procedures to deal with students’ complaints and appeals.

Key Findings:

From our meetings with administration, faculty and students, it appeared that there was an informal system for students’ complaints and appeals. When used there seemed to be satisfaction that complaints were addressed in most cases. Appeals on grading issues seemed more complex

and less encouraging to the students. The non-anonymous oral exam process heightens the current and future risk to the appealing students, so most seem to dismiss the possibility of a successful appeal or an appeal process that will not have later consequences in a different course.

Recommendations:

Appeals on improper student, staff or faculty conduct should center on the respect for privacy while at the same time demonstrating transparency to promote trust in the process. A number of schools have well established guidelines and procedures for these types of complaints.

Appeals on a grade are much more difficult. Many school view academic freedom as not permitting an appeal on a substantive grade without some evidence of an objective error (as in adding up points) or some evidence of an outside influence such as bias or personal retribution (as in retaliation for rebuffed sexual advances). NUOLA will benefit from establishing an inclusive committee (faculty, staff, administration, students and alumni) to discuss these difficult matters and determine what process and standards are best for the entire school community.

3.7 Institution recognizes the important role of the students in developing and operating a comprehensive University code of conduct.

Key Findings:

Conversations with NUOLA faculty, administration, staff and students indicate that the importance of a code of conduct is recognized but with diverse interpretation over just what that means in practice. Recently selected NUOLA faculty and students participated in a workshop in Kyiv where one of the outcome proposals was to recommend that Ukrainian Law Schools consider the possibility of implementing the Honor System, or similar mechanism, that was introduced by Washington & Lee University School of Law (USA), at the workshop.

Recommendations:

NUOLA should capitalize on the willingness among faculty, administration and students to discuss, draft, adopt and implement a community comprehensive code of conduct or honor system. Experiences have demonstrated that a top down written and implemented code of conduct has little relevance or ownership among most student bodies. A comprehensive code, recognizing that integrity and ethical conduct are universal in the law school community with each group having an active role in enforcing and honoring the code is the most successful and sustainable method.

Element 4: Student admission, progression, recognition and certification.

Element 4. Notable Survey Findings.

The absolute majority of students, graduates and faculty agree that the law school has all the necessary regulations on students' admission, progression, recognition and certification, and that the policies, admission processes and criteria are implemented consistently and transparently. At the same time more than one fourth of students do not find assessment arrangements and marking fair (6.2% of 'strongly disagree' responses and 23.1% of 'disagree responses'), with 40% being neutral in this regard. In the self-assessment students evaluated this statement more positively, namely 4.2% strongly disagreed, 11.1% disagreed and 27,6% were neutral, although still the answers to this statement are not marked by extremely positive student' reactions. One employer also strongly disagreed to the fairness of assessment arrangements. Nevertheless, faculty give a very high grade (60% strongly agree) to the admission process.

4.1. Institution students are admitted, progressed, recognized and certified via a transparent, fair, and meritocratic process.

Key findings:

For the most part the principles and conditions of students' admission, progression, recognition and certification are laid down at the level of national legislation. Thus, the University system concerning these aspects of higher education quality assurance is set up in a rather traditional way. At the same time, while the entrance admission process is held independent from the University based on the results of external national independent exam, all the following and current admission procedures are a matter of the institution's internal policy, so these processes may be managed effectively by the University.

There is no sufficient clarity as to what the procedures of admission to various courses are. During the on-site visit we have found out that students have to fulfill testing in foreign language in order to be admitted to attending courses which are taught in foreign languages, however – we have not discovered what document outlines the procedure or where information concerning this is published.

In the process of monitoring no reference to Lisbon Qualification Convention, which entered into force in Ukraine in 2000, was discovered. It remains pretty unclear of how the qualifications for the students are determined, what taxonomy composition is taken to shape the curriculum for a particular qualification etc.

Recommendations:

The University should take care of providing transparent and meritocratic procedures of students admission and progression at various levels of studying. Each program or course needs to have clear and well-explained criteria of admission, if relevant. But what is even more important - these should include a description of the students progress in this particular program or course - i.e. pre-defined and reasonable grading system, assignments types illustrations etc. These procedures must be communicated directly and fairly to students beforehand, so that a student knows exactly what he or she is expected to do, to know and to demonstrate when being assessed in order to enter and complete particular course or program. Such requirements and criteria should be developed based on the purpose and goals of the discipline and strongly correspond to them.

Where possible, the University should define and consolidate reasonable criteria for students progression, recognition and certification, considering the provisions of the Lisbon Recognition Convention and explanatory documents related to it.

4.2. Institution puts in place both processes and tools to collect, monitor and act on information on student progression.

Key findings:

The University does processes tools to collect, monitor and act on information on student progression: a student has to complete his or her annual curriculum by gaining ‘pass’ for some disciplines, and examination for others. If a student fails an examination (i.e. – gaining “2” according to NUOLA grading system or “FX” according to European standards) – there is a possibility to re-pass the exam with the same individual course teacher; in a case of the repeated failure there will be a commission appointed to examine a student and if, again, the student fails he or she will be excluded from the University. Except during the final year of the bachelor program, students have the possibility to re-pass some courses in order to gain excellent degree diploma. Basically these provisions are prescribed by national legislation. However, if the student wants to improve the grade (for example, from B to C, or from E to D) – there is no procedure or possibility given.

Recommendations:

Consider, if possible, the procedure of re-taking exams, or just as a part of ordinary procedure to have few trials to take an exam, in order for a student who wants to get a better grade, not just ‘fail’ or ‘pass’. This might be pretty easy if the testing is digitized (e.g., through Moodle or EduBrite) and checked automatically.

4.3. Institution employs multiple types of testing methods, valid, reliable and fair.

Key findings:

A clear majority of the exams at the University and Faculty of Advocacy are oral exams. Disciplines which end in modules are assessed by written testing or the overall grade is put automatically if the student has performed successfully during the course study. On the other hand, interviews with the students, who have passed written testing to be admitted to the Master program, show that this admission method is preferable. In particular, students named impartiality, time and possibility to

better concentrate on the questions as benefits of written testing in comparison to the oral form of examination and admission.

The oral exam brings few significant risks: such exams are too time-demanding; they also have the risk of subjectivity and prejudice in assessment. Classical oral exams, which are mainly built through the theoretical questions, are rather limited in testing student ability to apply legal analysis and problem solving. So, applying oral exams exclusively may lead to ineffective and unfair assessment of students.

Recommendation:

When designing the assessment (evaluation) form – either for particular course, or any other assessment or monitoring – one should consider and identify the purpose of such testing first and then choose the method which best fits to achieve it. A combination of various testing methods shall be introduced.

4.4. Institution assesses and awards credit for practical legal education.

Key findings:

In general the University, as well as the School of Advocacy encourage students to participate in various students (experiential learning) activities, including law students competitions like moot courts, debates etc. Such active students may possibly gain respect and some tolerance from the administration and teachers, but they do not receive any academic credits for their efforts.

Participation in professional legal events (experiential learning) greatly improves students' knowledge of law and number of personal soft skills, like self-presentation, oral speech, structuring, logic, and analytical thinking, etc.

Recommendations:

Participation in professional legal events (experiential learning) is an important and adequate indicator for student progression and because of this should be encouraged by the university and awarded with academic credits, for example – as an alternative to writing course academic papers.

Students should be given a choice – either to conduct scientific research and defend a paper, or – for example – to take part in law students competition and, in a case of good performance – be awarded within the same grade rate as for an academic paper. For instance: writing a memorial for the Jessup Competition, as well as for many others, is often more complicated and knowledge-worthy than writing an ordinary paper. Moreover, as the whole Competition is in English, such participation brings added value on top of developing knowledge in international law itself.

Awarding credits for experiential education also reinforces the importance of this form of education and recognizes that it is an important part of the curriculum of the Faculty of Advocacy.

Element 5: Teaching Staff

Element 5. Notable Survey Findings.

Most students agree that teachers in the law school are well qualified and competent, but a considerable part of students also gives negative feedback to the statement (18.5%), with the same percentage reacting neutrally. Similar number of disagreements was noted in case with graduates (18.2%) for this statement. In the self-assessment survey there was a little less negative feedback from students to this statement (3.4% strongly disagree, 11.4% disagree and 21.9% are neutral), while the answers of employers were equally divided into all five response grouping.

Students react less critically to the statement on whether teachers are well organized and regularly prepared for classes (9.2% disagreed), with more than two thirds of aggregate positive answers. All surveyed employers also supported this statement. Additionally, many students referred to teachers as to the strengths of the law school.

Obviously, there is an issue with the evaluation of teachers' performances by students, because total negative feedback to this statement exceeds 45%, with more than 30% of students being neutral. The total number of disagreed and strongly disagreed graduates here exceeds 70%. Some teachers (20%) and administration representatives (25%) also show dissatisfaction in this regard. Similarly, in the self-assessment survey 8% of students strongly disagreed to the statement, 19.6% disagreed and 25.9% were neutral. Therefore, the introduction of evaluation mechanisms may be regarded as one of priority directions to assure quality of legal education.

Students' answers to other questions on teaching staff activity in general are positive, namely the majority of students agree they are able to contact teachers when they need to, that teachers use a variety of teaching methodologies, apply problem-based teaching methods and sufficiently engage students in practice-oriented and skills-based learning, adequately explain key concepts, and are enthusiastic about the subject. Teachers overwhelmingly strongly agree (66.7%) they are enthusiastic about their subjects. However, for some statements positive feedback was coupled by a substantial percentage of negative students' responses, for instance, 18.5% disagreed that the teaching methods are problem-based, learning is practice-oriented and skills-based (45.5% of the alumni and 25% of administration disagreed here), and 15.4% disagreed about the variety of teaching methodologies. This is further evidenced by statements from students alleging the excessive focus on theory, as opposed to practice, by some lecturers (in the section about the law school weaknesses). In addition, according to the self-assessment results 12.5% of students disagreed that teachers are enthusiastic about the subject they are teaching.

5.1. Institution recognizes its primary responsibility for its staff and provides opportunities for professional development of the teaching staff.

Key Findings:

Overall the University recognizes the importance of faculty and encourages their professional development. Faculty members are qualified in the areas of substantive knowledge of the law, and many faculty have practical legal experience.

5.2. Institution sets up and follows clear, transparent and fair processes for staff recruitment.

Key Findings:

There were no major issues or problems identified involving staff recruitment and hiring.

5.3. Institution encourages scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research and innovation in teaching methods and the use of new technologies.

Key Findings:

Scholarship is an important activity in the University and Faculty system and is actively incorporated in the University. There could be greater focus on innovation in teaching methods and technologies. See 5.4.

5.4. Institution promotes teaching excellence and variety of interactive teaching.

Key Findings:

There has been some effort to identify and promote interactive teaching methodologies although this has been uneven. Classes observed by the team were of varying quality when it comes to the use of interactive teaching methods. Often the mere use of visual aids is credited with being interactive teaching. Many classes continue to use traditional, non-interactive lecture methods without substantial engagement by the students.

Most classrooms do not yet have modern teaching equipment. This limits the ability of faculty to use PowerPoint and Internet resources while teaching.

The University and the School of Advocacy actively promote teaching excellence and give importance to the further development of the University and the individual departments.

Recommendations:

The University should develop a program for all faculty on modern interactive teaching methods. This program should include: training in modern interactive teaching methods for all faculty; expectation of the University and the Department that these methods should be used in all

classes; support for faculty in developing these skills; requirement that new faculty undergo appropriate training when hired; and inclusion of teaching method use in faculty evaluation.

