



NEW JUSTICE PROGRAM

METHODOLOGY FOR INDEPENDENT, EXTERNAL, ON-SITE ASSESSMENT OF LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY IN UKRAINE

ACCORDING TO THE EUROPEAN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN THE
EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA (2015)

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

Authors of the first edition:

Delaine R. Swenson, Department Head of the Chair of International and American Law at the Faculty of Law, John Paul II Catholic University, Lublin, Poland
Finlay Young, Lawyer and Researcher

Authors of the amended edition:

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

KYIV
2017

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.

CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	4
II.	Executive Summary	6
III.	Methodology Description	8
	Annex A: Model Questions for Each Assessment Element	16
	Annex B: Model Questions for Interviews and Focus Group Discussions	24
	1. University Leadership and Administrators	24
	2. Law School Leadership and Administrators	25
	3. Teachers	27
	4. Students	28
	5. Alumni	29
	6. Employers	30
	7. Questions Related to Legal Clinical Education	31
	Annex C: Model Questionnaires for On-Line Surveys	33
	Survey 1: Students	33
	Survey 2: Graduates	37
	Survey 3: Teaching Staff	41
	Survey 4: Administrators	45
	Survey 5: Employers	49
	Annex D: Model Protocol for Classroom Teaching Observation	52
	Annex E: Model Schedule for On-Site Assessment Legal Education Quality Assessment	55
	Annex F: Biographies of Assessment Toolkit Developers	59

I. INTRODUCTION

This Methodology for Independent, External, On-Site Assessment of Legal Education Quality in Ukraine (Methodology) was developed in the framework of international technical assistance with support from the USAID New Justice Program¹ and is based on the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (2015) and adapted to the Ukrainian context.

The Methodology addresses Ukrainian legal education champions' request for a reliable toolkit for an objective assessment of legal education quality in Ukraine and development of a law school's internal quality assurance processes.

The draft Methodology that USAID FAIR Justice Project's international experts developed in 2014 became subject of analysis, review, and feedback of Ukrainian law schools² that underwent external assessments by international and local experts.

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.

The Methodology's assessment criteria proved their reliability and validity during the independent, external, on-site assessments of legal education quality at 1) Ivan Franko Lviv Law School in May 2014, 2) Yuri Fedkovych Chernivtsi Law School in May 2015, and 3) Odesa Law Academy School of Advocacy in March 2017.

The assessments resulted in expert reports with recommendations on how to improve the quality of legal education at the mentioned law schools specifically and highlighted, where relevant, issues and recommendations stemming from the national system of legal education more generally.

¹ The USAID New Justice Program (hereinafter – 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, USAID New Justice Program 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.

² Ivan Franko Lviv Law School, Yuri Fedkovych Chernivtsi Law School, and National University "Odesa Law Academy" School of Advocacy.

Having successfully tested the Methodology that offers unbiased assessment according clear and precise criteria for evaluation of key performance areas, including policies and procedures for internal quality assurance, admission and assessment of students, and quality assurance of teaching staff, the USAID FAIR Project presented it to the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (MOE), the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine (MOJ) and the leadership of leading Ukrainian law schools at an MOE-hosted roundtable discussion in May 2015.

The USAID New Justice Program sincerely hopes that the Methodology further improved after the NUOLA assessment will garner attention from the MOE, MOJ, and the Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance and Ukrainian law schools and will continue to serve as a tested, effective tool for law schools to improve the quality of legal education they provide.

The USAID New Justice Program expresses its deep appreciation for the fruitful cooperation to the Methodology developers, Prof. Andrii Mykhailovytch Boiko, LNU Law School Dean at the time of the first pilot assessment in May 2014, Prof. Petro Stanislavovytch Patsurkivskyi, CNU Law School Dean, Prof. Volodymyr Vasylovych Zavalniuk, NUOLA Rector, and NUOLA School of Advocacy Dean Mykola Mykhailovytch Stoianov, administrators, teachers, students, and graduates of the respective law schools and their employers for their enthusiasm and kind cooperation on the assessments implementation and the high level of their commitment to the modernization of legal education quality in Ukraine.

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Methodology paper identifies five key stakeholder groups that it urges should be involved in the assessment process: administrators and faculty leadership; teachers; students, graduates, and legal employers.

There is a variety of possible assessment methods that can be used during the assessment process, including the following:

- Computer-based surveys powered by Monkey Survey or Google Survey;
- Individual interviews;
- Focus group discussions;
- Site and classroom visits;
- Review of relevant documents, examinations, student papers and textbooks.

The criteria for quality assessment were adapted from the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area. The assessment criteria focus on the following ten key elements:

1. Policy 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.

Under each of these ten elements, certain desired optimal outcomes are listed to which the law school is compared. In the assessment report under each of these optimal outcomes are listed the key findings regarding that area and the specific recommendations that are the result of these key findings.

The recommendations in the assessment reports are divided into two groups: 1) those that can be implemented by the law school or university on their own and 2) those that will require a change in law or action/decisions /regulations by the Ministry of Education or other higher authorities.

The lessons learned when implementing the Methodology resulted in the following suggestions for future assessments:

- Distribute surveys at least three weeks before an on-site visit to allocate more time for data aggregation and analysis before proceeding with interviews and focus groups;
- Use a separate email for the on-line survey and make sure the expert responsible for

- on-line surveys reminds the respondents to fill in the survey form on time;
- Collect data from students of each year separately to be able to compare and contrast students' perceptions depending on their year of study;
 - Nominate in advance one team member to moderate interviews and focus group discussions so that he/she can prepare for this function; different team members can moderate different on-site activities;
 - Make sure that there is enough time (7-10 min.) between working sessions for a mental break, quick discussion, and interview/focus group discussion room management purposes;
 - Allocate some time at the end of a working day so that the project team can get together, quickly share their views and, discuss this day's findings, and systematize the information obtained during this day;
 - Try not to overuse respondents' attention while conducting the introductory part of each working meeting;
 - Conduct interviews first. Focus group discussions should follow the interviews, since this allows for better information management as well as creates momentum for generating new ideas;
 - Allocate enough time for informal communication with the faculty and students;
 - Stick to the questions tailored for interviews and focus group discussions and the questions' structure while moderating both interviews and focus group discussions;
 - Allocate the time for employers towards the end of a working week;
 - Allocate an additional time before the on-site assessment to review original or translated University / School statutes, key internal regulations and by-laws;
 - Ensure a greater spontaneity of visits or selection of interviewees;
 - Ensure a closer consultation with experts on scheduling on-site activities;
 - Interviews followed by focus groups might work better if there was time allocated for experts to compare their notes after interviews and then communicate to a different person from particular stakeholder group during focus group discussion;
 - End meetings on time before class visits so as not to interrupt an on-going class or, if possible, start the day with class visits and then continue with other meetings and activities;
 - Consider pre-assessment informal telephone/Skype conversations between school leadership and international and/or local expert(s) concerning structural understanding;
 - Review of monographs less important or helpful than more details of library access and functions, process of document/monograph evaluations of possible plagiarism and research depth;
 - Build some buffer time into schedule as meetings can run late.
 - Allocate one day or longer at end of on-site visit for experts to meet to outline report, assign section responsibilities, and set draft/final deadlines.

II. METHODOLOGY DESCRIPTION

A. INTRODUCTION

This modern perception-based Methodology for external on-site legal education quality assessment is developed, and is regularly updated, in line with international and European standards adapted to the Ukrainian context and designed to assess legal education quality at a Ukrainian law school.

B. OBJECTIVES

The external assessment seeks to articulate best practices, providing a basis for future assessments in Ukraine. Drawing on the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), and in particular - its revised version of May 2015, it provides for the following:

- Agreeing on aims and objectives with the subject institution;
- Relying on explicitly agreed criteria, applied consistently;
- Focusing on achieving agreed aims and objectives;
- Producing an assessment report that is clear and readily accessible to the intended readership;
- Providing recommendations for subsequent action;
- Being essentially collaborative in nature, seeking to engage law school and wider actors in constructive dialogue focused on quality improvement.

By adopting this Methodology the assessment team seeks to use 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 Methodology, which is designed to be clear, concise, and readily accessible to the intended readership, is to provide practical recommendations on how to assess the quality of legal education at a given law school.

C. STRUCTURE

This Methodology considers overall legal education quality using ten key elements and institutional criteria based on and adapted from the ESG, specifically:

Element 1: Policy for Internal Quality Assurance;

Element 2: Design and Approval of Programs;

Element 3: Student-Centered Learning, Teaching and Assessment;

Element 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification;

Element 5: Teaching Staff;

Element 6: Curriculum, Learning Resources and Student Support;

Element 7: Information Management and Administration;
Element 8: Public Information;
Element 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programs;
Element 10: Cyclical External Quality Assurance.

The Methodology is structured around these ten elements and associated criteria and draws on a variety of primary and secondary research sources.

D. ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT

1. Secondary Research Sources:

- Student-Centered Learning. Toolkit for students, staff and higher education institutions.
- Guidelines for Peer Assessment of Student-Centered Learning.
- Model of Integrated Academic Performance and Accountability System for HEI, Shawyun Teay, 2015.
- “Concept of Development of Higher Legal Education in Ukraine” proposed by the ABA ROLI.
- “The Status of Legal Education and Science in Ukraine” - a report developed in 2009 under the auspices of the OSCE.
- “European Standards and Guidelines for Internal Quality Assurance within Higher Education Institutions” - a paper developed thanks to the European Commission.
- “Standards for Approval of Law Schools and Legal Education Reform Legal Education Reform Index Factors” - an ABA-developed document.
- “Concept Paper on Education Reform” - a paper designed owing to the IRF support.
- Questionnaire developed by the American Councils’ project on strengthening academic integrity in Ukraine, 2016
- Law of Ukraine ‘On Higher Education’.
- Regulation on Accreditation Commission in Ukraine.
- Regulation on State Education Inspection in Ukraine.
- State Requirements to Accreditation of Higher Educational Establishments.
- Translated documents from law schools under assessment (where possible), including:
 - i.** University/Law School Charter
 - ii.** By-Laws regulating operation of departments, divisions, centers
 - iii.** Code of University/Law School Community Ethics
 - iv.** Admissions criteria/process documents
 - v.** Assessment and Evaluation protocols, examples
 - vi.** Law School curricula and syllabi
 - vii.** Basic information (number of students, annual intake, number of faculty, etc.)
 - viii.** Information regarding the law school advancement process

- ix. Sample of student assessment methods (exams) or student produced material (papers)
- x. Information on law school governance and the role of the University in the governance process (i.e. samples of relevant policies and procedures)

2. Primary Research Methods:

1) Surveys/questionnaires

- Separate surveys are to be used to generate data on current students, law school graduates, teachers, law school administrators and legal employers perceptions of legal education quality both at the law school under assessment and, where appropriate, in Ukraine generally.
- Surveys are to be anonymous to encourage frank, constructive responses.
- Surveys are to be structured around the criteria/indicators proposed below.
- Surveys are to be disseminated and collected in advance of the field trip.
- These baseline surveys could also be used in a future end line study following quality improvement project implementation.

Surveys are intended to generate data from current students, law school graduates, teachers, local bar associations and law school administrators concerning perceptions of legal education quality at a law school under assessment. Surveys are designed in a way to allow for anonymous filling out by using an online system, for instance powered by Monkey Survey or Google Survey, to encourage frank and constructive responses. Questions are structured around the agreed criteria and indicators. The five point “Likert Scale” (participants state whether they strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree with the posited statement) is proposed to allow for simple aggregation and comparison of responses.

2) Key Informant Interviews

- These are to be semi-structured, using both standardized close-ended questions and standardized open-ended questions.
- Semi-structured interviews are to allow for non-standardized follow-up questions that may vary between key informants, so as to further explore key points arising in surveys, questionnaires.

Key informant interviews with 1-2 persons from each key informant group are designed to collect information from all the five stakeholder groups: administrators, teachers, students, graduates, and legal employers, who are to be interviewed during a site visit. These interviews are semi-structured, using a mixture of standardized close-ended questions and standardized open-ended questions. Semi-structured interviews allow for non-standardized follow-up questions so as to further explore key points arising in surveys and questionnaires.

3) Focus Group Discussions (FGD)

- FGDs are to provide an opportunity for assessment team members to gather more detailed information about particular issues and themes arising from the surveys and interviews.
- Typical FGD would engage 8-10 persons.
- Proposed participants in individual FGDs are to include teachers, students, graduates, and legal employers.

4) **Classroom Observations**

- Assessment team members are to observe classroom teaching at a law school under evaluation. A variety of types and levels of classes are to be selected for observation.
- A simple standardized assessment protocol is to be used to assess the teaching methodologies employed and ensure consistent analysis of classes (see Annex D).

E. INTERVIEWEES

1. **University**

- Rector and relevant Vice Rectors who deal with law school issues and finances.
- Administrators who deal with law school issues.
- Directors or other kinds of administrators who deal with University wide issues that have an impact on the law school under assessment, i.e. admissions, university development, international relations; quality control; testing and teaching methods, assessments and training; etc.

2. **Law School**

- Dean and Vice Deans
- Chairs/Sub-department Heads
- Professors
- Associate Professors
- Assistants/Adjuncts
- PhD Students, including those who work as assistant professors
- Specialized faculty members, including those dealing with clinical education, internships, thesis supervision, etc.

3. **Students**

- First Year Bachelor
- Upper Year Bachelor
- Master Students
- PhD Students

- Legal clinic students
- Relevant student groups if not mentioned above

4. Alumni

- Last year graduates
- Within 3 years
- 3-6 years
- Older alumni

5. Legal Employers

- Public: prosecutors, chief judges and chief judicial administrators, judges, law enforcement officials, administration officials, etc.
- Private: representatives of large firms, medium firms, small firms, sole practitioners, representatives of non-governmental organizations, including professional associations of lawyers.

F. RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO SCOPE OF ASSESSMENT AND PROPOSED CRITERIA

The assessment is to consider overall legal education quality as relying on ten key elements adapted from the ESG 2015. Institutional criteria are proposed under each key element.

Element 1: Policy for Internal Quality Assurance:

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

1.2 Institution has a culture that recognizes the importance of quality, and quality assurance in education and acknowledges that the responsibility for quality assurance rests with individual administrators, faculty, students, and other related stakeholders.

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

Element 2: Design and Approval of Programs:

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

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

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.

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

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

Element 3: Student-Centered 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.

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

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.

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

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

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

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

Element 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification:

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

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

4.3 Institution employs multiple types of testing methods, such methods are valid (test what is sought to be tested), reliable (similar performances are graded similarly) and fair (no unfair surprises or processes).

4.4 Institution assesses and awards credit for practical legal education.

Element 5: Teaching Staff:

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

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

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.

5.4. Institution promotes teaching excellence and variety of interactive teaching

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

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

Element 6: Curriculum, Learning Resources and Student Support:

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

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.

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, counselors and other advisers, as well as administrative staff.

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

Element 7: Information Management and Administration:

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

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

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

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

Element 8: Public Information:

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.

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.

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

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

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.

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

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.

10.2 Institution promotes self-assessment prior to each external assessment

G. ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTATION

- 1) Quality of Legal Education On-Line Anonymous Surveys:
 - a. Students
 - b. Graduates
 - c. Law Teachers
 - d. Law School Administrators
 - e. Legal Employers

- 2) Key Informant Interview Questions
 - a. Students
 - b. Graduates
 - c. Law Teachers
 - d. Law School Administrators
 - e. Legal Employers

- 3) Focus Group Discussion Notes

- 4) Classroom Teaching Observation Protocol

ANNEX A: MODEL QUESTIONS FOR EACH ASSESSMENT ELEMENT

KEY QUESTIONS FOR EACH ASSESSMENT ELEMENT

Element 1: Policy for Internal Quality Assurance

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

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.

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 Questions:

- What do you consider as the key elements of a quality legal education?
- What are your priorities for improvement of quality within the law school?
- Does the law school have a strategic planning process where specific aims are articulated and quality improvement is the focus?
- Vision for the law school: 3 years, 5 years, long term.

Reviewers might consider making this a future requirement of law schools. That a law school might be required to provide a written document on its vision or the law school in three, five years, and that this written document should be supplied to the experts prior to the site visit.

- Are the perspectives of students sought in the process of quality improvement?
- What are the main barriers to the improvement of legal education quality in Ukraine?
- Tell us about your role in the law school?
- Law school as an academic institution or lawyer training institution - balance of the two.
- Is there a legal clinic in the structure of the law school and, if yes, how does it operate?
- Is there a Legal Education Quality Assurance Unit and, if yes, how does it function?

Element 2: Design and Approval of Programs

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

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

1.3. 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.

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

1.5. Institution should provide diverse and meaningful individual course electives for students to self-select which constitutes or exceeds the required minimum of 25% electives.

Key Questions:

- What degrees does the law school offer its students?
- What are the respective purposes and differences between these degrees?
- How does the law school monitor and review its programs?
- What key (compulsory) structure issues lie in framework of program development?
- How can the law school programs be adjusted?
- How does the curriculum encompass practical aspects of the future legal profession?
- Does the curriculum prepare students for legal profession in general or it has specific elements aimed to prepare students for the careers in various sectors (commercial, governmental, civil society, academic)?
- Are the values of legal ethics and respect for human rights incorporated into curriculum? In what way?
- Does every syllabus consider issues of legal profession ethics and human rights? In what way?
- Does the institution provide the opportunity for students to freely elect separate courses upon their unrestricted choice?
- Is the provision about electives set out in any of internal law school regulations? What exactly?
- What ratio of electives does the law school propose?
- How is the list of electives formed?
- Starting with what year may students elect the courses?
- How do the students find out about the suggested electives?
- How is the process of course election organized?

Element 3: Student-Centered Learning, Teaching and Assessment

- 3.1.** Institution develops and delivers its programs and assessment in a way that encourages students to actively participate in learning process.
- 3.2.** Students are taught and trained in a way that responds the demands of professional legal ethics.
- 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
- 3.4.** Institution students are assessed using published criteria, regulations and procedures, which are applied consistently and take into account mitigating circumstances.
- 3.5.** Students have possibility to anonymously evaluate the courses and teachers, on a regular and systematic basis.
- 3.6.** Institution secures appropriate and formal procedures to deal with students' complaints and appeals.
- 3.7.** Institution recognizes the important role of the students in developing and operating a comprehensive University code of conduct.

