



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FAIR JUSTICE PROJECT

LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF THE LAW FACULTY AT THE YURIY FEDKOVYCH CHERNIVTSI NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

REPORT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS ON LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY
ASSURANCE POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Contract No. AID-121-C-11-00002

Authors:

Thomas H. Speedy Rice
Finlay Young
Myroslava Antonovych
Olena Ovcharenko

September 2015

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	4
II.	Executive Summary.....	6
III.	Methodology.....	10
IV.	Background.....	12
V.	Findings and Recommendations to the Law School.....	14
VI.	Recommendations to Government.....	41
	Appendix 1 - Assessment Team Member Biographies.....	43
	Appendix 2 - Schedule of Experts' Activities During Site Visit.....	44
	Appendix 3 - Survey Results.....	52
	Appendix 4 – Classroom Observation Protocol.....	80

I. INTRODUCTION

The USAID funded Fair, Accountable, Independent, and Responsible (FAIR) Judiciary Program in Ukraine is designed to support legislative, regulatory and institutional reform of judicial institutions to build a foundation for a more accountable and independent Judiciary. To achieve this objective the project coordinates with Ukrainian partners, other U.S. Government supported programs, and international donors to design and implement activities that support Ukrainian governmental and nongovernmental efforts to strengthen the rule of law. Based on an assessment of continued political will to pursue meaningful reforms in the judicial sector, a re-affirmation of the United States Government priorities in the sector and an evaluation of the program performance in the Base Period from October 1, 2011 to September 30, 2013, on September 19, 2013 FAIR was extended for an additional three years. In its Option Period from October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2016, FAIR will build upon the advances made during the previous period and continue providing focused technical assistance to Ukrainian counterparts in the judicial reform process.

FAIR is working to improve the quality of legal education in Ukraine in order to improve the quality of candidates for judicial positions. This includes, but is not limited to, FAIR's assistance in establishing legal education standards, which includes among other things legal profession qualifications framework development, as well as both internal and external quality assurance mechanisms.

Having developed and implemented a variety of programs to promote legal education reform in partnerships with the Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Education and a number of law schools together with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Ukrainian Legal Foundation, in 2014 the FAIR Justice Project began work on a pilot legal education quality assessment project aimed at enhancing the quality of legal education via developing a modern law school evaluation methodology in line with international and European standards adapted to the Ukrainian context.

Following this goal FAIR designed the Pilot project implementation to provide expertise in external legal education quality assessment in a selected law school. Upon its initiative and agreement, the Law Faculty of the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv was chosen as a pilot site for an assessment. One year on, the Yuri Fedkovych National University of Chernivtsi agreed to be a second pilot site for this assessment. The assessments resulted in reports with recommendations on how to improve the quality of legal education at the pilot law schools specifically and highlighted, where relevant, issues and recommendations stemming from the national system of legal education more generally.

As this kind of external assessment is new to Ukraine, as with the first pilot assessment, two foreign experts were engaged to work with and support two Ukrainian professionals throughout the assessment process. Through this approach, both local context-specific expertise and sustainability are built into the program, as the Ukrainian experts gain from the international experts the knowledge, skills and abilities to conduct future assessments in other Ukrainian law schools.

The Pilot external legal education quality assessment findings are designed not only to help enhance the quality of legal education at the pilot law schools, but in the long run, to help inculcate a quality assurance policy within the nationwide system of legal education that considers labor market expectations of legal services providers.

The team of experts had the following tasks:

- Work on preparation and implementation of a site visit to the Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University (CNU) Law School to assess the legal education quality at this law school in accordance with the 2014 Methodology for External On-Site Legal Education Quality Assessment;
- Based on assessment findings, prepare a draft Assessment Report with relevant recommendations (if any) as to improving the quality of legal education at the CNU Law School to be shared with the law school leadership. The Assessment Report should also, as appropriate, provide appropriate comments if the Methodology for External On-Site Legal Education Quality Assessment did not work properly;
- Work with CNU Law School representatives to obtain feedback on the draft Assessment Report to be considered and taken into account as appropriate;
- Finalize the Assessment Report, taking the feedback received from the CNU Law School into account;
- Present the Assessment Report to the CNU Law School leadership and faculty;
- Perform other assignments relevant to the tasks under this general SOW.