As resources become available projectors and computer equipment should be made available in all lecture rooms in the department.

5.5. Institution recognizes and supports international learning and exchange opportunities as an essential component of academic and teaching mobility and development.

Key Findings:

The number of faculty who have participated in International Teaching and Exchange is limited. Faculty knowledge and ability to teach and research in foreign languages is also limited outside certain specialized units of the University.

Recommendations:

Additional opportunities should be made available for International Teaching and Research opportunities for faculty, more language training made available, and faculty should be encouraged to participate in these programs. Where possible additional University resources should be made available to facilitate International experiences for faculty.

5.6. Institution recognizes that faculty involvement in governance is an essential component in meaningful University development.

Key Findings:

Faculty involvement in governance is limited, particularly at the Department level. Most faculty governance is centered around the University Scientific Council. Most faculty are not involved in the Scientific Council and there appears to be little organization or involvement of the faculty at the Department level, although faculty involvement in the level of the Chairs appears to be greater.

Recommendation:

The University and the Faculty should discuss the creation of additional opportunities for faculty to be involved in chair, department and University governance.

Element 6: Curriculum, Learning Resources and Student Support

Element 6. Notable Survey Findings.

Some answers on this element may be marked by the increased students' and graduates' neutrality: 41.5% of students on whether sufficient advice and support with studies is received (54.5% of graduates), and 38.5% of students on whether good advice is available in order to make study choices (36.4% of graduates). These trends do not constitute a clear reason for concern, but more advice and support might be expected from faculty and administration.

There is more positive feedback from students and graduates about the proper informing on the operation of legal clinic and associated opportunities (more than two thirds in aggregate), and whether adequate learning resources are constantly available (more than three fourths in aggregate). This positive feedback is further supported by the indicated strengths of the law school, with material base most often mentioned as an advantage. In addition, students and graduates give an overwhelmingly positive feedback (more than 80% in aggregate) to the statement on the availability of stable access to the internet and other legal databases, while several responses from teachers (26.7%) are negative on this matter. Overall, although the law school seems to have sufficient internet coverage and a special repository with faculty publications, some international paid databases are not accessible (HeinOnline, EBSCO, Springer) or partly accessible (Oxford, Cambridge).

6.1 Institution employs modern and flexible teaching and learning methodologies to ensure effective learning.

Key Findings:

NUOLA use of teaching technologies and their accessibility in multiple classrooms is commendable. Actual teaching methodologies are more limited in scope, still mostly memorizing and oral recitations by students.

Recommendations:

A good starting point for considering what is at the core of modern, flexible teaching and learning methodologies starts with the "Seven Principles of Good Practice in Higher

Education⁶.”

1. Good practice: encourages student-faculty contact.
2. Good practice: encourages cooperation among students.
3. Good practice: encourages active learning.
4. Good practice: gives prompt feedback.
5. Good practice: emphasizes time on task.
6. Good practice: communicates high expectations.
7. Good practice: respects diverse talents and ways of learning.

Perhaps of critical importance building on the comments in Element 3, is NUOLA need to encourage and promote diverse teaching methodologies in teaching practices (not necessarily technology) that respect diverse talents and ways of learning.

While some of this is easier said than done, NUOLA has a strong library and library staff, a talented IT department, strong faculty and very bright students. The pieces are all there for the creation of very innovative, effective learning in each classroom. Thoughtful consideration and implementation of the seven principles is very possible at NUOLA based on the interviews with faculty and students. With encouragement by the administration and a willingness to permit some experimentation, NUOLA can move to more modern and flexible teaching and learning methodologies with a high probability of success resulting in a more dynamic and rewarding educational experience for teachers and students alike.

6.2 Institution curriculum effectively prepares students for legal careers in government, private, or academic work, including soft skills and balance of theory / practice focuses.

Key Findings:

NUOLA has a strong focus on oral exams, which, while important, is only one component of the essential lawyer skills need for a successful entry into a legal career. While there are many lists and division after sub-division of skill categories, we can focus on Listening, Communication (oral and written legal skills), Correspondence with clients and the profession, Negotiation, Time Management, Research, Inquiry, and Critical Thinking.

Our observations and comments from the Bar and Alumni indicate that there is still too much emphasis on theory without practical grounding. The Council of Advocates noted that graduates are lacking in practical skills training, formalities and soft skills such as client interactions and attorney conduct.

It is important to note that these comments are less about shortcomings at NUOLA and more

⁶ The "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education," originally published in the AAHE (American Association of Higher Education) Bulletin (Chickering & Gamson, 1987) and has consistently demonstrated relevance up to the present time.

about the changing nature of the practice of law. While legal theory has not changed much or rapidly, legal practice has and in ways diverse and foreign to legal theory.

Recommendations:

Understanding legal theory is essential but equally essential is how that theory interfaces and instructs the application of laws to society and the effective role of lawyers. The Council of Advocates recommends more practical lessons/workshops, student observation of actual court proceedings with debriefing sessions on good and not so good skills, better training on use of proper forms. We support those recommendations.

Legal education and lawyers have to be better and do more to succeed in this evolving environment. Hard skills such as learning laws, research, oral advocacy, writing advocacy, including proper use of forms are among the hard skills that NUOLA can enhance or incorporate into its existing curriculum and course objectives.

Soft skills are growing in importance. Soft skills include communications, relationship building, and service orientation, are critical skills for the modern attorney to be successful. Electronic discipline is also a growing essential skill. It is surprising what attorneys will put in an email or tweet, which they would never say in person. Legal education should incorporate into its skills training and ethics training the understanding that emails and tweets may be social tools with relaxed rules before becoming a lawyer but once practicing these tools are governed by rules and expectation of professionalism. This is far removed from traditional legal learning but no less a modern problem for the legal profession that legal education can start to address.

6.3 Institution ensures that resources available for the support of student learning are adequate and appropriate and vary from physical resources such as libraries, study facilities and IT infrastructure to human support in the form of tutors, counsellors and other advisers, as well as administrative staff.

Key Findings:

NUOLA has an excellent library. There is good study space with both quiet areas and interactive areas. At some campuses, weather permitting, there was good outdoor space for a school in an urban setting. All the staff we encountered appeared very supportive of students, especially the library staff.

NUOLA does a good job involving local legal community and exposing students to Bar and Judges.

Job wise the school has started a job fair for employers to visit the school and meet students.

Recommendations:

NUOLA has a strong base which can be improved with more collaborative input, such as an Alumni Advisory Board or a Recent Graduate/student mentor program. The job fairs can be expanded, as there was meaningful enthusiasm among the students, alumni and Council of Advocates. NOULA should consider programs of regular on-campus interviews and additional job fairs perhaps focused on special practice areas if the demand is determined. Alumni interviewed expressed a willingness for greater school engagement and represent an untapped resource for school events and job fairs.

6.4 Institution recognizes and supports international learning and exchange opportunities as an essential component of student learning and support.

Key Findings:

International exchanges and learning opportunities are not well budgeted or funded.

There is a dependant expectation that these funds should come from the State.

Recommendations:

Odessa should work toward being a voice for international education, capitalizing on its diverse international history and citizens. NUOLA needs to develop better resources to support faculty/student development, which in turn promotes teaching development and better student engagement, which in turn will attract better students and improve faculty satisfaction. To do this it will need to direct more internal resources to support these activities and perhaps develop alumni donation campaigns, typically seen in Western schools. Understandably, development of this will take some time and effort but it will be essential to create the regional reputation that NUOLA seeks. As NUOLA's reputation increases so will the value of the degree that alumni possess.

Element 7: Information management and administration.

Element 7. Notable Survey Findings

Within this element some statements are devoted to administration matters, which is a legacy of the older version of Methodology, based on 2005 European Standards and Guidelines. In regard to the effective administration of courses most students give positive feedback, with 31.3% of neutral answers, while students' feedback on the timetabling of classes then shifts to highly negative (more than 45% in aggregate) and neutral (26.6%). Timetable is also mentioned by the surveyed students several times as a weakness of the law school. A substantial number of surveyed teachers also react negatively to the timetabling (more than 26%) or neutrally (40%). From administration timetabling has also received some criticism. Similarly negative feedback was also received from students in the self-assessment surveys (12.2% strongly disagreed and 13.9% disagreed). Among the timetable issues there seems to be a need to make some facultative classes in English more available to students, who are not able to attend them due to simultaneously held classes in the curriculum. Interestingly, graduates seem to be more satisfied with timetabling than students (63.6% of positive feedback), but here the possibility of statistic mistake should be taken into account, because the number of surveyed graduates is much smaller than the one of students (11 to 65). It should be, however, noted that the 2016-2017 educational year has been experimental in the procedure of timetabling using new technologies, and due to this some negative feedback may be related to the fact the respondents have not adapted to the new rules yet.

Most students agree they can access important information about their courses and progress, with a visible neutral (28.1%) and negative (more than 15% in aggregate) feedback. As for the collection of information, students also mostly agree that the law school has and uses key performance indicators (graduates overwhelmingly reacted neutrally to the mentioned statement), while in case of information about the satisfaction with the programs, there are many negative (more than 20% in aggregate) and neutral (29.7%) answers. Several teachers also strongly disagree that information about students' satisfaction is gathered. This statement is closely related to the one about the evaluation of teaching staff by students, where more involvement from the law school may take place.

A large portion of graduates (more than 45% in aggregate) disagree the law school gathers information about career paths of its alumni, and even more (above 60%) disagree there is an active alumni association.

7.1. Institution has an effective process to collect, analyze and use relevant information for the effective management of its study programs and other activities.

Key Findings:

The University and Faculty do have formal established procedures of development and monitoring of their study programs (syllabi). However, it seems like there is no effective control over the process of these program's implementation. Besides, some parts of the programs are rather formal. For example, some of the reviewed programs mention LMS Moodle as the instrument of technological module support. At the same time, interviews with teachers and students demonstrate that many of them have very vague ideas of what Moodle basically is and, consequently – do not employ it at all.

Recommendations:

Try to encourage teachers to make their programs (syllabi) more 'live' and realistic. As long as the Universities possess considerable autonomy - there are no formal or binding obstacles to modernize the syllabi so that they become working and truly supportive handbooks for teachers and students as well. Outline, topics and particular subject, direct and clear indication of sources for preparation, methods of classroom work and assessment criteria, as well as supposed outcomes of each session shall be stipulated as specific as possible. List of sources for preparation and text volumes have to be reasonable, so that the students are able to study this material together with preparing to practical part of the session if relevant.

There are suggested syllabus models within materials on the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). These can be very helpful and when used promote recognition and transferability in the EHEA.

7.2. Institution involves students and staff in providing and analyzing information and planning follow-up activities.

Key Findings:

Students are represented in General (Scientific) Council of the University and the Head of students self-government also takes part in rectorate meetings on a regular basis. However, students self-government seems to be rather weak at the faculty level, as the interview results show that ordinary students are very little aware of the activity and competence of the School Students Council.

Recommendations:

The University and the Faculty should take steps in order to strengthen and promote the students councils; competences and procedures of students self-government bodies should be properly communicated to students on a regular basis.

Student council(s) meetings should be well publicized in advance and their functions should be available to all students with open and transparent meetings.