Key Questions:

- Which modes of education delivery and pedagogical methods does the institution use?
- What kinds of guidance and support may students expect from their teachers?
- How does the mechanism for the resolution of students' complaints work?
- Could you explain how the principle of student autonomy is implemented in the institution?
- Can students suggest their own topics for papers? Can they in any way influence on the paper topic formulation?
- How can students in advance access the criteria for assessment and marking?
- Are students proposed to evaluate each course during their studying?
- In what way can the students evaluate the course / quality of teaching?
- In what way are the students' feedbacks on courses / quality of teaching considered by the law school administration?
- Does the institution provide trainings on soft-skills? What are they? When are they taught?
- How does the institution balance theoretical and practical aspects of the discipline / course?
- Is there a Law School Code of Conduct? In what way is the Code of Conduct developed?
- Who, when and in what way informs students of the rules of conduct?
- Are students or a student committee engaged to suggest updates and amendments to the Code of Conduct?
- Institution recognizes and supports an ethical learning community as an essential component of student learning and support.

Element 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification

- 4.1.** Institution students are admitted, progressed, recognized and certified via a transparent, fair, and meritocratic process.
- 4.2.** Institution puts in place both processes and tools to collect, monitor and act on information on student progression.
- 4.3.** Institution employs multiple types of testing methods, valid, reliable and fair.
- 4.4.** Institution assesses and awards credit for practical legal education.

Key Questions:

- Does the law school apply pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of the student "life cycle", e.g. student admission, progression, recognition and certification?
- Explain the process of how a student gains admission to the law school.
- What is the law school looking for in prospective candidates?
- Is the admissions process effective in identifying the strongest candidates?
- What is the proportion of applications to admissions?
- How is the number of admitted students determined?
- Why do students apply to study law at the law school under assessment?
- What methods are used to assess students at the law school?

- How does the law school's grading system work?
- How does the law school ensure that the grading and demands of different professors and courses are consistent?
- How does the law school monitor and act on information concerning student progression?
- What information is included in graduation documentation?
- How are tests and other methods of assessment developed?
- Does testing and assessment aim to make students apply their analytical skills? How is this reached?
- Is there any controlling or supervising division that takes control over testing quality? How does it work?
- Do students receive credits for participation in legal clinic / moot courts / other practical legal education projects?

Element 5: Teaching Staff

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

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

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.

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

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

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

Key Questions:

- How are law teachers selected to teach at the school?
- What are the different professional ranks of law teachers at the university?
- Are there formal academic requirements for law teachers?
- Once selected, is there any program of continuing assessment of law teachers?
- What opportunities for the teachers' development and career does the law school provide?
- Do students have a role to play in the assessment of law teachers?
- Do law teachers have formal requirements to publishing academic work alongside their teaching?
- Preparation of faculty - academic and teaching methods.
- What teaching methods do faculty most rely upon in their teaching?
- Are there other methods you would like to see developed in the law school?
- Are teachers free to choose teaching methods for their courses and programs?
- Are teachers encouraged by the law school to use innovative methods in their teaching (for example, problem-based learning)? If so, in what way are they encouraged?
- What technologies do teachers use for educational process?

- Do teachers have resources and opportunities to improve their teaching skills? What exactly?
- Is there an international relations department in the law school?
- How are teachers informed about international exchange or other educational, scholarship, or internship opportunities?
- Does the law school support and promote participation of its teachers in international educational programs? In what way?
- How many teachers have participated in international educational programs during the last two-three years? What kind of programs?
- Can a teacher influence the decision-taking process at the law school? How exactly?
- What way is the faculty / law school involved in university governance?
- Is there the Academic Council at the law school? What is its competence?

Element 6: Curriculum, Learning Resources and Student Support

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

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.

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.

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

Key Questions:

- How is the curriculum at the law school designed?
- What are the intended outcomes of the law school's curriculum?
- Do students have a choice regarding which courses they pursue?
- Are their full and part time options?
- What are the main learning resources relied upon by students?
- Is there specific library with legal literature in the law school or the students use general University library for their learning?
- Is there any digital learning management system incorporated by the law school for the studying process (for example, Moodle, Edmodo, Blackboard etc.)? If yes – to what extent and for what purposes is it used? Do all students, teachers and staff have to be registered in this system in order to be eligible for the law school studying process?
- To what extent are computers and legal databases used in legal education at the law school underassessment?
- Role of the law school's sub-departments/chairs in academic and student affairs
- Independence of sub-departments, relationship with the law school and the university.
- Do the law school curricula, material and human support address the needs of a diverse

student population (such as mature, part-time, employed and international students as well as students with disabilities)? In what way?

- Can you state that the educational environment in your law school is flexible and student-centered? How can this be seen?
- How does the law school inform students about the available and accessible facilities and other means of support?
- How are students informed about international exchange or other educational, scholarship or internship opportunities?
- Does the law school support and promote participation of its students in international educational programs? In what way?
- How many students have participated in international educational programs during the last two-three years? What kind of programs?

Element 7: Information Management and Administration

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.

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

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

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

Key Questions:

- How is the administration of the law school structured?
- How could the administration of the law school be strengthened?
- How does the law school collect, manage and use information? (Online? Paper-based?)
- Who is responsible for managing information and data at the law school?
- Does the law school have sufficient resources to achieve its goals in information management and administration?
- How do students access to key information about their studies and other activities (grades, courses etc.)?
- Is there anybody to monitor if the students are well informed of general important as well as every-day educational issues?
- Who does the student address in order to find out information about educational process? In what way?
- How promptly does the student receive the information?
- What instruments or procedures does the law school use to communicate the information directly to students?
- What information is delivered to the students directly?

Element 8: Public Information

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.

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.

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 Questions:

- Does the law school have a website? Who runs it?
- How does the law school disseminate information about its study and other activities? On its web site? Responds to the information requests?
- What information regarding its programs and other study activities is published on the university web site?
- What information would the law school like to make publicly available?
- How is the information selected for publishing?
- Who is responsible for the proper publishing of the information?
- How often is the public information updated?
- Who is responsible for publishing of papers and dissertations?
- Are such papers and dissertations publicly and freely available?
- Are there any time limitations on how long published papers and dissertations are hosted publicly?

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

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.

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

Key Questions:

- How often does the law school monitor its programs?
- Does the law school have specific requirements or regulations for the periodic monitoring and review of programs?
- Are there any leading criteria for the periodical program improvement?
- Are students, legal employers and other stakeholders involved into the process of program monitoring and review?
- Are the students, legal employers and other stakeholders' needs considered when the program is being updated?
- Do other teachers take part in the review of particular programs that fall within the

specialty of the teacher or are interdisciplinary?

- Is there any other mechanism of peer review as a part of programs review?
- How does the law school communicate its intention to update or amend the program to the students, legal employers and other relevant stakeholders?
- Does the law school publicly communicate the changes? In what way?

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.

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

Key Questions:

- Is the law school subject to external quality assurance?
- What stakeholders and instruments are engaged for the external quality assurance?
- Does the law school undergo self-assessment prior to an external assessment?
- What instruments are used for self-assessment?
- Is there any specific department or division, etc. responsible and competent to conduct self-assessment? What is its structure? To whom does it report?
- In what way are the recommendations based on the internal and external assurance considered and taken into account?
- Are there any specific procedures for the implementation of such recommendations?
- Does the law school monitor progress gained since the previous internal and/or external quality assurance?
- Are the methodology and instruments for the external quality assurance updated and amended each time when such assessment takes place?

Other Questions & Considerations:

- How much control does the law school have over its budget?
- How is this budget allocated?
- Does the law school have the facility to generate its own funds?
- How do law students fund their education?
- How is the cost of legal education at the law school determined?
- Law school control vs. university wide policies and procedures
- Role of the law school in the university context.
- Centralized services available to law students (all students).
- Local & central authorities, civil society organizations, businesses and the law school.

ANNEX B: MODEL QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

1. Interviews and focus groups with university leadership and administrators (rector, vice-rectors, heads of university-wide divisions, etc.)