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

The fourteen criteria for quality assessment used as a part of this process are adapted from the European Higher Education Quality Standards. They are grouped under seven key elements that provide the framework for both key findings under that element, and specific recommendations that emerge as a consequence of these findings, both for the faculty specifically, and for the Ministry of Education (which administers the system of higher education in Ukraine). The seven elements are: 1) Policy and Procedures for Internal Quality Assurance; 2) Approval, monitoring and periodic review of programs and awards; 3) Admission and Assessment of students; 4) Quality assurance of Teaching Staff; 5) Curriculum, teaching methodologies, learning resources and student Support; 6) Administration and Information Systems; and 7) Public information.

The assessment team found many positive attributes of the law faculty at Yuri Fedkovych in Chernivtsi. They were impressed with the commitment to students and to improving the quality of legal education offered to them that the administration and teachers demonstrated throughout. However, some areas were identified as needing further attention as the faculty develops. The detailed findings and recommendations are contained in the full report proper, but key recommendations under each element are summarized here:

Element 1: Policy and Procedures for Internal Quality Assurance

- The school should move to consider “Quality” an on-going process ensuring the delivery of agreed high quality education standards, and “quality assurance” as the means through which the school guarantees that the quality of the education it provides is being maintained and improved. It should seek to develop a “quality culture”; that is, the creation and continuous utilisation of meaningful internal institutional quality assessment mechanisms.

- In pursuit of this, the law school's existing Concept should be a starting point for a faculty-wide consultative and participatory process of self-assessment and strategic planning, where the faculty's overall mission, and its goals and objectives in pursuit of that mission, can be developed further, formulated in concrete terms, with timeframes for achievement. Institutional self-assessment can then evaluate the success of the school in achieving its goals.
- Devising an improved quality assurance process should be a central focus of the participatory strategic planning process recommended. This should include clear policies and procedures that ensure the continuous assessment of the programs and awards on offer, the faculty's teaching, as well as its examinations regime. It assess effectiveness, track results over time, and use the results of self-assessments and external assessments (such as this one) to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula and teaching.

Element 2: Approval, Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programs and Awards

- The Faculty should work out a clear, efficient and objective process for monitoring and revising courses. Those instructions should come in line with the provisions of the Law of Ukraine "On Higher Education" adopted on July 1, 2014 concerning the autonomy of universities that includes the right of the university to set up its own standards and forms of teaching. There should be positive and aspirational guidelines for course excellence and an expectation that courses will be reviewed annually for improvement and revisions with necessary collegial support.

Element 3: Admission and Assessment of Students

- The faculty should modify its approach to examination, decreasing the reliance on oral exams. Exams should fit the nature and objectives of the course. Anonymous written exams work well in some courses, research and written papers in others, and oral exams in still others. Exams should be designed to test a wide range of skills, in particular knowledge, critical thinking and relevant legal procedure, not only to demonstrate memorization skills. A greater role should be found for written exams with a variety of problem and scenarios based exam questions, and extended essays requiring independent research.

Element 4: Quality Assurance of Teaching Staff

- Peer review and evaluation of teaching can be very helpful, but the current system when only teachers assess each other's work, and where this process seems in some way ad hoc, is insufficient to ensure high quality teaching and objective feedback. Instead, a bifurcated process may work well in this setting. For new teachers there would be assigned a teaching mentor whose role is to observe preparation and teaching on occasion, be available to answer any questions or assist with improvement, and may critique as appropriate. However, this person is excluded from the reporting and evaluation process. The evaluator(s) independently do the teaching evaluation and recommendations.

- All students should have the ability to anonymously use a standardized teacher/course evaluation form at the end of every semester but before grades are issued. The forms should be deposited with a neutral or independent holder until after grades are issued and then provided to the faculty member for self-assessment and improvement. This data can also be used for Chairs to evaluate teachers, as part of ongoing internal self-assessment, and for administrative purposes.

Element 5: Curriculum, Teaching Methodologies, Learning Resources and Student Support

- Teaching and examination should emphasize more the understanding and application of knowledge. For this to happen, not only must teaching and assessment methodologies be updated, but the content and focus of courses should be re-appraised. Teachers should be encouraged and supported to develop distinctive content, methodologies and testing.
- The law faculty should consider changing the class format that seems to be predominant in current classroom teaching. The current format is very formal, with limited potential for effective interaction or full use of critical thinking. Teaching methods used should seek to be interactive, using case studies, role plays (including moot cases), presentations and the socratic dialogue (among others), to develop key transferable skills such as problem solving and analytical thinking among the students. Emphasis should be on the potential of students to apply knowledge obtained in and out of classes. Students should have ample opportunity to pursue independent research outside of prescribed texts
- To improve the development of practical skills and to help students gain experience allowing them to make informed choices about their career path, the internship program should be improved. The law school should consider including a wider range of receiving institutions, including local government, courts, prosecutors, law firms, and civil society groups. These institutions should be engaged in the design of the internship program, which should allow for the receipt of credit. Internship or practical credits should be a required aspect of the law school curriculum. Students should be distributed for internship (practice) in smaller numbers spread throughout the academic year.
- The law school should seek to modify a schedule of classes which currently seems to overload both students and teachers. Modern learning methodologies emphasize the importance of independent study in developing student skills - too many classes leave in insufficient time for independent study and reading. Teachers complained of too many teaching hours in general, while there is sometimes a third “shift” – when the classes end at 20.30 PM.