7.3. Institution ensures that important information is reported directly to students promptly and efficiently.

Key Findings:

In most cases University and Faculty administration and teachers staff communicate with students via group monitors. Few hours per week are officially allocated for the teacher to be at the chair where students may find them in a case of need. However, all the chairs are located in the main building, which is at some distance from the School of Advocacy. Besides, students may still have classes at these hours.

Students complain about the fact that they would be happy to attend courses taught in foreign languages, however – these classes are normally held in other university building, as indicated above, and often overlap with regular classes.

Recommendations:

Using of the LMSs makes the process of communication between the stakeholders of the educational process much more effective and faster. It saves time, reduces the possibility of miscommunication through “other’s mouths”, and eliminates possible bias or favoritism in the use of the monitor system.

University and the faculty should first ensure the technical element of any of the LMSs functioning. Afterwards – administration and teaching staff, as well as students should be instructed on how and to what extent, for what purposes they may use it. Actually, LMS allows plethora of constructive functions, including, but not limited to setting the syllabi, tasks for students; arranging them into different groups for various projects and activities within study programs; conduct of assessments and evaluations, surveys and much more.

7.4. Institution effectively manages and administers programs of study to ensure a conducive learning environment for students.

Key Findings:

Some disciplines may be and are taught in foreign languages (in German, French and English). Students are selected to these courses based on language knowledge level. However, students do not receive credits for such courses – thus they are subsidiary for students; too often sessions of these subsidiary courses coincide with the basic course schedule and are held in a different building than the School of Advocacy. Most of the students may not in fact take the possibility of even partial studying in foreign language.

Recommendations:

Include courses which are taught in foreign language into regular curriculum.

Schedule foreign language courses to compliment the Ukrainian language course.

Award academic credit to students who successfully complete the foreign language course.

Element 8: Public Information

Element 8. Notable Survey Findings

'Public Information' is directed foremost at external audience, but not at stakeholders that were surveyed as respondents. For this reason there are no statements in on-line surveys testing this element and respectively no notable survey findings on this element.

8.1. Institution regularly publishes up to date, impartial and objective information, both quantitative and qualitative, about its activities including programs and awards they are offering.

Key Findings:

The University and the School of Advocacy both have their own web-sites which are well-structured and their contents updated adequately. There is a lot of information and news about current university and faculty life and activities, as well as introduced calls for academic and educational events - both, for teachers and students; programs (exchange or internships etc.) and other opportunities are published. This information is set in separate website units (academic activity, international cooperation, news, for a student etc.). The University and the School of Advocacy each have persons responsible for information publishing.

University documents are published on its website and sorted into three units: documents on educational, academic and administrative activity. However, these documents are mixed within the units and some of them do not open (e.g. staff list). Website document units have no search filters which makes it rather complicated and uncomfortable to find properly the document needed, because search results show every result from the whole website which contains the keyword being searched. For instance, University Charter does not appear via the search field and is published on the second page of the document list, following regulations on tendering, university schools and chairs what seems to be illogical.

However, according to the information received from the University, the new web-site has already been designed and is about to be launched.

Recommendations:

University web-site should be organized in the way that all important documents were well grouped and easily accessible.

Consider the possibility to single out a separate block or unit of documents which are the decisions brought by the University and Faculty administrations respectively. Due publishing and delivering of such decisions to public is obligatory under the Law of Ukraine "On Access to Public Information", so – clear distinguishing of various types of the University documentation will smoothen and the process of their search.

8.2. Information about programs covers the selection criteria for them, the intended learning outcomes of these programs, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures used, the pass rates and the learning opportunities available to their students as well as graduate employment information.

Key Findings:

Neither university nor faculty web-sites have published curricula or syllabi and information associated with them.

The University website does not contain information about employment possibilities for students. On the contrary, the School of Advocacy website has a page with information about the Centre of students and graduates employment “Career” where readers may find actual news regarding employment possibilities and job vacancy advertisements.

Recommendations:

The educational system should be set out in a way of maximum transparency, intelligibility and to ensure valid accessibility for prospective students to make their conscious choice - both - of their future profession, specialization and the institution itself. Particularly study curricula and syllabi should provide detailed and specific information about educational content and plan of studying, methods of teaching, admission and assessment criteria, credit amounts, expected outcomes etc. This sort of information is needed to choose a course after having been adequately informed about it and to gain higher education which will best fit the person’s expectations and demands. Considering this, key information and description of University and Faculty programs shall be duly published and constantly updated. This will also contribute to the programs monitoring efficiency.

8.3. Papers and dissertations published as part of the academic process should be readily available on line and not removed without just cause.

Key Findings:

According to the Ministry of Education Order no.758 from 14.07.2014 published on the University website dissertations are removed from it after three months period from receiving the diploma of PhD. The University fulfils this requirement.

Recommendation:

Academic research and its results are an integral component of quality higher education and, as a product of progressing knowledge, academic papers have to be accessible for students. We do understand that the University may not act contrary to legislation. On the other hand, the University may prepare and direct to the government a specific note, insisting on the removal of the ‘three months’ provision and introducing the rule of dissertations availability for an unlimited time.

Of vital importance is development, publishing and timely update of clear and profound description

of the University programs and curricula, which includes for at least: detailed information about educational content and schedule of the corresponding curricula and programs, teaching methodology, admission criteria, amount of academic credits, expected results after course accomplishment, etc.

Element 9: On-going monitoring and periodic review of programs

Element 9. Notable Survey Findings.

Only one statement is devoted to the assessment of this element in students' survey, and it is about the involvement of students and other stakeholders in the review and revision of programmes. Many students responded to it neutrally (34.4%), with more than 40% of aggregate positive and more than 20% of aggregate negative answers. Graduates' responses shift to more negative ones, with more than 54% of negative feedback. Faculty staff negative feedback here is more modest amounting to 20% of 'disagree' responses, while 12.5% of administration 'strongly disagreed' to the statement.

More attention should be devoted to the evaluation of programs taking into account the changing needs of the society, as observed from some negative responses of administration, although the surveyed employers agree that the law school has a good working relationship with the legal community.

9.1. Institution continuously improves its programs in order to respond to the demands and needs of students and society by program monitoring and review, including where appropriate peer review mechanisms.

Key Findings:

The University and the Faculty of Advocacy appear to have a strong current ethic of enhancing quality and developing and adapting programs to meet changes and to improve the quality of education offered at the University and Faculty.

There currently are insufficient mechanisms for peer review of programs particularly on the Faculty level. Structural complexity at the University means that program review and coordination between programs occurs at higher levels of the University than is optimal.

Recommendations:

The University should explore additional mechanisms that would allow peer review and program development on the Faculty level in a way that allows all the chairs of the faculty of Advocacy to act together in programming input and design. This would increase the importance of the Faculty level at the University as an academic institution and lead to greater cooperation and coordination.

9.2. Institution involves students and other stakeholders in revision and reviewing of the program and publicly communicates and publishes the changed specifications.

Key Findings:

Students are not directly involved in the revision and reviewing of the program at the Chair and Faculty levels of the University. Student involvement in the University Wide Academic Council is limited and more formalistic. Genuine opportunities for student input are limited.

Recommendation:

Methods to increase student involvement in program review and development should be implemented by the University, especially on the Chair and Faculty level consistent with and in partnership with increased peer and faculty member involvement in the process as outlined above. As an option a call for suggestions from students and other stakeholders on how to review programs may be announced annually. Alternatively, periodic open student forums can be held where proposals are discussed and student input and suggestions are solicited. It does not mean that every student suggestion has to be adopted but students are capable of interesting and creative thinking. Especially since the student interface with technology is very different from the interfaces of 10 or 20 years ago. When students suggest a really good idea and it is adopted it can be very important to demonstrate that the faculty listens to students and the students have a responsibility in the success of the school and their education.

Element 10: Cyclical External Quality Assurance

10.1. Institution cyclically undergoes external quality assurance in line with the ESG and performs every external quality assurance with consideration of the progress gained since the last one.

Key Findings:

The University implemented the previous methodology designed by the USAID Fair Justice project by conducting an evaluation based on that methodology prior to this external assessment. That effort combined with their openness to this assessment is good evidence of the University's' belief in the use of these tools to improve the University.

Recommendations:

The University should continue to engage in external assessments as a tool to enhance University advancement. In addition, the University should develop mechanisms to implement and evaluate any recommendations as a result of this or other external assessments.

10.2. Institution promotes self-assessment prior to each external assessment

Key Findings:

The Faculty of Advocacy engaged in an internal assessment prior to this external assessment.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS TO GOVERNMENT

Apprenticeship Limits:

The Ministry of Education should review the rule that was given in 1993 regarding apprenticeships by bachelor (specialist) level students. The rule appears to limit apprenticeships to state institutions which has a detrimental effect on the ability of students to have meaningful apprenticeships at private law firms, solo or small lawyer's offices, and non-governmental organizations. This limitation hits the Faculty of Advocacy directly as many of their graduates intend to work in these types of institutions. This type of limitation seems unnecessary in a State based on the Rule of Law where it is recognized that the private practice of law and working on the rule of law as a part of civil society are equally important as working for the State, and that the role of a State law faculty is not only to generate state workers, but legal professionals who can fulfill a variety of important roles.

International Exchanges and Development:

The Ministry of Education should aggressively expand the scholarships and funding opportunities for international exchanges in legal education. The demands and expectations for legal education are changing rapidly and substantially in the globalized / interconnected world. The traditional method of legal education change through scholarly research and publication now equally competes with demands for better skills trained law graduates. While internet resources can add value to international exchanges and experiences, it cannot replace the scope of knowledge learned through live emersion nor foster the confidence to adopt new or expanded methodologies of legal teaching.

Comprehensive University Honor Systems or Codes of Conduct.

The Ministry of Education should view Education for Justice(E4J) as the touchstone for all Ukrainian Law Schools. The Ministry should encourage teaching and modeling integrity and ethics, including integration of these values in all courses. The Ministry should promote and encourage adoption and effective implementation of University wide Honor Systems, or similar mechanism through Codes of Conduct. Faculty, administration and students discussions, drafting, adoption and implementation community comprehensive honour systems or codes of conduct, which recognize that integrity and ethical conduct should be universal norms in the law school community, should become an expectation. Encouraging each group to take an active role in enforcing and honouring the code in order to promote the most successful and sustainable system.

Assessments and Examinations.

The Ministry of Education should promote anonymous, diverse and comprehensive examination methodologies. Too many Ukrainian Law Faculties are still wedded to the oral examination process. Complete standardization of any exam format is not possible but diverse student

assessment, done through anonymous grading would allow for better assessment integrity, reduce opportunities for corruption and bias. External issues or opinions can affect the oral assessment process and grade. Anonymous examination corrects a fundamental flaw inherent in oral exams in that knowledge of the student's identity and seeing the prior grades in the gradebook create actual unfairness or at least unintentional unfairness and undermines academic integrity.

Publication of Thesis Texts.

The Ministry of Education should promote the assurance of legal research quality and public control of qualification papers. Several steps have already been taken in this regard, namely according to the Ministry Decree No. 758 as of 14 July 2015 dissertations have to be published at the institution's web-site at least 10 days before the public defense and three months after the defense. In order to assure constant control on the quality of dissertations it is advisable that dissertations are not removed from public access after the expiration of three months.

Syllabus Development

The Ministry of education should encourage well developed syllabus for each course taught. While a single format is not recommended, there are suggested syllabus models within materials on the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). These can be very helpful and when used, they promote recognition and transferability in the EHEA. Transferability in the EHEA will also be enhanced by the Ministry further encouraging the development of courses which are taught in foreign language as part of a regular curriculum, encouraging as much student accessibility are practical and recognizing as valid academic credits awarded to students who successfully complete the foreign language course.