1. What is the structure of the university? (general, 7.1³)
2. What is the balance of governance between the university and law school administrations? (general)
3. What governance decisions are decided by the faculty (school)? (general)
4. How much control over the law school and other schools does the university administration have? (5.6)
5. How is the rector of the institution appointed / elected? (general)
6. How are the deans and deputy deans appointed / elected? (general)
7. What governance and management bodies has the institution established? What are their powers and competences? (general, 1.3; 4.1; 5.2; 5.6; 7.1-7.3; 9.2)
8. How are the educational programs developed and approved? (2.1)
9. How often and on what reasons are the programs revised? (1; 3.5, 7.4; 9)
10. Are students involved into the process of curricula and educational programs updating and revision? In what way? (7.2; 9.2)
11. Does the institution promote peer review mechanisms when designing study programs? (1.2, 2.1)
12. Do the curricula consider diverse educational programs: individual schedules, opportunities to elect separate courses individually, distant study, etc.? How? (2.3; 3.3; 6.1, 6.3)
13. May students elect courses on their own? How many? May they also choose courses from other departments (schools)? (2.5)
14. How are candidates for teachers selected and appointed? (5.2)
15. What is the average workload per one teacher? (5.1)
16. What tasks are usually set out for a teacher? What responsibilities (academic, scientific work, other activities with students, additional volunteer workload – for example, membership in various sections, internal divisions etc.)? (5.1, 5.3)
17. Does the institution consider possibilities for the teachers who issued their own monographs in specific subjects to develop their own specialized courses for study curriculum? (5.1, 5.3)
18. Does the institution propose teachers to improve their teaching skills (variety of teaching methods, proper application and modernization of teaching methods, usage of new technologies, databases, online platforms, etc.) on regular and systematic bases? How is this process organized? (3.3; 5.1, 5.3, 5.4)
19. Is there a specifically established department or division in the institution responsible for the quality of teaching methods? (3.3; 5.3, 5.4)

³³ Hereinafter higher education quality assessment criteria are indicated to which the question relates.

20. What methods of students' assessment and progression are applied? (3.1, 3.4; 4.1-4.3)
21. How does the institution monitor the quality of assessment methods? (1.3; 4.1-4.3)
22. Do the teachers have to report and if so – whom to – about teaching and evaluation methods they apply during their courses? (4.3)
23. How does the institution monitor individual student progress? (4.1, 4.2)
24. How is students' self-government designed in your university? (1.3; 3.7)
25. What powers and competences are given to the students' self-government? (1.3; 3.7)
26. Is there the department of foreign relations? What are its functions? (5.5; 6.4)
27. How does the institution support participation of the teacher staff and students in international programs? (5.5; 6.4)
28. Does the institution encourage teaching and studying of the normative curricula courses in foreign languages? (5.5; 6.1, 6.4)
29. How is the human rights issue considered in your institution's curricula? (2.4; 3.3)
30. How is the issue of professional ethics considered in your institution's curricula? (2.4; 3.2)
31. Does the institution conduct self-assessment? How regularly?(1; 10.2)
32. Is there any specified body established by the institution to manage the process of self-assessment? (1; 10.2)
33. Describe in general the university's policy of legal education quality assurance. (1.2, 1.3)
34. Does the institution provide possibilities for teachers and students to anonymously evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the institution's administration? How? (1)
35. Does the institution provide possibilities for students to anonymously evaluate their study courses? How? (3.5, 7.2)
36. How does the institution communicate information to the staff and students? (7.2)
37. Does the institution use any learning management system (for instance, Moodle, EduBrite, Canvas, etc.)? How intensely is it used? (7.3, 7.4)
38. Who is responsible for collecting and analysis of information about study programs and other activities? (7.4)
39. Who is responsible for the public information management? (7.1; 8.1)
40. What are the responsibilities of such person? (8.2)
41. If you could change or improve three things in your university/law school – what would they be? (general)

2. Interviews and focus groups with the law school leadership and administrators (dean, deputy deans, chairs, heads of law school-wide divisions, etc.)

1. What is the structure of the law school? (general)
2. What governance decisions are decided by the law school? (5.6)
3. How are the study programs designed and developed? (2.1)
4. Are students, legal employers and other shareholders involved in the process of curricula and educational programs updating and revision? In what way? (7.2; 9.2)

5. Does the law school promote peer review mechanisms when designing study programs? (1.2; 2.1)
6. Do the curricula consider diverse educational programs: individual schedules, opportunities to elect separate courses, distant study etc.? How? (2.3; 3.3; 6.1, 6.3)
7. May students elect courses on their own? How many? May they also choose courses from other departments (schools)? (2.5)
8. What is the average workload per one teacher? (1; 5.1)
9. What tasks are usually set out for a teacher? What responsibilities (academic, scientific work, other activities with students, additional volunteer workload – like membership in various sections, internal divisions etc.)? (1; 5.1)
10. Does the law school consider to provide teachers having published monographs with the opportunities to prepare their own specialized courses within study programs (3.3; 5.1, 5.3, 5.4)
11. What is courses ratio per year? How many courses per year do students study? How many theoretical and practical disciplines are taught on different study years? (2.2)
12. How does the law school monitor the quality of assessment methods? (1.3, 4.3)
13. Do the teachers have to report and if so – to whom about teaching and evaluation methods they apply during their courses? (4.3)
14. How does the law school monitor individual student progress? (4.1, 4.2)
15. How does the law school support participation of the teaching staff and students in international programs? (5.5; 6.4)
16. Does the law school encourage teaching and studying of the normative curricula courses in foreign languages? (5.5; 6.4)
17. How is the human rights issue considered in your law school? This question relates to both: law school policy of respect to human rights among all stakeholders, including teaching staff and students and human rights component in study courses and programs as part of human rights education (2.5; 3.2, 3.3)
18. How is the issue of legal professional ethics considered in your law school? (2.4, 3.2)
19. Does the law school teach students any soft skills? (6.2)
20. How does the law school prepare students for their future careers? (6.2)
21. Does the law school cooperate with local prosecutor offices, judiciary, bar associations, other private lawyers or companies to set base for students practice? (6.2)
22. Does the law school promote various law students' competitions? What exactly? (2.2; 3.1; 5.3)
23. Does the law school support and / or encourage students to participate in law students' competitions? (2.2; 3.1; 5.3)
24. Do students receive motivation or credits for participating in law students' competitions? (4.4)
25. Does the law school conduct self-assessment and, if so, how regularly? (1; 10.2)
26. Does the law school introduce possibility for teachers and students to anonymously evaluate the efficiency of law school administration activity and operating? How? (1)
27. Does the law school introduce possibility for students to anonymously evaluate study

courses? How? (3.5; 7.2)

28. How does the law school communicate information to the staff and students? (7.2)

29. Does the law school use any learning management system (for example, Moodle, EduBrite, Canvas etc.)? How intensely is it used? (7.3, 7.4)

30. Who is responsible for collecting and analysis of information about study programs and other activities? (7.4)

31. How is students' self-government designed in your law school? (1.3)

32. Is there a law school students' council? How is it elected? (1.3, 5.6)

33. What powers and competences are given to the students' self-government? Where are these stipulated? (1.3; 3.6, 3.7; 5.6; 7.2; 9.2; 10.2)

34. If you could change or improve three things in your law school – what would they be? (other)

3. Interviews and focus groups with faculty

1. What was the process used for hiring you to teach at the university/law school? (5.2)

2. What courses do you teach? (general)

3. What is your average workload? (5.1)

4. What other duties besides teaching itself do you have? Are you paid for them? (5.1, 5.3, 5.4)

5. Do you coach or supervise any students or students' teams who participate in law students' competitions? (3.3; 5.3; 6.3)

6. Do you receive enough of material support and facilities from the law school (teaching and learning equipment, databases, space at your chair room etc.)? (5.1, 5.4)

7. Have you ever had to buy materials, study materials or equipment when it was supposed to be provided by the university (discs, paper for printer, books, stationery)?(5.1, 5.4)

8. Does the law school or institution provide you with access to scientific databases and resources you need to conduct your scientific research and organizing teaching on a quality level? (5.1, 5.3, 5.4)

9. Does the law school encourage and/or financially support your participation in external conferences, seminars, workshops or other programs? (5.1, 5.4, 5.5)

10. If you gain a PhD on your specific topic and write a monograph – will the law school / university allow you to develop your own specialized course on that topic and suggest it as an elective, for example? Is it prescribed by any internal regulation? (5.1, 5.4)

11. Have you participated in any international programs as a teacher? (5.5)

12. Where do you get information about the opportunities of international exchange or internship programs? (5.5, 7.3)

13. What teaching methods do you use for your lecturing? (3.3; 5.4; 6.1, 6.2)

14. What teaching methods do you use for your seminars, tutorials etc? (3.3; 5.4; 6.1, 6.2)

15. How do you communicate with your students beyond classroom activities? (3.3; 6.3)

16. Do you use any management learning system (for instance, Moodle, EduBrite, Canvas,

etc.)? To what extent? (3.3; 6.3)

17. How do you develop your syllabi? (2.1-2.3)

18. Who approves the syllabi? (2.1)

19. How often do you have to review your syllabi? Who controls this? (1; 7.4; 8.1, 8.2; 9)

20. How do you consider human rights and legal professional ethics issues in your syllabi and teaching? (2.4; 3.2)

21. How do you get informed of the university/law school decisions or regulations? (7.3)

22. If you could change or improve three things in your law school – what would they be? (other)

4. Interviews and focus groups with students

1. Why did you decide to enter this university / law school? (general)

2. What department are you studying at? (general)

3. What was the main reason for you to choose your specialty/specialization/major? (2.3; 8.1, 8.2)

4. What year of study are you in? (general)

5. If you had an opportunity to choose your specialty/specialization/major now, would you choose the one you study now? (other)

6. Does the university's infrastructure meet the demands of your specialty/specialization/major specifics and your expectations? (6.3)