Element 6: Administration and Information Systems

- The faculty, in particular the administration, should seek to cultivate a more open and participatory environment, and ensure decision-making is transparent and the logic and basis of decisions are understood. The more teachers and students can play a role in

school planning and decision making, the more they will respect and implement the positive changes the faculty is looking to implement.

- The Faculty should seek to develop its E-University on-line system further. This system should include profiles for all students including details, grades, schedules, and any other relevant information. It should be systematically updated. The responsibility of updating the e-courses could be given to the chairs of the Faculty. This would bring the law school in line with international best practices for information management.

Element 7: Public Information

- The content of the website should be enriched to include all data on applications, courses, students, as well as important information on employability statistics of law graduates. All advertisements about upcoming events and extra curricular activities should also be published to demonstrate a varied academic life within the school. In the ideal scenario, the website would also be available in English to allow those from other countries (and potential foreign students) learn about the school, and should be further developed to become a one stop portal for all law school information, for current and prospective students, teachers, and administrators.
- The Faculty should consider setting up an official organization of its alumni. The alumni could contribute to the life of the school through official fund raising for projects, administrated by the Faculty. Such Projects could involve students and teachers in legal practice, financing publications and projects of the teachers, and assisting students in finding the jobs upon graduation.

The assessment team would like to thank Dean Patsurkivskyi, the assistant Deans, administrators, teachers, students, graduates, legal employers and the staff of FAIR for their assistance in this assessment. The assessment took place against the challenging backdrop of significant political and legal changes in Ukraine, but we were very impressed with the level of cooperation we received. The level of commitment to the law faculty's further development was evident, and we hope this report is a challenging but useful tool in to support this ongoing process.

III. METHODOLOGY

This external legal education quality assessment methodology¹ was designed by USAID FAIR Justice Project consultants in 2014 to assess legal education quality in pilot law schools, with the overall goal of piloting and developing a modern law school evaluation methodology in line with international and European standards but adapted to the Ukrainian context. It sought to demonstrate best practices for conducting such assessments, using a collaborative approach to engage law school leadership and stakeholders in a constructive dialogue focused on quality improvement, and providing a basis for future assessments in Ukraine.

The main outcome of the second pilot Assessment using this methodology is this report, which is designed to be clear, concise, and readily accessible to the intended readership, with practical recommendations on how to improve the quality of legal education at the pilot law school specifically and, where appropriate, the national system of legal education generally. It considers the overall legal education quality of the institution using seven key elements and fourteen corresponding institutional criteria based on and adapted from the European Standards for Internal Quality Assurance Within Higher Education Institutions. The research and subsequently this report are structured around these seven elements and fourteen associated criteria.

In line with the methodology, and following 2014's initial piloting of this methodology, this assessment drew on a variety of primary and secondary research sources. Surveys were used to generate data concerning perceptions of legal education quality at the Pilot School among five respondent groups: current students, law school graduates, teachers, and law school administrators. Distribution of surveys took place a week in advance of the site visit via email lists offered by the law school, and were filled out anonymously using an online system to encourage frank and constructive responses. Questions were structured around the agreed criteria and indicators, and designed to allow comparison across respondent groups. The five point "Likert Scale" (participants state whether they strongly agree, agree, are neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree with the posited statement) was used to allow simple aggregation and comparison of responses. At the end of each survey were a small number of open ended questions about the strengths and weaknesses of the school.

In total, 355 surveys were returned from the five respondent groups at the law faculty, with 185 students, 88 graduates, 72 teachers, and 8 administrators returning completed surveys. Unfortunately, only 2 employers returned completed surveys, an insufficient number to from which to draw any conclusions about legal employer perceptions.