APPENDIX 1: ASSESSMENT TEAM MEMBERS BIOGRAPHIES

Delaine R. Swenson is an American lawyer and law professor with over 25 years of experience in training and the law. He presently serves as the Department Head of the Chair of International and American Law at the Faculty of Law of John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland and serves as Director and was the founder of the Center for Advancing Legal Skills. He is also a Founder and is currently Chair of the Founders Council of the Rule of Law Institute Foundation. Professor Swenson has conducted training for lawyers, judges, prosecutors, law professors and students and government officials in over 30 countries for clients such as the US Department of State, the US Department of Justice, the American Bar Association, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the United Nations, the German Investment Fund, and the European Union as well as several large law firms including Wardynski & Partners in Poland and White & Case in Asia. He served as the lead expert and trainer for a five year Model Court Project in China, a five year legal reform project in Georgia and several projects in Ukraine. Professor Swenson also has over 10 years of experience as a trial lawyer in the state and federal courts of the United States, and was the Young Lawyer of the Year in the State of Washington in 1993.

Thomas H. Speedy Rice is currently a Professor of Practice at Washington & Lee School of Law's Transnational Law Institute in Lexington, VA. He designs, and is currently teaching, practicum courses which are assisting the defense support services of the International Criminal Court and the Military Commissions at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, another in Serbia on the European Court of Human Rights, and most recently a practicum promoting implementation of the UN Convention Against Corruption and Good Governance in Albania, Ukraine and in the Pacific Islands. Prof. Rice is a past Fulbright Scholar to the Law Faculty of the University of Montenegro, Podgorica, Montenegro, Visiting Professor of American Law at the University of Central England, Birmingham, England, a Distinguished Visitor at California Western School of Law in San Diego, CA and a Rule of Law consultant for legal education reform living in Belgrade Serbia. Professor Rice has taught and lectured at numerous international schools and programs, including Florence, Italy, Beijing, China, Budapest, Hungary, and 23 other countries. He has also tried cases in U.S. State and Federal courts and argued appellate cases before a number of American courts including the United States Supreme Court, the California Supreme Court, and the New Mexico Supreme Court.

Mariia B. Tsypiashchuk is an instructor at the I.Malynovskiy Institute of Law of the National University of Ostroh Academy, Head of the legal clinic NUOA "Pro bono", Board member of the NGO "Association of Legal Clinics of Ukraine", PhD student at the NUOA department of psychology and pedagogy, Coordinator and lawyer at Rivne public reception of Ukrainian Helsinki Human Rights Union. In the period from 2009 to 2013 - national trainer of the European Law Students' Association in Ukraine (ELSA-Ukraine); Moderator at Rivne Docu / Club of the International Documentary Film Festival on Human Rights Docudays UA "Human

Rights Through the Lens"; Regional Coordinator of the travelling exhibition "Everyone Has the Right to Know Their Rights," 2016. Gained LL.M (excellent) degree in Law in 2009 at National University of Ostroh Academy Law Faculty. Studied Human Rights and other related courses in Maastricht University Law Faculty (Netherlands) during January-June, 2012.

Ivan O. Romashchenko is a lecturer at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Faculty of Law, Department of Civil Law, lawyer, legal expert, and translator. In 2012 he graduated from Leiden University (the Netherlands) with LL.M. (Advanced) degree in European and International Business Law. He acted both as a trainer for the faculty arbitration team (2012) and also as a judge in mediation (2013, 2014) and Jessup (2016, 2017) tournaments. In 2014 he was awarded with a PhD degree in civil law from Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, and later published a monograph on the studied topic. Currently he is an external PhD candidate at Leiden University (the Netherlands), writing thesis on corporate law, and within the described project in 2016 was a guest researcher at the Max Planck Institute for Comparative and International Private Law for two months. He has given lectures to both Ukrainian and foreign students on business contracts and cultural rights respectively within the European Neighbourhood Policy Law and Good Governance program (2012-2015) and Regional Master's Program in Human Rights and Democratization (2015-2017). He also co-organised a series of lectures with famous lawyers and attorneys at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (in cooperation with the Law Firm 'Pronin and Partners') (2016).

APPENDIX 2: SCHEDULE OF EXPERTS' ACTIVITIES DURING SITE VISIT

**PROGRAM OF EXPERTS' ACTIVITIES ON INDEPENDENT ON-SITE LEGAL
EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT
AT
THE SCHOOL OF ADVOCACY OF THE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY "ODESA LAW
ACADEMY"**

<u>DAY</u> <u>I</u>	MONDAY March 13, 2017	
Time	Participants	Activity
10:00- 11:00	All experts (Groups A and B together)	<p>Introductory meeting of experts at the Rector's office of the University with the Rector and Vice-Rectors</p> <p>Rector –Candidate of Legal Sciences, Professor Volodymyr Zavalniuk;</p> <p>Vice-Rector on Educational Work– Candidate of Legal Sciences, Professor Minas Arakelian;</p> <p>Vice-Rector on Scientific Work– PhD in Law, Associate Professor Halyna Ulianova;</p> <p>Vice-Rector on Educational Work on Educational and Methodological Work – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Professor Yuri Polianskyi</p>
11:00 – 12:00	All experts (Groups A and B together)	<p>Meeting with the Dean of the Department of the Bar, Mr. Mykola Stoianov, transfer to the main building of the Department of the Bar, meeting with Deputy Deans</p> <p>Mykola Stoianov, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Dean</p> <p>Mykhailo Serebro, Assistant, Deputy Dean on Scientific and Educational Work</p> <p>Larysa Chekmarova, Deputy on Scientific Work</p> <p>Olha Malakhova, Assistant, Deputy on Scientific Work</p>
11:00 - 11:40	All experts (Groups A and B together)	<p>Tour - acquaintance with material and technical base of the Department of the Bar (lecture rooms, conference halls, labs, etc.)</p>

12:00-13:00	Two experts (Group A)	Interview with Deputy Deans upon the experts' choice Larysa Chekmarova, Deputy on Scientific Work Olha Malakhova, Assistant, Deputy on Scientific Work
12:00-13:00	Two experts (Group B)	Interview with the Dean/Deputy Deans upon the experts' choice Mykola Stoianov, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Dean Mykhailo Serebro, Assistant, Deputy Dean on Scientific and Educational Work Larysa Chekmarova, Deputy on Scientific Work Olha Malakhova, Assistant, Deputy on Scientific Work
13:00-14:30	Lunch	
14:30-15:30	Two experts (Group A)	Interviews with heads of departments of the Department of the Bar PhD in Law, Professor Yurii Oborotov, Department of General Theoretical Science of Law PhD in Law, Professor Nina Anishchuk, Department of the History of State and Law
14:30-15:30	Two experts (Group B)	Interviews with heads of departments of the Department of the Bar PhD in Law, Professor Valentyn Dolezhan, Department of the Organization of Judicial and Law Enforcement Bodies and the Bar
15:30-16:30	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Focus-group discussion with heads of departments of the Department of the Bar PhD in Law, Professor Yurii Oborotov, Department of General Theoretical Science of Law PhD in Law, Professor Nina Anishchuk, Department of the History of State and Law PhD in Law, Professor Valentyn Dolezhan, Department of the Organization of Judicial and Law Enforcement Bodies and the Bar

16:45-18:00	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Focus-group discussion with Deputy Deans Mykhailo Serebro, Assistant, Deputy Dean on Scientific and Educational Work Larysa Chekmarova, Deputy on Scientific Work Olha Malakhova, Assistant, Deputy on Scientific Work
<u>DAY</u> <u>2</u>	TUESDAY March 14, 2017	
Time	Participants	Activity
9:00-09:30	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Meeting at the Council of Advocates of Odesa Oblast. Meeting with the leadership of the Council of Advocates of Odesa Oblast Yosyp Bronz – Chairman of the Council of Advocates of Odesa Oblast; Andrii Kostin – Deputy Chairman of the Council of Advocates of Odesa Oblast; Natalia Rudnytska – Head of the Qualifications and Disciplinary Commission of the Bar of Odesa Oblast; Svitlana Adabash – advocate, member of the Council of Advocates of Odesa Oblast.
10:00-11:00	Two experts (Group A)	Interviews with the students of the Department of the Bar
10:00-11:00	Two experts (Group B)	Interviews with the postgraduate students of the Department of the Bar
11:00-11:50	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Focus-group discussion with the students and postgraduate students of the law school
12:00-13:10	Two experts (Group A)	Observation of teaching in the lecture room (according to the schedule)*
12:00-13:10	Two experts (Group B)	Observation of teaching in the lecture room (according to the schedule)*

13:30-14:30	Lunch	
15:00-15:45	Two experts (Group A)	<p>Interview with the faculty of the Department of the Bar – one representative from each department:</p> <p>Mykhailo Riazanov – Associate Professor of the Department of General Theoretical Science of Law;</p> <p>Kostiantyn Horobets - Associate Professor of the Department of General Theoretical Science of Law;</p> <p>Tymur Ostapenko - Associate Professor of the Department of History and Law;</p>
15:00-15:45	Two experts (Group B)	<p>Interview with the faculty of the Department of the Bar – one representative from each department:</p> <p>Liudmyla Popsuienko – Associate Professor of History Department;</p> <p>Oleksii Svyda - Associate Professor of the Department of the Organization of Judicial and Law Enforcement Bodies and the Bar</p> <p>Oleh Kryvenko – Assistant of the Department of the Organization of Judicial and Law Enforcement Bodies and the Bar</p>
16:00-17:00	All experts (Groups A and B together)	<p>Focus-group discussion with the faculty of the Department of the Bar – two representatives from each department:</p> <p>Mykhailo Riazanov – Associate Professor of the Department of General Theoretical Science of Law;</p> <p>Kostiantyn Horobets - Associate Professor of the Department of General Theoretical Science of Law;</p> <p>Tymur Ostapenko - Associate Professor of the Department of History and Law;</p> <p>Liudmyla Popsuienko – Associate Professor of History Department;</p> <p>Oleksii Svyda - Associate Professor of the Department of the Organization of Judicial and Law Enforcement Bodies and the Bar</p> <p>Oleh Kryvenko – Assistant of the Department of the Organization of Judicial and Law Enforcement Bodies and the Bar</p>
	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Time to systematize the collected information, exchange opinions and record impressions based on results of the work

<u>DAY</u> <u>3</u>	WEDNESDAY March 15, 2017	
Time	Participants	Activity
09:00-09:45	Two experts (Group A)	Meeting with the graduates of the National University “Odesa Law Academy”, including the Department of the Bar S. Chernushych H. Domuschi A. Khyzhniak
09:00-90:45	Two experts (Group B)	Meeting with the graduates of the National University “Odesa Law Academy”, including the Department of the Bar Ye. Harieiev D. Cherepov V. Palianychko
10:00-11:00	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Focus-group discussion with the graduates of the National University “Odesa Law Academy”, including the Department of the Bar
11:15-13:15	Two experts (Group A)	Observation of teaching in the lecture room (according to the schedule)
11:15-13:15	Two experts (Group B)	Observation of teaching in the lecture room (according to the schedule)
13:30-14:30	Lunch	
15:00-16:30	Two experts (Group A)	Visiting the office of the legal clinic of the University. Interview with the faculty and students who support the operations of the legal clinic.