7. Do you live in a dormitory and, if so, how do you see this experience? (6.3)

8. What courses do you find the most practical? Why? (6.2; 7.4)

9. What courses you feel like being useless? Why? (6.2; 7.4)

10. Do you have opportunity to elect courses? Would you like to? (2.5)

11. Do you attend any courses taught in foreign language? Do you receive credits for them? (6.2, 6.4)

12. How do you contact your teacher if you have questions concerning your study? (3.3; 6.3)

13. Are you satisfied with teaching methods at your classes? Why?(3.3; 5.4; 6.1, 6.2)

14. Do you feel that evaluation and assessment of your study progress is fair, transparent and impatient? (4.1, 4.2)

15. What methods of assessment are used at your courses? Are you satisfied with such methods?(3.4; 4.2)

16. Do you always understand how professors evaluate/grade students' work/performance? (3.4; 4.1-4.3)

17. How clear are the tasks given by your professors? (4.1, 4.3)

18. Do your professors always give enough time to complete your assignments during classes or exams, to write your papers, course works or diploma works? (3.4; 4.1, 4.3)

19. Do your professors always provide you with their feedback on completed tasks, papers, course works or diploma works? (3.3, 6.3)

20. Do you have access to (legal) databases and other sources you need for your studying

- and academic research? (6.3)
21. Can you say that your classrooms are equipped well enough to make your studying effective and interesting throughout the class? (6.3)
 22. Have you participated in any international programs? (6.4)
 23. Did the law school or university support you financially to participate in such programs? (6.4)
 24. Have you had any training on soft skills? What were they? (6.2)
 25. Can you find all relevant information concerning the law school or institution promptly? Where? (8)
 26. Do you think the website of your law school / institution is useful and well organized? (7; 8)
 27. Is your timetable comfortable and organized well in order to get prepared for the classes? (2.2, 3.3)
 28. Do you personally take part in students' self-government? How do you find this experience? (1.3; 3.6, 3.7; 5.6; 7.2; 9.2; 10.2)
 29. What do you know about students' self-government in your law school and institution? (1.3; 3.6, 3.7; 5.6; 7.2; 9.2; 10.2)
 30. What aspects of your studying would you like to be able to change? (1.3; 3.6, 3.7; 5.6; 7.2; 9.2; 10.2)
 31. If you have things to complain about – who, with authority, would you speak to? (3.6)
 32. Does the administration deal with students complains or other issues addressed promptly and effectively? (3.6; 6.2)
 33. If you consider that you have been evaluated with prejudice or some personal issues prevented teacher from assessing you properly – are there any procedures you may apply to appeal the grade? How effective are they? (3.6; 6.2)
 34. Where do you perform your annual practice? (2.2, 2.3; 6.2)
 35. Do you think the curriculum practice is well organized and really practical? (2.2, 2.3; 6.2)
 36. Do you feel prepared enough for your future career as a lawyer? (2.2, 2.3, 2.4; 3.2; 6.2)
 37. Do you have any opportunity to evaluate each course anonymously? In what way? If not, would you like to have such opportunities? (3.5)
 38. Do you have an opportunity to address the law school and university administration easily in case you have questions to them? (3.6; 7.2)
 39. If you could change or improve three things in your law school – what would they be? (other)

5. Interviews and focus groups with alumni

1. What department (school) did you study at? (general)
2. When did you graduate? (general)
3. Where do you work now? (general)
4. Was the job(s) you had connected with your specialty/specialization/major? (6.2)
5. Can you say that you gained profound theoretical knowledge in the course of your

- studies? (2)
6. Can you say that you gained enough practical skills for your future in the course of your studies? (6.2)
 7. What courses were the most practical? Why? (6.2; 7.4)
 8. Taking into account your experience, what courses, if any, you see as useless? Why? (6.2; 7.4)
 9. On average, how do you assess the level of qualification of your law school graduates? Why? (general)
 10. How would you estimate the material support provided in the course of your studies from your law school and university (classroom equipment, Internet access, media equipment access to legal databases, etc.)? (6.3)
 11. Does the institution or law school collect any information about the employment of its graduates? If so, how?(8.2)
 12. Does the law school or university keep in touch with you after graduation? If so, how?(1.3; 8.2; 10.1)
 13. Does the law school or institution invite alumni to any events law school events? (8.2)
 14. Does the law school invite alumni to teach current law students etc.? (other)
 15. Do you have an alumni association at your law school / university? (other)
 16. Would you like to have such an association and actively take part in it? (other)
 17. What aspects of study process, do you think, alumni association has to deal with? (other)
 18. If you could change or improve three things in your alma mater – what would they be? (other)

6. Interviews and focus groups with legal employers

1. What makes a law graduate become a successful lawyer? (general)
2. Do graduates normally arrive with sufficient knowledge and understanding of the law? (2.2, 6.1,)
3. What specific practical skills are needed? (6.2)
4. Generally, do law graduates arrive with these practical skills? (6.2)
5. What kind of approaches could help develop these practical skills in students? (6.2)
6. How do you choose which graduates to employ? What are the criteria and considerations? (3.2, 9.2)
7. How do you rank Ukraine's law schools?(general)
8. Are good law school grades a reliable indicator of potential to be a good lawyer? (6.2)
9. Do you have formal or informal links with law schools? (9.2)
10. Would you be interested in fostering stronger/formal links with law schools? (9.2)
11. Do you have an internship or work experience schemes for law students? Why? (9.2)
12. Would such schemes help prepare students for work? (specific)
13. How do you prepare new graduates for success in their work?(specific)
14. What are the general strengths of law graduates in Ukraine? Weaknesses? (6.1, 6.2)
15. Do you have experience of working with the graduates of the law school

underassessment?(general)

16. Why did you select those graduates? (general)

17. What is the general reputation of the law school under assessment in the legal community? (10.1)

18. Do you have any experience employing graduates with legal clinical experience? (2.3)

19. Does the level of practical skills and theoretical knowledge of these graduates differ? In what way? (2.3)

20. What do you think are the main strengths and weaknesses of the graduates of the law school under assessment? (6.1, 6.2)

21. What three things would you change in the legal education system of Ukraine if you could do so?(other)

7. Interviews and focus groups related to legal clinical education

A. Administrators (dean, deputy deans, etc.)

1. How do you see the role of legal clinics experience in ensuring legal education quality?
2. Does the university support legal clinic financially?
3. Does the university support legal clinic in other ways? What exactly?
4. Is there a specific by-law that regulates activity of legal clinic in your law school?
5. Does the law school legal clinic take into account the Standards for Legal Clinics adopted by the Association of Legal Clinics of Ukraine?
6. Does the law school curriculum contain the course on "legal clinical education"?
7. What is the structure of this course?
8. Is such a course mandatory or elective?
9. How many ECTS credits does the course allow to earn?
10. Who teaches this course?
11. Are there specific legal clinic staffs or do legal clinic supervisors combine their work at the legal clinic with their main teaching activities?
12. How is the legal clinic staff (if any) appointed? On what basis do they work?
13. What are the professional or other requirements, if any, for the legal clinic staff?

B. Legal clinic supervisors and other staff

1. How many staff members work at the legal clinic?
2. Are all of them employed by the university or some perform this job voluntarily?
3. What is the legal clinic structure?
4. What is the workload per one legal clinic staff member?
5. Do other faculty or law school teachers assist or supervise consultants of legal clinic?
6. Does the university/law school support legal clinic financially? Is that support sufficient?
7. Does the university/law school support legal clinic in any other way?
8. What official documents regulate the activity of legal clinic?
9. Are there any interferences of administration concerning the types of cases taken by the legal clinic?
10. How are these documents adopted?

11. How often are they revised? What is the revision procedure?
12. How are the students selected to the legal clinic?
13. How many consultants are there in the legal clinic?
14. How many semesters do the students work in the legal clinic?
15. How many hours per week are the consultants expected to work in the legal clinic?
16. Does the legal clinic have human rights component in its activity? How exactly?
17. What does the legal clinic do?
18. What is its mission and modus operandi?
19. Are there any conditions one has to meet before addressing the legal clinic?
20. On average, how many clients per year do you have?
21. Does the legal clinic have specialization?
22. Does the work in legal clinics account to annual practice students have to perform within their curriculum?
23. Do you have mandatory introductory trainings for the student-consultants before they start working on a case? What are they?
24. Does your legal clinic cooperate with the bar association, centers of free legal aid or other legal aid actors?
25. How are legal clinic consultants assessed?
26. Are students certified when they accomplish their legal clinical education?
27. Is your legal clinic a member of the Association of Legal Clinics of Ukraine? Why?
28. Do you organize/take part in any networking legal clinical activities?
29. How does your legal clinic analyze (monitors) its activity?
30. Does the legal clinic publish information about its activities?

C. Legal clinic consultants (members, attendants)

1. How long do you work at the legal clinic?
2. How often do you attend the legal clinic?
3. What trainings/courses did you go through while working at the legal clinic?
4. Do you feel comfortable with the facilities (printing/scanning equipment, space for work, and other amenities) available in a legal clinic?
5. What does the legal clinic do?
6. What is its mission and modus operandi?
7. Are there any conditions one has to meet before addressing the legal clinic?
8. How many cases have you been involved in?
9. Do you perform any Street Law programs? How often and for whom?
10. Do you feel that legal clinic provides you with real practical skills?
11. What are the most practical things that you do at the legal clinic? Why?
12. What programs (events, internships, etc.) have you been involved in during your work at the legal clinic?
13. Are you informed of the Association of Legal Clinics of Ukraine activities?
14. If so, have you been involved in any such activities?