During the site visit, key informant interviews were also conducted with participants from the five stakeholder groups: administrators, teachers, students, graduates, and legal employers. Over eighteen individuals were interviewed during the site visit. These interviews were semi-structured, using a mixture of standardized close-ended questions and standardized open-ended questions. Semi-structured interviews allowed for non-standardized follow-up questions so as to further explore key points arising in surveys and questionnaires. Focus group discussions (FGDs)

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

were used to gather more detailed information about particular issues and themes arising from the surveys and interviews. These FGDs were designed to consist of 6-10 persons. Ten FGDs were conducted. Classroom observations were used to assess teaching methodologies within the school. A simple assessment protocol was utilized to ensure consistent analysis of classes. Six different classes were observed by the team.

IV. BACKGROUND

Legal education in Ukraine is in period of transition. Understanding of the requirements of the legal profession is slowly moving from a Soviet approach that focused on "social anomalies", the need "to exercise powers of government in the name of the law", and resolve "specific cases" and "legal issues"², to an approach based on philosophy and principles of the law, and the human rights protection of individuals.

However, substantial deficits in legal education quality endure. While there are currently 134 higher education institutions (HEIs) graduating lawyers in Ukraine³, according to the independent rating system only five of these institutions were awarded over 20 points on a 100-point scale by graduates, employers, and experts. At the same time, government reports state that nationally, as few as one in twelve law school graduates finds a job in his/her field of expertise.⁴

Legal education is offered by both public (state) and private law schools. Some public law schools are subordinate to the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (MoE) while others are departments of universities governed by other ministries (such as the Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Health Protection, and the Ministry of Agriculture). However, all law schools operate based on a license received from the MoE. This license serves as a state permission to enroll a certain number of students in the law school. The licensing procedure is established by government regulations and is characterized by quantitative and very formal criteria and requirements.⁵ Alongside licensing, there is also an accreditation process for law-schools. Formally, the accreditation process is a confirmation of the ability of the law-school to provide quality education. However, in practice the accreditation process is a duplication of the licensing process, as it is still based on the same quantitative criteria.⁶

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

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

² For more details, see the report "State of Legal Education and Science in Ukraine" http://upf.com.ua/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/legal-education-report_final_ENG-tr.pdf, p. 43-49.

³ Information from educational web-portal <http://osvita.ua/vnz/guide/search-17-0-0-61-0.html>.

⁴ See, e.g.: <http://www.osce.org/uk/ukraine/108309?download=true>

⁵ See <http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1556-18/page2>.

⁶ See in particular: <http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1556-18/page2>.

There is currently neither a guaranteed standard for legal education, nor a legal profession qualifications framework. The content of legal education offered is guided, to a large extent, by the draft standard for legal education developed in 2004,⁷ and is stipulated in a curriculum - a higher education institution's regulatory document. The system of student assessment in Ukraine is being transferred under the European standards – from a five-grade scale to the European 100-grade scale (ECTS) (though sometimes law schools combine elements of both systems). The new Law “On Higher Education” requires that higher educational institutions apply internal quality assurance. This requires the establishment of principles and procedures, monitoring and review of training programs, evaluation of students and faculty members, training for faculty members, publicity, and combatting plagiarism (Art. 16). However, most law schools lack their own system of internal quality assurance.

⁷ See the report “State of Legal Education and Science in Ukraine” http://upf.com.ua/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/legal-education-report_final_ENG-tr.pdf, p. 29-34

V. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE LAW SCHOOL

1: Policy and Procedures for Internal Quality Assurance

Element 1: Notable Survey Findings

- Survey findings of perceptions under this element were generally very positive across all groups. In particular, a very large majority of students (84.7 %) surveyed either agreed or strongly agreed that the law school recognizes, values and encourages quality education. A slightly lower, but still very high percentage (81.8 percent) of law school graduates agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.
- However, it is important to note that alongside these positive perceptions of the law school's focus on quality, the surveys indicated that a significant minority of students do not feel they have a role in this quality process, with a third (33%) of student respondents either neutral, in disagreement, or strong disagreement with the statement that they had the opportunity to participate in ensuring provision of quality education.
- Teacher survey responses under this element were, very likely due to the self-serving nature of the questions, overwhelmingly positive. However, cognizant of this fact, slight differences in positive response patterns are perhaps worth noting. While 74.6 percent of teachers strongly agreed that the law school recognizes, values and encourages quality legal education, only 42.6% of teachers strongly agreed that the law school has policies and procedures for ensuring its provision.

1.1: Institution has clear policies and associated procedures for the assurance of the quality and standards of programs and awards.