15:00-16:30	Two experts (Group B)	Acquaintance with facilities and funds of the library/reading room of the law school
16:30-18:00	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Familiarizing with internal regulations/rules of the law school

<u>DAY</u> 4	THURSDAY March 16, 2017	
Time	Participants	Activity
09:00-10:00	Two experts (Group A)	Meeting with the leadership of the NUOLA Center for Education Quality Assessment Oleksandr Torbas, Director of NUOLA Center for Education Quality Assessment
09:00-10:00	Two experts (Group B)	Meeting with the leadership of the NUOLA Division on Quality Testing Mykhailo Riazanov, Director of NUOLA Division on Quality Testing
10:15 – 11:15	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Familiarizing with NUOLA faculty’s publications and students’ papers
11:30-13:15	Two experts (Group A)	Observation of teaching in the lecture room (according to the schedule)*
11:30-13:10	Two experts (Group B)	Observation of teaching in the lecture room (according to the schedule)*

13:30-14:30		
14:30-15:00	All experts (Groups A and B)	Interview with Vice-Rectors Vice-Rector on Educational Work– Candidate of Legal Sciences, Professor Minas Arakelian; Vice-Rector on Scientific Work– PhD in Law, Associate Professor Halyna Ulianova; Vice-Rector on Educational Work on Educational and Methodological Work – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Professor Yurii Polianskyi
15:00-15:30	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Working meeting with the Rector of the NU “OLA”. Discussion of preliminary observations based on assessment results. Rector –Candidate of Legal Sciences, Professor Volodymyr Zavalniuk
16:00-18:00	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Interview with the representatives of judicial corps Serhii Chvankin – judge of the Kyivskyy District Court of Odesa City; Hennadii Voitov - judge of the Kyivskyy District Court of Odesa City; Volodymyr Petrenko - judge of the Kyivskyy District Court of Odesa City; Leonid Lichman – judge of the Odesa Oblast Commercial Court

<u>DAY</u> <u>5</u>	FRIDAY March 17, 2017	
Time	Participants	Activity
09:00-10:00	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Time to systematize the collected information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional lessons, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and record impressions based on results of the work

10:00-12:30	Two experts (Group A)	Observation of teaching process in the lecture room (according to the schedule)
10:00-12:30	Two experts (Group B)	Observation of teaching process in the lecture room (according to the schedule)
12:30-13:30	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Acquaintance with publications of the representatives of the Department of the Bar and papers of the students
13:30-14:30	Lunch	
14:30-15:45	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Time to systematize the collected information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional lessons, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and record impressions based on results of the work
16:00-17:00	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Wrap-up meeting with the dean/deputy deans of the law school Presentation of preliminary conclusions based on evaluation results. Brief summary of recommendations
17:00-18:00	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Discussion of the process of integration of some parts of report based on evaluation results. Distribution of roles and agreeing upon coordination of work on the draft report and its deadline to be submitted to the dean of the law school for his comments. Agreeing upon the format of team work on the final report based on evaluation results

APPENDIX 3 – ON-LINE SURVEY RESULTS

SURVEY 1 – STUDENTS – 65 RESPONDENTS

1. My Law School values quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	3.1%	2
Neutral	13.8%	9
Agree	47.7%	31
Strongly agree	35.4%	23
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

2. My Law School respects and attends to the diversity of students and their cultural and personal needs

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	3.1%	2
Disagree	7.7%	5
Neutral	23.1%	15
Agree	38.5%	25
Strongly agree	27.7%	18
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

3. My Law School enables flexible learning paths

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.3%	4
Disagree	21.9%	14
Neutral	34.4%	22
Agree	28.1%	18
Strongly agree	9.4%	6
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

4. I never felt discriminated against on any ground by Law School administrators, faculty, support staff or any other Law School community member

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.2%	4
Disagree	18.5%	12
Neutral	20.0%	13
Agree	40.0%	26
Strongly agree	15.4%	10
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

5. My Law School has a publicly available strategy, policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	3.1%	2
Disagree	4.6%	3
Neutral	33.8%	22
Agree	32.3%	21
Strongly agree	26.2%	17
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

6. There are opportunities for me to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.5%	1
Disagree	18.5%	12
Neutral	27.7%	18
Agree	41.5%	21
Strongly agree	10.8%	7
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

7. My Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.5%	1
Disagree	6.9%	4
Neutral	36.9%	24
Agree	38.5%	25
Strongly agree	16.9%	11
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

8. My Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	3.1%	2
Disagree	7.7%	5
Neutral	18.5%	12
Agree	33.8%	22
Strongly agree	36.9%	24
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

9. My Law School has all necessary regulations on student admission, progression, recognition and certification

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	10.8%	7
Neutral	24.6%	16
Agree	44.6%	29
Strongly agree	20.0%	13
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

10. Access policies, admission processes and criteria are implemented consistently and in a transparent manner

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	4.6%	3
Neutral	21.5%	14
Agree	41.5%	27
Strongly agree	32.3%	21
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

11. My Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.2%	4
Disagree	23.1%	15
Neutral	40.0%	26
Agree	20.0%	13
Strongly agree	10.8%	7
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

12. I have received detailed feedback on my work

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	4.6%	3
Disagree	10.8%	7
Neutral	36.9%	24
Agree	38.5%	25
Strongly agree	9.2%	6
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

13. I have received this feedback promptly

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.2%	4
Disagree	12.3%	8
Neutral	43.1%	28
Agree	32.3%	21
Strongly agree	6.2%	4
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

14. This feedback has helped me to clarify things I did not understand

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	3.1%	2
Disagree	18.5%	12
Neutral	26%	40
Agree	30.8%	20
Strongly agree	7.7%	5
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

15. Law School teachers are well qualified and competent

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	4.6%	3
Disagree	18.5%	12
Neutral	18.5%	12
Agree	43.1%	28
Strongly agree	15.4%	10
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

16. Law School teachers are well organized and regularly prepared for classes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	3.1%	2
Disagree	9.2%	6
Neutral	20.0%	13
Agree	49.2%	32
Strongly agree	18.5%	12
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

17. I have the opportunity to evaluate my Law School teachers performances

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	10.8%	7
Disagree	36.9%	24
Neutral	30.8%	20
Agree	12.3%	8
Strongly agree	9.2%	6
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

18. I receive sufficient advice and support with my studies

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.5%	1
Disagree	9.2%	6
Neutral	41.5%	27
Agree	35.4%	23
Strongly agree	12.3%	8
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

19. I have been able to contact Law School teachers when I need to

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.5%	1
Disagree	12.3%	8
Neutral	27.7%	18
Agree	44.6%	29
Strongly agree	13.8%	9
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

20. Good advice is available when I need to make study choices

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.5%	1
Disagree	13.8%	9
Neutral	38.5%	25
Agree	36.9%	24
Strongly agree	9.2%	6
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

21. I believe my legal education will prepare me adequately for a future legal career

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	4.6%	3
Disagree	7.7%	5
Neutral	30.8%	20
Agree	43.1%	28
Strongly agree	13.8%	9
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

22. Law School teachers regularly use a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	3.1%	2
Disagree	15.4%	10
Neutral	23.1%	15
Agree	43.1%	28
Strongly agree	15.4%	10
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

23. Teachers apply problem-based teaching methods and sufficiently engage me in practice-oriented and skills-based learning

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.5%	1
Disagree	18.5%	12
Neutral	23.1%	15
Agree	38.5%	25
Strongly agree	18.5%	12
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

24. I was promptly informed about the operation of the legal clinic in my Law School and had an opportunity to apply for participating in it

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	4.6%	3
Disagree	6.2%	4
Neutral	21.5%	14
Agree	41.5%	27
Strongly agree	26.2%	17
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

25. Law School teachers adequately explain key concepts

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	1.5%	1
Neutral	27.7%	18
Agree	52.3%	34
Strongly agree	18.5%	12
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

26. Law School teachers are enthusiastic about the subject they are teaching

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	35.4%	23
Agree	43.1%	28
Strongly agree	21.5%	14
<i>answered question</i>	65	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

27. My Law School education is interesting and intellectually stimulating

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	4.7%	3
Neutral	12.5%	8
Agree	45.3%	29
Strongly agree	37.5%	24
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

28. Adequate learning resources are constantly available for me to learn course materials

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.6%	1
Disagree	4.7%	3
Neutral	18.8%	12
Agree	46.9%	30
Strongly agree	28.1%	18
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

29. I have stable access to the internet and other legal databases for research purposes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.6%	1
Disagree	6.3%	4
Neutral	9.4%	6
Agree	40.6%	26
Strongly agree	42.2%	27
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

30. My Law School is well organized and administers courses effectively

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	4.7%	3
Disagree	7.8%	5
Neutral	31.3%	20
Agree	40.6%	26
Strongly agree	15.6%	10
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

31. The timetabling of my classes works efficiently

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	21.9%	14
Disagree	28.1%	18
Neutral	26.6%	17
Agree	17.2%	11
Strongly agree	6.3%	4
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

32. Any changes in my courses or teaching are communicated effectively

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	7.8%	5
Disagree	17.2%	11
Neutral	25.0%	16
Agree	35.9%	23
Strongly agree	14.1%	9
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

33. I can access important information and data about my courses and progress

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	3.1%	2
Disagree	12.5%	8
Neutral	28.1%	18
Agree	42.2%	27
Strongly agree	14.1%	9
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

34. My Law School provides for the opportunity to appeal against the evaluation results, which seem to be incorrect or unfair

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	7.8%	5
Disagree	20.3%	13
Neutral	32.8%	21
Agree	29.7%	19
Strongly agree	9.4%	6
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

35. My Law School has appropriate procedures to deal with students' complaints

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.3%	4
Disagree	18.8%	12
Neutral	42.2%	27
Agree	28.1%	18
Strongly agree	4.7%	3
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

36. Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted by my Law School

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.6%	1
Disagree	4.7%	3
Neutral	25.0%	16
Agree	46.9%	30
Strongly agree	21.9%	14
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

37. Programmes are reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.3%	4
Disagree	17.2%	11
Neutral	34.4%	22
Agree	29.7%	19
Strongly agree	12.5%	8
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

38. There are regular thought-provoking discussions during seminars

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	6.3%	4
Neutral	21.9%	14
Agree	48.4%	31
Strongly agree	23.4%	15
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

39. My Law School embraces flexible learning paths and recognizes competences gained outside formal curricula

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	4.7%	3
Disagree	10.9%	7
Neutral	18.8%	12
Agree	46.9%	30
Strongly agree	18.8%	12
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

40. My Law School respects academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	4.7%	3
Disagree	15.6%	10
Neutral	29.7%	19
Agree	32.8%	21
Strongly agree	17.2%	11
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

41. My Law School has a Code of Conduct/Honor Code and implements it effectively

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	7.9%	5
Disagree	15.9%	10
Neutral	41.3%	26
Agree	28.6%	18
Strongly agree	6.3%	4
<i>answered question</i>	63	
<i>skipped question</i>	2	

42. My Law School programs/courses have explicit intended learning outcomes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	6.3%	4
Neutral	38.1%	24
Agree	41.3%	26
Strongly agree	14.3%	9
<i>answered question</i>	63	
<i>skipped question</i>	2	

43. My Law School programs/courses are designed by involving students and other stakeholders in the work

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	9.4%	6
Disagree	21.9%	14
Neutral	37.5%	24
Agree	25.0%	16
Strongly agree	6.3%	4
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