ANNEX C: MODEL QUESTIONNAIRES FOR ON-LINE SURVEYS

LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

SURVEY 1 – CURRENT STUDENTS

About this Survey: This survey is being conducted by _____

in cooperation with _____,

as part of a wider legal education quality assessment. The survey is entirely anonymous. Results will be used only to help support improvements in the quality of legal education offered in Ukraine.

Instructions: This survey contains two sections. For section 1, please read each statement and indicate to what extent you agree or disagree. Please mark only one box for each statement. For section 2, please make any general comments you have in response to the questions asked. Please, answer all questions to the best of your knowledge.

PART 1: STATEMENT	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.1. My Law School values quality legal education					
1.2. I never felt discriminated against on any ground by Law School administrators, faculty, support staff or any other Law School community member					
1.3. My Law School has a publicly available strategy, policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
1.4. There are opportunities for me to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
1.5. My Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students					
1.6. I believe my legal education will prepare me adequately for a future legal career					
1.7. My Law School respects academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud					
1.8. My Law School has a Code of Conduct/Honor Code and implements it effectively					
2.1. My Law School programs/courses have explicit intended learning outcomes					
2.2. My Law School programs/courses are designed by involving students and other stakeholders in the work					

2.3. My Law School programs/courses include well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate					
3.1. My Law School respects and attends to the diversity of students and their cultural and personal needs					
3.2. My Law School enables flexible learning paths					
3.3. I have received detailed feedback on my work					
3.4. I have received this feedback promptly					
3.5. This feedback has helped me to clarify things I did not understand					
3.6. My Law School education is interesting and intellectually stimulating					
3.7. My Law School provides for the opportunity to appeal against the evaluation results, which seem to be incorrect or unfair					
3.8. My Law School has appropriate procedures to deal with students' complaints					
3.9. Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted by my Law School					
3.10. There are regular thought-provoking discussions during seminars					
3.11. My Law School embraces flexible learning paths and recognizes competences gained outside formal curricula					
3.12. My Law School encourages my sense of autonomy while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teacher					
3.13. My assessors are familiar with modern testing and examination methods and well-qualified to assess my progress					
3.14. My Law School assesses my progress based on the criteria for and method of assessment as well as criteria for marking published in advance					
3.15. Where possible, my Law School carries out my progress assessment by more than one examiner					
4.1. My Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic					
4.2. My Law School has all necessary regulations on student admission, progression, recognition and certification					
4.3. Access policies, admission processes and criteria are implemented consistently and in a transparent manner					
4.4. My Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair					

5.1. Law School teachers are well qualified and competent					
5.2. Law School teachers are well organized and regularly prepared for classes					
5.3. I have the opportunity to evaluate my Law School teachers performances					
5.4. I have been able to contact Law School teachers when I need to					
5.5. Law School teachers regularly use a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning					
5.6. Teachers apply problem-based teaching methods and sufficiently engage me in practice-oriented and skills-based learning					
5.7. Law School teachers adequately explain key concepts					
5.8. Law School teachers are enthusiastic about the subject they are teaching					
6.1. I receive sufficient advice and support with my studies					
6.2. Good advice is available when I need to make study choices					
6.3. 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					
6.4. Adequate learning resources are constantly available for me to learn course materials					
6.5. I have stable access to the internet and other legal databases for research purposes					
7.1. My Law School is well organized and administers courses effectively					
7.2. The timetabling of my classes works efficiently					
7.3. Any changes in my courses or teaching are communicated effectively					
7.4. I can access important information and data about my courses and progress					
7.5. My Law School has and uses key performance indicators					
7.6. My Law School gathers information about our satisfaction with the programs					
8.1. My Law School publishes up to date, impartial and objective information about changes and activities that affect my education					
8.2. Information about programs published by my Law School covers the selection criteria for student participation, the intended learning outcomes of these programs, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures used,					

and the pass rates					
8.3. My Law School publishes information and provides assistance about graduate employment					
9.1. Programs are reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders					
10.1. My Law School cyclically undergoes external quality assurance					
10.2. My Law School promotes self-assessment prior to external assessment					
PART 2. GENERAL COMMENTS					
1. The main strengths of my Law School are:					
2. The main weaknesses of my Law School are:					
3. Please use this space to make any other comments on your Law School:					

LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

SURVEY 2 – LAW SCHOOL GRADUATES (LAST FIVE YEARS)

About this Survey: This survey is being conducted by _____

in cooperation with _____,

as part of a wider legal education quality assessment. The survey is entirely anonymous. Results will be used only to help support improvements in the quality of legal education offered in Ukraine.

Instructions: This survey contains two sections. For section 1, please read each statement and indicate to what extent you agree or disagree. Please mark only one box for each statement. For section 2, please make any general comments you have in response to the questions asked. Please, answer all questions to the best of your knowledge.

PART 1: STATEMENT	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.1 My Law School valued quality legal education					
1.2. I never felt discriminated against on any ground by Law School administrators, faculty, support staff or any other Law School community member					
1.3. My Law School had publicly available strategy, policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
1.4. There were opportunities for me to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
1.5. My Law School monitored the quality of my legal education					
1.6. I believe my legal education prepared me adequately for my current legal career					
1.7. My Law School respected academic integrity and freedom and was vigilant against academic fraud					
1.8. My Law School had a Code of Conduct/Honor Code and implemented it effectively					
1.9. My degree from this law school helped me to find a job in the field of law					
1.10. My Alma Mater involves alumni in development of the law faculty					
2.1. My Law School programs/courses had explicit intended learning outcomes					
2.2. My Law School programs/courses were designed by involving students and other stakeholders in the work					
2.3. My Law School programs/courses included well-structured placement					

opportunities where appropriate					
3.1. My Law School respected and attended to the diversity of students and their cultural and personal needs					
3.2. My Law School enabled flexible learning paths					
3.3. I received detailed feedback on my work					
3.4. I received this feedback promptly					
3.5. This feedback helped me to clarify things I did not understand					
3.6. My Law School education was interesting and intellectually stimulating					
3.7. My Law School provided for the opportunity to appeal against the evaluation result, which seemed to be incorrect or unfair					
3.8. My Law School had appropriate procedures to deal with students' complaints					
3.9. Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship was promoted by my Law School					
3.10. There were thought-provoking discussions during seminars					
3.11. My Law School embraced flexible learning paths and recognized competences gained outside formal curricula					
3.12. My Law School encouraged my sense of autonomy while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teacher					
3.13. My assessors were familiar with modern testing and examination methods and well-qualified to assess my progress					
3.14. My Law School assessed my progress based on the criteria for and method of assessment as well as criteria for marking published in advance					
3.15. Where possible, my Law School carried out my progress assessment by more than one examiner					
4.1. My Law School admission process was transparent, fair, and meritocratic					
4.2. My Law School had all necessary regulations on student admission, progression, recognition and certification					
4.3. Access policies, admission processes and criteria were implemented consistently and in a transparent manner					
4.4. Law School assessment arrangements and marking were fair					
5.1. My Law School teachers were well qualified and competent					

5.2. My Law School teachers were well organized and regularly prepared for classes					
5.3. I had the opportunity to evaluate my Law School teachers performances					
5.4. I was able to contact Law School teachers when I needed to					
5.5. Law School teachers regularly used a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning					
5.6. Teachers applied problem-based teaching methods and sufficiently engaged me in practice-oriented and skills-based learning					
5.7. Law School teachers adequately explained key concepts					
5.8. Law School teachers were enthusiastic about the subject they were teaching					
6.1. I received sufficient advice and support with my studies					
6.2. Good advice was available when I needed to make study choices					
6.3. 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					
6.4. Adequate learning resources were constantly available for me to learn course materials					
6.5. I had stable access to the internet and other legal databases for research purposes					
7.1. My Law School was well organized and administered my courses effectively					
7.2. The timetabling of my classes worked efficiently for me					
7.3. Any changes in my courses or teaching were communicated effectively					
7.4. I could access important information and data about my courses and progress					
7.5. My Law School had and used key performance indicators					
7.6. My Law School gathered information about students' satisfaction with their programs					
7.7. My Alma Mater gathers information about career paths of its alumni					
7.8. My Alma Mater has an active alumni association					
8.1. My Law School published up to date, impartial and objective information about changes and activities that affected my education					
8.2. Information about programs published by my Law School covered the selection criteria					

for student participation, the intended learning outcomes of these programs, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures used, and the pass rates					
8.3. My Law School published information and provided assistance about graduate employment					
9.1. Programs were reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders					
10.1. My Law School cyclically underwent external quality assurance					
10.2. My Law School promoted self-assessment prior to external assessment					
SECTION 2. GENERAL COMMENTS					
1. The main strengths of my Law School are:					
2. The main weaknesses of your Law School are:					
3. Please use this space to make any other comments on your Law School:					

LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

SURVEY 3 – LAW SCHOOL TEACHERS

About this Survey: This survey is being conducted by _____

in cooperation with _____,

as part of a wider legal education quality assessment. The survey is entirely anonymous. Results will be used only to help support improvements in the quality of legal education offered in Ukraine.

Instructions: This survey contains two sections. For section 1, please read each statement and indicate to what extent you agree or disagree. Please mark only one box for each statement. For section 2, please make any general comments you have in response to the questions asked. Please, answer all questions to the best of your knowledge.

PART 1: STATEMENT	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly
	Disagree				Agree
1.1. My Law School values quality legal education					
1.2. I do not discriminate students against on any ground					
1.3. My Law School has a publicly available strategy, policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
1.4. I have an opportunity to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
1.5. My Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students					
1.6. My Law School prepares students adequately for a future legal career					
1.7. My Law School respects academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud					
1.8. My Law School has a Code of Conduct/Honor Code and implements it effectively					
2.1. My Law School programs/courses have explicit intended learning outcomes					
2.2. My Law School programs/courses are designed by involving students and other stakeholders in the work					
2.3. My Law School programs/courses include well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate					
3.1. My Law School respects and attends to the diversity of students and their cultural and personal needs					

3.2. My Law School enables flexible learning paths					
3.3. I provide detailed feedback on student work					
3.4. I provide this feedback promptly					
3.5. This feedback is designed to help students clarify things they did not understand					
3.6. I ensure my classes are interesting and intellectually stimulating					
3.7. My Law School provides students with the opportunity to appeal against the evaluation result, which seems to be incorrect or unfair					
3.8. My Law School has appropriate procedures to deal with students' complaints					
3.9. Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted by my Law School					
3.10. There are regular thought-provoking discussions during my seminars					
3.11. My Law School embraces flexible learning paths and recognizes competences gained outside formal curricula					
3.12. My Law School encourages the student's sense of autonomy while ensuring adequate guidance and support from me					
3.13. I am familiar with modern testing and examination methods and well-qualified to assess my progress					
3.14. I assess students' progress based on the criteria for and method of assessment as well as criteria for marking published in advance					
3.15. Where possible, I carry out students' progress assessment with a co-examiner(s)					
3.16. Students are regularly well-prepared for my classes					
3.17. Students ask thought-provoking questions regularly during my sessions and encourage discussion					
4.1. My Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic					
4.2. My Law School has the necessary regulations on student admission, progression, recognition and certification					
4.3. My Law School implements access policies, admission processes and criteria consistently and in a transparent manner					
4.4. Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair					
5.1. I am well qualified and competent					
5.2. I am well organized and always prepared for classes					

5.3. I have the formal opportunity to evaluate my own performance as a law teacher					
5.4. I am available for students to contact me when they need to					
5.5. I regularly use a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning					
5.6. I apply problem-based teaching and provide sufficient field for students to practice theory					
5.7. I adequately explain key concepts to students					
5.8. I am enthusiastic about the subject I am teaching					
5.9. I receive support from my Law School in developing my skills in this field					
5.10. My Law School follows clear, transparent and fair process for staff recruitment and conditions of employment that recognize the importance of teaching					
5.11. The Law School offers me opportunities for and promotes my professional development					
5.12. The Law School encourages my scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research					
5.13. The Law School encourages me to innovate with respect to teaching methods and use new technologies in legal research					
5.14. I can use multimedia technologies when teaching in class					
5.15. My academic career depends primarily on my progress as a lecturer					
6.1. I offer sufficient advice and support to students					
6.2. I may give good advice to students when they need to make study choices					
6.3. I regularly encourage students to engage in the operation of the legal clinic in my Law School					
6.4. Adequate learning resources are constantly available for students to learn course content					
6.5. I have stable access to the internet and other legal databases for research purposes					
7.1. My Law School is well organized and administers courses effectively					
7.2. The timetabling of my classes works efficiently for students					
7.3. The timetabling of my classes works efficiently for me					
7.4. Any changes in my courses or teaching are communicated effectively					

7.5. I can access important information and data about the courses and students I teach					
7.6. My Law School has and uses key performance indicators					
7.7. My Law School gathers information about students' satisfaction with their programs					
8.1. My Law School publishes up to date, impartial and objective information about changes and activities that affect my teaching					
8.2. Information about programs published by my Law School covers the selection criteria for student participation, the intended learning outcomes of these programs, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures used, and the pass rates					
8.3. My Law School publishes information and provides assistance about graduate employment					
9.1. Programs are reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders					
9.2. I encourage my students to give feedback on my lectures and/or seminars					
9.3. I have the opportunity to participate in developing/reviewing my Law School curriculum					
10.1. My Law School cyclically undergoes external quality assurance					
10.2. My Law School promotes self-assessment prior to external assessment					
SECTION 2: GENERAL COMMENTS					
1. What (if any) interactive teaching methods do you use?					
2. The main strengths of my Law School are:					
3. The main weaknesses of my Law School are:					
4. Please use this space to make any other comments on your Law School:					

LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

SURVEY 4 - LAW SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

About this Survey: This survey is being conducted by _____

in cooperation with _____,

as part of a wider legal education quality assessment. The survey is entirely anonymous. Results will be used only to help support improvements in the quality of legal education offered in Ukraine.

Instructions: This survey contains two sections. For section 1, please read each statement and indicate to what extent you agree or disagree. Please mark only one box for each statement. For section 2, please make any general comments you have in response to the questions asked. Please, answer all questions to the best of your knowledge.

PART 1: STATEMENT	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.1. My Law School values quality legal education					
1.2. My Law School supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against the students or staff					
1.3. My Law School has publicly available strategy, policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
1.4. There are opportunities for students to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
1.5. My Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students					
1.6. Our legal education will prepare students adequately for a future legal career					
1.7. My Law School respects academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud					
1.8. My Law School has a Code of Conduct/Honor Code and implements it effectively					
2.1. My Law School programs/courses have explicit intended learning outcomes					
2.2. My Law School programs/courses are designed by involving students and other stakeholders in the work					
2.3. My Law School programs/courses include well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate					
3.1. My Law School respects and attends to the diversity of students and their cultural and personal needs					

3.2. My Law School enables flexible learning paths					
3.3. Students of my Law School receive detailed feedback on the work					
3.4. Students of my Law School receive feedback promptly					
3.5. Students receive feedback that helps them to clarify things they do not understand					
3.6. Our Law School education is interesting and intellectually stimulating for students					
3.7. My Law School provides students with the opportunity to appeal against the evaluation result, which seem to be incorrect or unfair					
3.8. My Law School has appropriate procedures to deal with students' complaints					
3.9. Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted by my Law School					
3.10. There are regularly thought-provoking discussions during seminars					
3.11. My Law School embraces flexible learning paths and recognizes competences gained outside formal curricula					
3.12. My Law School encourages students' sense of autonomy and ensures adequate guidance and support from the teacher					
3.13. The assessors in my Law School are familiar with modern testing and examination methods and well-qualified to assess students' progress					
3.14. My Law School assesses progress based on the criteria for and method of assessment as well as criteria for marking published in advance					
3.15. Where possible, my Law School carries out progress assessment by more than one examiner					
3.16. The regulations for assessment in the Law School take into account mitigating circumstances					
3.17. Assessment carried out at my Law School is consistent, fairly applied to all students and in line with the stated procedures					
3.18. A formal procedure for student appeals is in place in my Law School					
4.1. My Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic					
4.2. My Law School has all the necessary regulation on student admission, progression, recognition and certification					
4.3. My Law School implements access policies, admission processes and criteria consistently and in a transparent manner					

4.4. My Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair					
5.1. Law School teachers are well qualified and competent					
5.2. Law School teachers are well organized and regularly prepared for classes					
5.3. Students have the opportunity to evaluate their Law School teacher performances					
5.4. I am able to contact law school teachers when I need to for administrative purposes					
5.5. Law School teachers regularly use a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning					
5.6. Law School teachers use problem-based teaching methods with practice-oriented and skills-based learning					
5.7. Law School teachers adequately explain key concepts					
5.8. Law School teachers are enthusiastic about the subject they are teaching					
5.9. My Law School regularly carries out assessment of teaching staff based on clear and fair criteria					
5.10. My Law School provides teachers with the opportunity to appeal against the evaluation result, which seem to be incorrect or unfair					
5.11. My Law School has appropriate procedures to deal with teachers' complaints					
5.12. Academic career in my Law School primarily depends on the progress of an employee as a researcher and lecturer					
6.1. Students receive sufficient advice and support with their studies					
6.2. Good advice is available for students when they need to make study choices					
6.3. I ensure that the operation of the legal clinic in my Law School is maintained					
6.4. Adequate learning resources are constantly available for students to learn course materials					
6.5. My Law School has stable internet access and access to legal databases for research purposes					
6.6. As an administrator I have adequate resources to effectively and efficiently carry out my responsibilities					
7.1. My Law School is well organized and administers courses effectively					
7.2. The timetabling of classes works efficiently for students					
7.3. The timetabling of classes works efficiently for teachers					

7.4. Any changes in courses or teaching are communicated effectively to students and university					
7.5. Important information and data about courses and student progress is available to faculty and students					
7.6. My Law School has and uses key performance indicators					
7.7. My Law School gathers information about students' satisfaction with their programs					
8.1. My Law School publishes up to date, impartial and objective information about changes and activities that affect teaching and education					
8.2. Information about programs published by my Law School covers the selection criteria for student participation, the intended learning outcomes of these programs, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures used, and the pass rates					
8.3. My Law School publishes information and provides assistance about graduate employment					
9.1. Programs are reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders					
9.2. Programs are regularly evaluated taking into account the changing needs of the society					
10.1. My Law School cyclically undergoes external quality assurance					
10.2. My Law School promotes self-assessment prior to external assessment					
SECTION 2: GENERAL COMMENTS					
1. The main strengths of my Law School are:					
2. The main weaknesses of my Law School are:					
3. Please use this space to make any other comments on my Law School:					

LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

SURVEY 5 – LEGAL EMPLOYERS

About this Survey: This survey is being conducted by _____

in cooperation with _____,

as part of a wider legal education quality assessment. The survey is entirely anonymous. Results will be used only to help support improvements in the quality of legal education offered in Ukraine.