44. My Law School programs/courses include well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	4.7%	3
Disagree	20.3%	13
Neutral	26.6%	17
Agree	35.9%	23
Strongly agree	12.5%	8
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

45. My Law School encourages my sense of autonomy while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teacher

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	3.1%	2
Disagree	7.8%	5
Neutral	35.9%	23
Agree	40.6%	26
Strongly agree	12.5%	8
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

46. My assessors are familiar with modern testing and examination methods and well-qualified to assess my progress

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.6%	1
Disagree	3.1%	2
Neutral	29.7%	19
Agree	53.1%	34
Strongly agree	12.5%	8
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

47. My Law School assesses my progress based on the criteria for and method of assessment as well as criteria for marking published in advance

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.6%	1
Disagree	9.4%	6
Neutral	20.3%	13
Agree	56.3%	36
Strongly agree	12.5%	8
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

48. Where possible, my Law School carries out my progress assessment by more than one examiner

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	4.7%	3
Disagree	12.5%	8
Neutral	26.6%	17
Agree	50.0%	32
Strongly agree	6.3%	4
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

49. My Law School has and uses key performance indicators

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.6%	1
Disagree	3.2%	2
Neutral	36.5%	23
Agree	46.0%	29
Strongly agree	12.7%	8
<i>answered question</i>	63	
<i>skipped question</i>	2	

50. My Law School gathers information about our satisfaction with the programs

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.3%	4
Disagree	18.8%	12
Neutral	29.7%	19
Agree	32.8%	21
Strongly agree	12.5%	8
<i>answered question</i>	64	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

51. Year of my study

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1 year	14.5%	9
2 year	17.7%	11
3 year	14.5%	9
4 year	24.2%	15
5 year	22.6%	14
6 year	6.5%	4
<i>answered question</i>	62	
<i>skipped question</i>	3	

52. The main strengths of my Law School are:

<i>answered question</i>	45
<i>skipped question</i>	20

53. The main weaknesses of my Law School are:

<i>answered question</i>	41
<i>skipped question</i>	24

54. Please use this space to make any other comments on your Law School:

<i>answered question</i>	14
<i>skipped question</i>	51

SURVEY 2 – LAW SCHOOL GRADUATES – 11 RESPONDENTS

1. My Law School valued quality legal education		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	18.2%	2
Agree	36.4%	4
Strongly agree	36.4%	4
<i>answered question</i>		11
<i>skipped question</i>		0

2. My Law School respected and attended to the diversity of students and their cultural and personal needs		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	27.3%	3
Neutral	9.1%	1
Agree	27.3%	3
Strongly agree	36.4%	4
<i>answered question</i>		11
<i>skipped question</i>		0

3. My Law School enabled flexible learning paths		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	9.1%	1
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	36.4%	4
Agree	18.2%	2
Strongly agree	27.3%	3
<i>answered question</i>		11
<i>skipped question</i>		0

4. I never felt discriminated against on any ground by Law School administrators, faculty, support staff or any other Law School community member		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	9.1%	1
Disagree	27.3%	3
Neutral	9.1%	1
Agree	0.0%	0
Strongly agree	54.5%	6

<i>answered question</i>	11
<i>skipped question</i>	0

5. My Law School had publicly available strategy, policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	18.2%	2
Neutral	36.4%	4
Agree	27.3%	3
Strongly agree	18.2%	2
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

6. There were opportunities for me to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	54.5%	6
Agree	36.4%	4
Strongly agree	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

7. My Law School monitored the quality of my legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	27.3%	3
Neutral	36.4%	4
Agree	18.2%	2
Strongly agree	18.2%	2
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

8. My Law School admission process was transparent, fair, and meritocratic

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	18.2%	2
Agree	45.5%	5
Strongly agree	27.3%	3
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

9. My Law School had all necessary regulations on student admission, progression, recognition and certification

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	27.3%	3
Agree	27.3%	3
Strongly agree	36.4%	4
<i>answered question</i>		11
<i>skipped question</i>		0

10. Access policies, admission processes and criteria were implemented consistently and in a transparent manner

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	18.2%	2
Agree	36.4%	4
Strongly agree	36.4%	4
<i>answered question</i>		11
<i>skipped question</i>		0

11. Law School assessment arrangements and marking were fair

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	27.3%	3
Neutral	27.3%	3
Agree	27.3%	3
Strongly agree	18.2%	2
<i>answered question</i>		11
<i>skipped question</i>		0

12. I received detailed feedback on my work

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	9.1%	1
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	18.2%	2
Agree	72.7%	8
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		11
<i>skipped question</i>		0

13. I received this feedback promptly

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	9.1%	1
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	36.4%	4
Agree	45.5%	5
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

14. This feedback helped me to clarify things I did not understand

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	9.1%	1
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	36.4%	4
Agree	36.4%	4
Strongly agree	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

15. My Law School teachers were well qualified and competent

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	18.2%	2
Neutral	36.4%	4
Agree	27.3%	3
Strongly agree	18.2%	2
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

16. My Law School teachers were well organized and regularly prepared for classes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	18.2%	2
Neutral	18.2%	2
Agree	54.5%	6
Strongly agree	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

17. I had the opportunity to evaluate my Law School teachers performances

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	9.1%	1
Disagree	63.6%	7
Neutral	18.2%	2
Agree	9.1%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

18. I received sufficient advice and support with my studies

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	18.2%	2
Neutral	54.5%	6
Agree	18.2%	2
Strongly agree	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

19. I was able to contact Law School teachers when I needed to

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	18.2%	2
Agree	63.6%	7
Strongly agree	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

20. Good advice was available when I needed to make study choices

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	18.2%	2
Neutral	36.4%	4
Agree	45.5%	5
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

21. I believe my legal education prepared me adequately for my current legal career

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	18.2%	2
Neutral	18.2%	2
Agree	27.3%	3
Strongly agree	36.4%	4
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

22. Law School teachers regularly used a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	18.2%	2
Neutral	45.5%	5
Agree	27.3%	3
Strongly agree	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

23. Teachers applied problem-based teaching methods and sufficiently engaged me in practice-oriented and skills-based learning

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	45.5%	5
Neutral	18.2%	2
Agree	27.3%	3
Strongly agree	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

24. I was promptly informed about the operation of the legal clinic in my Law School and had an opportunity to apply for participating in it

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	9.1%	1
Agree	36.4%	4
Strongly agree	54.5%	6
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

25. Law School teachers adequately explained key concepts

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	90.9%	10
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

26. Law School teachers were enthusiastic about the subject they were teaching

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	63.6%	7
Agree	36.4%	4
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

27. My Law School education was interesting and intellectually stimulating

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	36.4%	4
Agree	45.5%	5
Strongly agree	18.2%	2
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

28. Adequate learning resources were constantly available for me to learn course materials

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	9.1%	1
Agree	18.2%	2
Strongly agree	63.6%	7
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

29. I had stable access to the internet and other legal databases for research purposes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	9.1%	1
Agree	54.5%	6
Strongly agree	36.4%	4
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

30. My Law School was well organized and administered my courses effectively

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	36.4%	4
Agree	27.3%	3
Strongly agree	36.4%	4
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

31. The timetabling of my classes worked efficiently for me

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	36.4%	4
Agree	63.6%	7
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

32. Any changes in my courses or teaching were communicated effectively

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	18.2%	2
Neutral	18.2%	2
Agree	45.5%	5
Strongly agree	18.2%	2
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

33. I could access important information and data about my courses and progress

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	9.1%	1
Agree	63.6%	7
Strongly agree	18.2%	2
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

34. My Law School provided for the opportunity to appeal against the evaluation result, which seemed to be incorrect or unfair

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	9.1%	1
Disagree	27.3%	3
Neutral	36.4%	4
Agree	18.2%	2
Strongly agree	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

35. My Law School had appropriate procedures to deal with students' complaints

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	36.4%	4
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	45.5%	5
Agree	9.1%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

36. Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship was promoted by my Law School

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	9.1%	1
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	36.4%	4
Agree	45.5%	5
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

37. Programmes were reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	9.1%	1
Disagree	45.5%	5
Neutral	36.4%	4
Agree	0.0%	0
Strongly agree	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

38. There were thought-provoking discussions during seminars

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	18.2%	2
Neutral	27.3%	3
Agree	36.4%	4
Strongly agree	18.2%	2
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

39. My Law School embraced flexible learning paths and recognized competences gained outside formal curricula

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	63.6	7
Agree	18.2%	2
Strongly agree	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

40. My Law School respected academic integrity and freedom and was vigilant against academic fraud

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	36.4%	4
Disagree	18.2%	2
Neutral	18.2%	2
Agree	18.2%	2
Strongly agree	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

41. My Law School had a Code of Conduct/Honor Code and implemented it effectively

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	9.1%	1
Disagree	45.5%	5
Neutral	36.4%	4
Agree	9.1%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

42. My Law School programs/courses had explicit intended learning outcomes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	36.4%	4
Neutral	18.2%	2
Agree	45.5%	5
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

43. My Law School programs/courses were designed by involving students and other stakeholders in the work

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	54.5%	6
Neutral	27.3%	3
Agree	18.2%	2
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

44. My Law School programs/courses included well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	45.5%	5
Neutral	45.5%	5
Agree	9.1%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

45. My Law School encouraged my sense of autonomy while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teacher

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	36.4%	4
Neutral	36.4%	4
Agree	18.2%	2
Strongly agree	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

46. My assessors were familiar with modern testing and examination methods and well-qualified to assess my progress

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	18.2%	2
Neutral	27.3%	3
Agree	45.5%	5
Strongly agree	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

47. My Law School assessed my progress based on the criteria for and method of assessment as well as criteria for marking published in advance

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	27.3%	3
Neutral	27.3%	3
Agree	45.5%	5
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

48. Where possible, my Law School carried out my progress assessment by more than one examiner

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	18.2%	2
Neutral	27.3%	3
Agree	45.5%	5
Strongly agree	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

49. My Law School had and used key performance indicators

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	81.8%	9
Agree	9.1%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

50. My Law School gathered information about students' satisfaction with their programs

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	18.2%	2
Disagree	54.5%	6
Neutral	9.1%	1
Agree	18.2%	2
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

51. My degree from the National University 'Odessa Law Academy' helped me to find a job in the field of law

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	9.1%	1
Disagree	9.1%	1
Neutral	27.3%	3
Agree	18.2%	2
Strongly agree	36.4%	4
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

52. My Alma Mater gathers information about career paths of its alumni

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	18.2%	2
Disagree	27.3%	3
Neutral	27.3%	3
Agree	27.3%	3
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

53. My Alma Mater has an active alumni association

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	9.1%	1
Disagree	54.5%	6
Neutral	27.3%	3
Agree	0.0%	0
Strongly agree	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

54. My Alma Mater involves alumni in development of the law faculty

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	9.1%	1
Disagree	27.3%	3
Neutral	45.5%	5
Agree	0.0%	0
Strongly agree	18.2%	2
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

55. Number of years passed after my graduation

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
0-3 years	72.7%	8
4-7 years	27.3%	3
8-12 years	0.0%	0
12 years +	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	11	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

56. My field of employment

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Non-legal	9.1%	1
Legal-private	54.5%	6
Legal-public	18.2%	2
Legal-judiciary	18.2%	2
Legal-science	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		
<i>skipped question</i>		

57. The main strengths of my Law School are:

<i>answered question</i>	9
<i>skipped question</i>	2

58. The main weaknesses of my Law School are:

<i>answered question</i>	6
<i>skipped question</i>	5

59. Please use this space to make any other comments on your Law School:

<i>answered question</i>	4
<i>skipped question</i>	7

SURVEY 3 – TEACHERS – 16 RESPONDENTS

1. My Law School values quality legal education		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	13.3%	2
Agree	20.0%	3
Strongly agree	66.7%	10
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

2. My Law School respects and attends to the diversity of students and their cultural and personal needs		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.7%	1
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	13.3%	2
Agree	40.0%	6
Strongly agree	40.0%	6
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

3. My Law School enables flexible learning paths		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.7%	1
Disagree	6.7%	1
Neutral	40.0%	6
Agree	40.0%	6
Strongly agree	6.7%	1
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

4. I do not discriminate students against on any ground		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	20.0%	3
Strongly agree	80.0%	12
<i>answered question</i>	15	

skipped question

1

5. My Law School has a publicly available strategy, policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	6.7%	1
Neutral	26.7%	4
Agree	40.0%	6
Strongly agree	26.7%	4
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

6. I have an opportunity to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.7%	1
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	6.7%	1
Agree	20.0%	3
Strongly agree	66.7%	10
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

7. My Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	13.3%	2
Neutral	40.0%	6
Agree	26.7%	4
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

8. My Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	6.7%	1
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	33.3%	5
Strongly agree	60.0%	9
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

9. My Law School has the necessary regulations on student admission, progression, recognition and certification

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	13.3%	2
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	46.7%	7
Strongly agree	40.0%	6
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

10. My Law School implements access policies, admission processes and criteria consistently and in a transparent manner

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	20.0%	3
Agree	53.3%	8
Strongly agree	26.7%	4
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

11. Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.7%	1
Disagree	6.7%	1
Neutral	33.3%	5
Agree	40.0%	6
Strongly agree	13.3%	2
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

12. I provide detailed feedback on student work

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	26.7%	4
Agree	60.0%	9
Strongly agree	13.3%	2
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

13. I provide this feedback promptly

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
----------------	------------------	----------------

Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	20.0%	3
Agree	66.7%	10
Strongly agree	13.3%	2
<i>answered question</i>		15
<i>skipped question</i>		1

14. This feedback is designed to help students clarify things they did not understand		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	6.7%	1
Agree	53.3%	8
Strongly agree	40.0%	6
<i>answered question</i>		15
<i>skipped question</i>		1

15. I am well qualified and competent		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	20.0%	3
Agree	60.0%	9
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>		15
<i>skipped question</i>		1

16. I am well organized and always prepared for classes		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	13.3%	2
Agree	40.0%	6
Strongly agree	46.7%	7
<i>answered question</i>		15
<i>skipped question</i>		1

17. I have the formal opportunity to evaluate my own performance as a law teacher		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	20.0%	3
Neutral	26.7%	4
Agree	33.3%	5

Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>		15
<i>skipped question</i>		1

18. I offer sufficient advice and support to students		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	6.7%	1
Agree	60.0%	9
Strongly agree	33.3%	5
<i>answered question</i>		15
<i>skipped question</i>		1

19. I am available for students to contact me when they need to		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	33.3%	5
Strongly agree	66.7%	10
<i>answered question</i>		15
<i>skipped question</i>		1

20. I may give good advice to students when they need to make study choices		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	66.7%	10
Strongly agree	33.3%	5
<i>answered question</i>		15
<i>skipped question</i>		1

21. My Law School prepares students adequately for a future legal career

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	6.7%	1
Neutral	13.3%	2
Agree	53.3%	8
Strongly agree	26.7%	4
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

22. I regularly use a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	20.0%	3
Agree	46.7%	7
Strongly agree	33.3%	5
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

23. I apply problem-based teaching and provide sufficient field for students to practice theory

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	13.3%	2
Neutral	20.0%	3
Agree	13.3%	5
Strongly agree	13.3%	5
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

24. I regularly encourage students to engage in the operation of the legal clinic in my Law School

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	6.7%	1
Neutral	26.7%	4
Agree	33.3%	5
Strongly agree	33.3%	5
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

25. I adequately explain key concepts to students

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	6.7%	1
Agree	73.3%	11
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

26. I am enthusiastic about the subject I am teaching

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	33.3%	5
Strongly agree	66.7%	10
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

27. I ensure my classes are interesting and intellectually stimulating

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	6.7%	1
Agree	46.7%	7
Strongly agree	46.7%	7
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

28. Adequate learning resources are constantly available for students to learn course content

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	26.7%	4
Agree	40.0%	6
Strongly agree	33.3%	5
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

29. I have stable access to the internet and other legal databases for research purposes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	26.7%	4
Neutral	13.3%	2
Agree	33.3%	5
Strongly agree	26.7%	4
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

30. My Law School is well organized and administers courses effectively

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	13.3%	2
Neutral	13.3%	2
Agree	53.3%	8
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

31. The timetabling of my classes works efficiently for students

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.7%	1
Disagree	20.0%	3
Neutral	40.0%	6
Agree	26.7%	4
Strongly agree	6.7%	1
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

32. Any changes in my courses or teaching are communicated effectively

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.7%	1
Disagree	13.3%	2
Neutral	13.3%	2
Agree	40.0%	6
Strongly agree	26.7%	4
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

33. I can access important information and data about the courses and students I teach

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	33.3%	5
Agree	46.7%	7
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

34. My Law School provides students with the opportunity to appeal against the evaluation result, which seems to be incorrect or unfair

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	13.3%	2
Neutral	33.3%	5
Agree	33.3%	5
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

35. My Law School has appropriate procedures to deal with students' complaints

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	20.0%	3
Neutral	33.3%	5
Agree	26.7%	4
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

36. Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted by my Law School

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	6.7%	1
Agree	73.3%	11
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

37. Programmes are reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	20.0%	3
Neutral	40.0%	6
Agree	26.7%	4
Strongly agree	13.3%	2
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

38. There are regular thought-provoking discussions during my seminars

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	66.7%	10
Strongly agree	33.3%	5
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

39. My Law School embraces flexible learning paths and recognizes competences gained outside formal curricula

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	20.0%	3
Neutral	26.7%	4
Agree	33.3%	5
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

40. My Law School respects academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	13.3%	2
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	26.7%	4
Agree	40.0%	6
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

41. My Law School has a Code of Conduct/Honor Code and implements it effectively

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	33.3%	5
Neutral	40.0%	6
Agree	13.3%	2
Strongly agree	13.3%	2
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

42. My Law School programs/courses have explicit intended learning outcomes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	6.7%	1
Neutral	20.0%	3
Agree	53.3%	8
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

43. My Law School programs/courses are designed by involving students and other stakeholders in the work

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	26.7%	4
Neutral	20.0%	3
Agree	40.0%	6
Strongly agree	13.3%	2
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

44. My Law School programs/courses include well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	13.3%	2
Neutral	26.7%	4
Agree	46.7%	7
Strongly agree	13.3%	2
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

45. My Law School encourages the student's sense of autonomy while ensuring adequate guidance and support from me

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	13.3%	2
Neutral	20.0%	3
Agree	46.7%	7
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

46. I am familiar with modern testing and examination methods and well-qualified to assess my progress

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	6.7%	1
Neutral	6.7%	1
Agree	53.3%	8
Strongly agree	33.3%	5
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

47. I assess students' progress based on the criteria for and method of assessment as well as criteria for marking published in advance

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	6.7%	1
Agree	60.0%	9
Strongly agree	33.3%	5
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

48. Where possible, I carry out students' progress assessment with a co-examiner(s)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	13.3%	2
Neutral	33.3%	5
Agree	40.0%	6
Strongly agree	13.3%	2
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

49. My Law School has and uses key performance indicators

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	6.7%	1
Neutral	33.3%	5
Agree	33.3%	5
Strongly agree	26.7%	4
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

50. My Law School gathers information about students' satisfaction with their programs

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	13.3%	2
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	40.0%	6
Agree	40.0%	6
Strongly agree	6.7%	1
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

51. Students are regularly well-prepared for my classes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	13.3%	2
Neutral	33.3%	5
Agree	53.3%	8
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

52. Students ask thought-provoking questions regularly during my sessions and encourage discussion

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	13.3%	2
Agree	60.0%	9
Strongly agree	26.7%	4
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

53. I encourage my students to give feedback on my lectures and/or seminars

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	6.7%	1
Neutral	13.3%	2
Agree	46.7%	7
Strongly agree	33.3%	5
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

54. I receive support from my Law School in developing my skills in this field

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	13.3%	2
Neutral	20.0%	3
Agree	46.7%	7
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

55. I assess my students' progress based on the criteria for and method of assessment as well as criteria for marking published in advance

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	80.0%	12
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

56. My Law School follows clear, transparent and fair process for staff recruitment and conditions of employment that recognise the importance of teaching

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	13.3%	2
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	26.7%	4
Agree	33.3%	5
Strongly agree	26.7%	4
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

57. The Law School offers me opportunities for and promotes my professional development

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.7%	1
Disagree	6.7%	1
Neutral	13.3%	2
Agree	40.0%	6
Strongly agree	33.3%	5
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

58. The Law School encourages my scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.7%	1
Disagree	6.7%	1
Neutral	20.0%	3
Agree	33.3%	5
Strongly agree	33.3%	5
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

59. The Law School encourages me to innovate with respect to teaching methods and use new technologies in legal research

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	13.3%	2
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	33.3%	5
Agree	33.3%	5
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

60. I have the opportunity to participate in developing/reviewing my Law School curriculum

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	6.7%	1
Neutral	13.3%	2
Agree	60.0%	9
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

61. I can use multimedia technologies when teaching in class

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	6.7%	1
Neutral	33.3%	5
Agree	40.0%	6
Strongly agree	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

62. My academic career depends primarily on my progress as a lecturer

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	6.7%	1
Disagree	6.7%	1
Neutral	13.3%	2
Agree	40.0%	6
Strongly agree	33.3%	5
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

63. My experience as a law teacher in the university

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
0-3 years	40.0%	6
4-7 years	26.7%	4
8-12 years	13.3%	2
12 years +	20.0%	3
<i>answered question</i>	15	
<i>skipped question</i>	1	

64. What (if any) interactive teaching methods do you use?*answered question* 11*skipped question* 5**65. The main strengths of my Law School are:***answered question* 11*skipped question* 5**66. The main weaknesses of my Law School are:***answered question* 10*skipped question* 6**67. Please use this space to make any other comments on your Law School:***answered question* 3*skipped question* 13

SURVEY 4 – ADMINISTRATION – 8 RESPONDENTS

1. My Law School values quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	12.5%	1
Strongly agree	62.5%	5
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

2. My Law School respects and attends to the diversity of students and their cultural and personal needs

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	50.0%	4
Strongly agree	25.0%	2
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

3. My Law School enables flexible learning paths

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	62.5%	5
Strongly agree	12.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

4. My Law School supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against the students or staff

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	37.5%	3
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

5. My Law School has publicly available strategy, policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	12.5%	1
Strongly agree	62.5%	5
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

6. There are opportunities for students to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	37.5%	3
Agree	12.5%	1
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

7. My Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

8. My Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

9. My Law School has all the necessary regulation on student admission, progression, recognition and certification

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	37.5%	0
Strongly agree	37.5%	0
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