Instructions: This survey contains two sections. For section 1, please read each statement and indicate to what extent you agree or disagree. Please mark only one box for each statement. For section 2, please make any general comments you have in response to the questions asked. Please, answer all questions to the best of your knowledge.

PART 1: STATEMENT	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.1. This Law School values quality legal education					
1.2. This Law School supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against the students or staff					
1.3. This Law School has publicly available strategy, policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
1.4. There are opportunities for students to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
1.5. This Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students					
1.6. The legal education received by students from the University prepared them adequately for a future legal career					
1.7. Law Graduates of the University have the required substantive knowledge (legal system, legislation, principles and doctrines) necessary for success in a legal career					
1.8. 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.					
3.1. This Law School respects and attends to the diversity of students and their personal and cultural needs					
3.2. This Law School enables flexible learning paths					

4.1. This Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic					
4.2. This Law School has all the necessary regulation on student admission, progression, recognition and certification					
4.3. This Law School implements access policies, admission processes and criteria consistently and in a transparent manner					
4.4. Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair					
5.1. Law School teachers are well qualified and competent					
5.2. Law School teachers are well organized and regularly prepared for classes					
5.3. Teaching staff encourage students to gain practical knowledge and skills					
6.1. This Law School has an effective and practically oriented legal clinic which provides accessible opportunities for the students to participate in it					
7.1. This Law School is well organized and administers courses effectively					
8.1. This Law School publishes up to date, impartial and objective information about changes and activities that affect the employer's perception of the Law School					
8.2. Information about programs published by this Law School covers the selection criteria for student participation, the intended learning outcomes of these programs, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures used, and the competitive advantages of this law school's graduates					
8.3. This Law School publishes information and provides assistance as to its graduates' employment					
9.1. This Law School has a good working relationship with the legal community.					
9.2. This Law School regularly engages in projects in cooperation with the local legal community.					
10.1. This Law School cyclically undergoes external quality assurance					
10.2. This Law School promotes self-assessment prior to external assessment					
SECTION 2: GENERAL COMMENTS					

1. The main strengths of this Law School are:	
2. The main weaknesses of this Law School are:	
3. Please use this space to make any other comments on this Law School:	

ANNEX D: 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 _____

ANNEX E: MODEL SCHEDULE FOR ON-SITE ASSESSMENT OF LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY

DAY 1				
MONDAY				
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contact
09:00 10:00	All experts (Groups A and B together)	Introductory meeting with the university / law school leadership.		
10:00 11:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Observation of the law school facilities.		
11:00 12:00	Two experts (Group A)	Interview with the Dean/Deputy Deans upon the expert's choice.		
11:00 12:00	Two experts (Group B)	Interview with the Dean/Deputy Deans upon the expert's choice.		
12:15 13:30	All experts (Group A and B together)	Focus-group discussion with Deputy Deans.		
13:30 14:30	Lunch			
14:30 15:30	Two experts (Group A)	Interview with heads of law school sub departments.		
14:30 15:30	Two experts (Group B)	Interview with heads of law school sub departments.		
15:40 17:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Focus group discussion with heads of law school sub-departments.		
17:00 18:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Time to systematize the obtained information, exchange opinions and record impressions based on the results of the work.		
DAY 2				
TUESDAY				
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contact
09:00 10:00	Two experts (Group A)	Interview with the law school students.		
09:00 10:00	Two experts (Group B)	Interview with the law school postgraduate students.		
10:15 11:30	All experts (Group A and B together)	Focus-group discussion with the students and postgraduate students of the law school.		
11:50 13:10	Two experts (Group A)	Classroom teaching observation (according to the schedule) / <i>time for spontaneous visits.</i>		
11:50 13:10	Two experts (Group B)	Classroom teaching observation (according to the schedule) / <i>time for spontaneous visits.</i>		
13:30 14:30	Lunch			

14:30 15:20	All experts (Group A and B together)	Time for spontaneous visits and observations.		
15:30 16:45	Two experts (Group A)	Inspection of the law school legal clinic.		
15:30 16:45	Two experts (Group B)	Acquaintance with facilities and funds of the law school library.		
17:00 18:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Focus-group with legal clinic administrators.		
<u>DAY3</u>	WEDNESDAY			
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contact
09:00 10:00	Two experts (Group B)	Interview with representatives of the public prosecutor's office, including those who are alumni of the law school under assessment.		
09:00 10:00	Two experts (Group A)	Interview with the representatives of judicial corps.		
10:20 11:30	All experts (Group A and B together)	Focus group discussion with representatives of the public prosecutor's office, including those who are alumni of the law school under assessment and the representatives of the judicial corps.		
11:50 13:10	Two experts (Group A)	Classroom teaching observation / <i>time for spontaneous visits.</i>		
11:50 13:10	Two experts (Group B)	Classroom teaching observation / <i>time for spontaneous visits.</i>		
13:30 14:30	Lunch			
14:30 15:30	Two experts (Group A)	Interview with law school teachers. One representative from each law school sub department.		
14:30 15:30	Two experts (Group B)	Interview with law school teachers. One representative from each law school sub department.		
16:00 17:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Focus group discussion with law school teachers. Two teachers from each law school sub department.		
17:00 18:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Time to systematize the collected information, exchange opinions and record impressions based on results of the work.		
<u>DAY4</u>	THURSDAY			
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contact
09:00- 10:00	Two experts (Group A)	Interview with legal practitioners (employers), including those who are		

		alumni of the law school under assessment.		
09:00 10:00	Two experts (Group B)	Informal meeting with students taking law school courses taught in cooperation with other universities, if any / <i>time for spontaneous visits.</i>		
10:20 11:30	All experts (Group A and B together)	Focus group discussion with legal practitioners, including those who are alumni of the law school under assessment.		
11:50 13:10	Two experts (Group A)	Classroom teaching observation / <i>time for spontaneous visits.</i>		
11:50 13:10	Two experts (Group B)	Classroom teaching observation / <i>time for spontaneous visits.</i>		
13:30 14:30	Lunch			
15:00 16:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Working meeting with the Rector and Vice-Rectors.		
16:00 17:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Time for spontaneous visits.		
17:00 18:00	Two experts (Group A)	Acquaintance with internal university and law school regulations.		
17:00 18:00	Two experts (Group B)	Acquaintance with internal university and law school regulations, faculty chairs and departments on expert choice.		
<u>DAY5</u>	FRIDAY			
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contacts
09:00 11:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions, visit additional classes, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and develop a report.		
11:50 13:10	Two experts (Group A)	Observation of teaching process in the lecture room.		
11:50 13:10	Two experts (Group B)	Observation of teaching process in the lecture room.		
13:30 14:30	Lunch			
15:00 15:40	All experts (Group A and B together)	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional classes, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions		

		and develop a report.		
16:00 17:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Final meeting with the law school leadership. Presenting preliminary assessment findings and outlining recommendations.		
17:00 18:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Discussion on the process of integrating the developed parts of the assessment report, further development and finalization of the report and coordination of this work. Wrap-up.		

ANNEX F: BIOGRAPHIES OF ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY DEVELOPERS

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.

Finlay Young is a Scottish independent lawyer and researcher whose work in transitional countries focuses on supporting legal education and judicial reform, access to justice, and addressing issues of prolonged pre-trial detention. He has designed and led research projects for organizations such as the World Bank, Open Society Foundation, and the American Bar Association Rule of Law Initiative. He has managed US government funded legal reform projects in a number of different national contexts. He has previously taught at the University of Glasgow in Scotland, and done academic work at the Institute of Law in Zurich, Switzerland. He holds law degrees from the University of Glasgow and the University of Pennsylvania Law School, and passed the New York Bar exam in 2009.

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.Malynovskyi Institute of Law of the National University of Ostroh Academy (NUOA), 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 at Maastricht University Law Faculty (the 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 Neighborhood Policy Law and Good Governance program (2012-2015) and Regional Master's Program in Human Rights and Democratization (2015-2017). He also co-organized 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).