10. My Law School implements access policies, admission processes and criteria consistently and in a transparent manner

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	37.5%	3
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

11. My Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

12. Students of my Law School receive detailed feedback on the work

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

13. Students of my Law School receive feedback promptly

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1

Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	37.5%	3
Strongly agree	25.0%	2
<i>answered question</i>		8
<i>skipped question</i>		0

14. Students receive feedback that helps them to clarify things they do not understand

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	50.0%	4
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	12.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>		8
<i>skipped question</i>		0

15. Law School teachers are well qualified and competent

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	50.0%	4
Strongly agree	25.0%	2
<i>answered question</i>		8
<i>skipped question</i>		0

16. Law School teachers are well organized and regularly prepared for classes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	37.5%	3
Agree	37.5%	3
Strongly agree	25.0%	2
<i>answered question</i>		8
<i>skipped question</i>		0

17. Students have the opportunity to evaluate their Law School teacher performances

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	12.5%	1
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	37.5%	3
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	12.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

18. Students receive sufficient advice and support with their studies

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	37.5%	3
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

19. I am able to contact law school teachers when I need to for administrative purposes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

20. Good advice is available for students when they need to make study choices

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	50.0%	4
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

21. Our legal education will prepare students adequately for a future legal career

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	37.5%	3
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

22. Law School teachers regularly use a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	50.0%	4
Strongly agree	12.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

23. Law School teachers use problem-based teaching methods with practice-oriented and skills-based learning

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	25.0%	2
Neutral	37.5%	3
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	12.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

24. I ensure that the operation of the legal clinic in my Law School is maintained

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	37.5%	3
Agree	37.5%	3
Strongly agree	12.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

25. Law School teachers adequately explain key concepts

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

26. Law School teachers are enthusiastic about the subject they are teaching

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	37.5%	3
Agree	12.5%	1
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

27. Our Law School education is interesting and intellectually stimulating for students

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	50.0%	4
Agree	0.0%	0
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

28. Adequate learning resources are constantly available for students to learn course materials

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	12.5%	1
Strongly agree	62.5%	5
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

29. My Law School has stable internet access and access to legal databases for research purposes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

30. My Law School is well organized and administers courses effectively

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	37.5%	3
Agree	0.0%	0
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

31. The timetabling of classes works efficiently for students

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	12.5%	1
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

32. The timetabling of classes works efficiently for teachers

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	12.5%	1
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	37.5%	3
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	12.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

33. Any changes in courses or teaching are communicated effectively to students and university

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	12.5%	1
Disagree	25.0%	2
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	12.5%	1
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

34. Important information and data about courses and student progress is available to faculty and students

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

35. My Law School regularly carries out assessment of teaching staff based on clear and fair criteria

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	37.5%	3
Agree	37.5%	3
Strongly agree	12.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

36. My Law School provides teachers with the opportunity to appeal against the evaluation result, which seem to be incorrect or unfair

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	62.5%	5
Agree	12.5%	1
Strongly agree	25.0%	2
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

37. My Law School provides students with the opportunity to appeal against the evaluation result, which seem to be incorrect or unfair

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	50.0%	4
Agree	12.5%	1
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

38. My Law School has appropriate procedures to deal with students' complaints

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

39. My Law School has appropriate procedures to deal with teachers' complaints

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	50.0%	4
Agree	12.5%	1
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

40. Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted by my Law School

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

41. Programmes are reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	12.5%	1
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	37.5%	3
Strongly agree	25.0%	2
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

42. There are regularly thought-provoking discussions during seminars

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	37.5%	3
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

43. My Law School embraces flexible learning paths and recognizes competences gained outside formal curricula

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	50.0%	4
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

44. My Law School respects academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	37.5%	3
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	25.0%	2
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

45. My Law School has a Code of Conduct/Honor Code and implements it effectively

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	25.0%	2
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	37.5%	3
Strongly agree	25.0%	2
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

46. My Law School programs/courses have explicit intended learning outcomes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

47. My Law School programs/courses are designed by involving students and other stakeholders in the work

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	12.5%	1
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	37.5%	3
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	12.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

48. My Law School programs/courses include well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	25.0%	2
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	0.0%	0
Strongly agree	62.5%	5
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

49. My Law School encourages students' sense of autonomy and ensures adequate guidance and support from the teacher

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	12.5%	1
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

50. The assessors in my Law School are familiar with modern testing and examination methods and well-qualified to assess students' progress

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

51. My Law School assesses progress based on the criteria for and method of assessment as well as criteria for marking published in advance

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	37.5%	3
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

52. Where possible, my Law School carries out progress assessment by more than one examiner

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	25.0%	2
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	37.5%	3
Strongly agree	25.0%	2
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

53. My Law School has and uses key performance indicators

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	37.5%	3
Agree	0.0%	0
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

54. My Law School gathers information about students' satisfaction with their programs

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	25.0%	2
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	37.5%	3
Strongly agree	12.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

55. Programs are regularly evaluated taking into account the changing needs of the society

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	12.5%	1
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	37.5%	3
Agree	12.5%	1
Strongly agree	25.0%	2
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

56. As an administrator I have adequate resources to effectively and efficiently carry out my responsibilities

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	37.5%	3
Agree	12.5%	1
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

57. The regulations for assessment in the Law School take into account mitigating circumstances

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	62.5%	5
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	12.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

58. Assessment carried out at my Law School is consistent, fairly applied to all students and in line with the stated procedures

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

59. A formal procedure for student appeals is in place in my Law School

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	25.0%	2
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	37.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

60. Academic career in my Law School primarily depends on the progress of an employee as a researcher and lecturer

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	12.5%	1
Neutral	12.5%	1
Agree	25.0%	2
Strongly agree	50.0%	4
<i>answered question</i>	8	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

61. The main strengths of my Law School are:

<i>answered question</i>	7
<i>skipped question</i>	1

62. The main weaknesses of my Law School are:

<i>answered question</i>	7
<i>skipped question</i>	1

63. Please use this space to make any other comments on your Law School:

<i>answered question</i>	2
<i>skipped question</i>	6

SURVEY 5 – EMPLOYERS – 2 RESPONDENTS

1. This Law School values quality legal education		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	50.0%	1
Agree	50.0%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

2. This Law School respects and attends to the diversity of students and their personal and cultural needs		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	50.0%	1
Agree	50.0%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

3. This Law School enables flexible learning paths		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	50.0%	1
Agree	50.0%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

4. This Law School supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against the students or staff		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	50.0%	1
Strongly agree	50.0%	1

<i>answered question</i>	2
<i>skipped question</i>	0

5. This Law School has publicly available strategy, policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	50.0%	1
Agree	50.0%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

6. There are opportunities for students to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	100.0%	2
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

7. This Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	50.0%	1
Agree	50.0%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

8. This Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	50.0%	1
Agree	50.0%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

9. This Law School has all the necessary regulation on student admission, progression, recognition and certification

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	50.0%	1
Agree	50.0%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

10. This Law School implements access policies, admission processes and criteria consistently and in a transparent manner

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	50.0%	1
Agree	50.0%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

11. Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	50.0%	1
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	50.0%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

12. Law School teachers are well qualified and competent

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	50.0%	1
Agree	50.0%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

13. Law School teachers are well organized and regularly prepared for classes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	100.0%	2
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

14. The legal education received by students from the University prepared them adequately for a future legal career

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	50.0%	1
Neutral	50.0%	1
Agree	0.0%	0
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

15. Law Graduates of the University have the required substantive knowledge (legal system, legislation, principles and doctrines) necessary for success in a legal career

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	100.0%	2
Agree	0.0%	0
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

16. Law Graduates of the University have the required practical skills (research, analysis, writing, communication, legal ethics; prevention conflict of interest) necessary for success in a legal career.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	50.0%	1
Neutral	50.0%	1
Agree	0.0%	0
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

17. This Law School is well organized and administers courses effectively

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	100.0%	2
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

18. This Law School has a good working relationship with the legal community.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	100.0%	2
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

19. This Law School regularly engages in projects in cooperation with the local legal community.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	50.0%	1
Agree	50.0%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

20. Teaching staff encourage students to gain practical knowledge and skills

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	50.0%	1
Agree	50.0%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>	2	
<i>skipped question</i>	0	

21. This Law School has an effective and practically oriented legal clinic which provides accessible opportunities for the students to participate in it

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	50.0%	1
Agree	50.0%	1
Strongly agree	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		2
<i>skipped question</i>		0

22. The main strengths of this Law School are:

<i>answered question</i>	0
<i>skipped question</i>	2

23. The main weaknesses of this Law School are:

<i>answered question</i>	0
<i>skipped question</i>	2

24. Please use this space to make any other comments on this Law School:

<i>answered question</i>	0
<i>skipped question</i>	2

**APPENDIX 4: MODEL PROTOCOL FOR CLASSROOM TEACHING OBSERVATION
CLASSROOM TEACHING OBSERVATION PROTOCOL**

Date: _____

Faculty member observed:

Course observed:

Rating scale: 1= very poor, 2= weak, 3= average, 4= good, 5= excellent, NA = Not applicable

CONTENT					
Main ideas are clear and specific	1	2	3	4	5
Sufficient variety in supporting information	1	2	3	4	5
Relevancy of main ideas was clear	1	2	3	4	5
Higher order thinking was required	1	2	3	4	5
Instructor related ideas to prior knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
Definitions were given for vocabulary	1	2	3	4	5
ORGANIZATION					
Introduction captured attention	1	2	3	4	5
Introduction stated organization of lecture	1	2	3	4	5
Effective transitions (clear, with summaries)	1	2	3	4	5
Clear organizational plan	1	2	3	4	5
Concluded by summarizing main ideas	1	2	3	4	5
Reviewed by connecting to previous classes	1	2	3	4	5
Previewed by connecting to future classes	1	2	3	4	5
INTERACTION					
Instructor questions at different levels	1	2	3	4	5
Sufficient wait time	1	2	3	4	5

Students asked questions	1	2	3	4	5	
Instructor feedback was informative	1	2	3	4	5	
Instructor incorporated student responses	1	2	3	4	5	
Good rapport with students	1	2	3	4	5	
VERBAL/NON-VERBAL						
Language was understandable	1	2	3	4	5	
Articulation and pronunciation clear	1	2	3	4	5	
Absence of verbalized pauses (er, ah, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	
Instructor spoke extemporaneously	1	2	3	4	5	
Accent was not distracting	1	2	3	4	5	
Effective voice quality	1	2	3	4	5	
Volume sufficient to be heard	1	2	3	4	5	
Rate of delivery was appropriate	1	2	3	4	5	
Effective body movement and gestures	1	2	3	4	5	
Eye contact with students	1	2	3	4	5	
Confident & enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	
USE OF MEDIA						
Presentation content Clear & well organized	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Visual aids can be easily read	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Instructor provided an outline/handouts	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Computerized instruction effective	1	2	3	4	5	NA
OTHER NOTES:						

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Threats to effectiveness:

Suggestions for improvement:

Additional remarks, if any:

--	--	--	--	--	--

OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS RATING:	1	2	3	4	5

METHODS USED BY THE INSTRUCTOR:

_____ Lecture _____ Brainstorming _____ Small Group Discussion

_____ Socratic Dialogue _____ Class Discussion _____ Role Play

_____ Panel Discussions _____ Problem Solving _____ Case Studies

_____ Handouts _____ White/Chalk Boards _____ Overhead Projector _____ PowerPoint

Expert's Name _____

Signature _____