Key Findings:

- A clear framework exists for the assurance of quality and standards at the university level. However, when implemented at the law school level, it is insufficiently detailed, and largely ineffective if the goal is to ensure quality teaching at the law school.
- The standards of Quality Assurance of the Law School are based on the Overall University Standards of Quality Assurance (Regulation on the System of the Internal QA Assessment the Chernivtsi Yuri Fedkovych National University Standards (adopted on February 2015). Six Committees have been set up in the University to apply this Regulation (Committee on Licensing and Accreditation, Committee on Educational

Work, Committee on Science and Information, Committee on Social Affairs, Committee on International Relations). However, these standards of quality assurance are of general applicability to all faculties, and therefore do not themselves provide for the specific demands of legal education quality assessment.

- At the internal law school level, beyond the basic requirements of the university mentioned above, formal law school-specific quality assurance policies and procedures that could be considered part of an overall quality assurance system seemed largely absent. There is no policy for regular internal self-assessment. Interviewees indicated that quality assurance depended on the individual initiative of department heads.
- Of particular note is the fact there is not a standardized Teacher/Course evaluation form or method that any or all of the students can fill out anonymously, for every course, at the end of every semester. Such a system is a vital part of any QA process. Currently, selected students fill out a computer based evaluation form, which diminishes anonymity and reliability. Information the faculty gathers from this seems focused on the issue and identification of corruption, and is of little value for the purposes of quality assurance and improvement.

Recommendations:

- In line with the Law School's own concept note, and also the new law on higher education, the school should develop its own detailed quality assurance framework. This should include clear policies and procedures that ensure the continuous assessment of the programs and awards on offer, the faculty's teaching, as well as its examinations regime. It should be broad based, requiring the active participation of administration, teachers and students in the processes of quality assurance within the school. It should have as its cornerstone assessments of effectiveness, track results over time, and use the results of self-assessments and external assessments (such as this one) to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula and teaching.
- In developing this framework, and in general when developing its quality assurance mechanisms, the faculty should seek to foster an institutional culture that recognises and promotes the concept of internal self-evaluation as the core of the school's quality assurance and improvement processes. While external processes like the assessment on which this report is based are important, self-evaluation at the institutional level is how stakeholders of the school, particularly the teachers, will most effectively drive meaningful reforms and improvements. The Administration should seek to develop a culture that sees internal assessment and self-evaluation understood by teachers as a constructive and positive self-learning exercise for all the school's stakeholders.
- The School's internal self-assessment should use institutional criteria (those used in this assessment could be used as a starting point) to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the education the school provides in light of its mission and institutional goals. It should assess: the appropriateness of the academic standards it sets, the effectiveness of the curriculum in delivering the intended outcomes of the programs, the extent to which the

intended standards and outcomes are achieved by students, and the overall learning opportunities provided for students. It should also be the basis through which the school identifies and periodically re-examines specific goals for its strategic plan, the means to achieve the goals, and success in achieving these goals.

- The school should seek to ensure this process is sustained, evidence-based and participatory. As with this external assessment, it should use various methods to gather information about the effectiveness of the school. It could include quantitative data such as statistics on student achievement, entry qualifications, employment data, etc. Qualitative data may include student feedback, staff feedback, and employers views on the graduates they have hired from the school, previous assessment results, monitoring data.
- The school's framework must also include a systematic, anonymous assessment of each discipline, as well as regularised teacher/course evaluation by students. This means that all students should have the ability to anonymously fill out a standardized teacher/course evaluation form at the end of every semester but before grades are issued. The forms should be deposited with a neutral or independent holder until after grades are issued and then provided to the faculty member for self-improvement. In particular, it should include the systematic, anonymous assessment of each discipline, as well as regularised teacher evaluation by students.
- The school should ensure that there is a member of staff responsible for coordinating quality assurance processes within the school. This coordinator should seek to include all respondent groups in a participatory manner. This could, for example, take the form of a multi-member committee with the Dean chairing, student representatives, teachers of various levels. The goal should be a process that is "horizontal" rather than "vertical" (hierarchical, top-down imposition) in nature.

1.2: Institution has a culture that recognizes the importance of quality and quality assurance in education.

Key findings:

- The law school does have a culture that recognises the importance of providing quality legal education to its students, and the commitment of the leadership to improving the standing of the school and the quality of education it offers is evident. However, there is a lack of coherence across the faculty leadership and teaching staff as to what actually constitutes "quality". This likely stems, at least in part, from the absence of an overarching framework and process of quality assurance that the school's stakeholders participate in continuously.
- Conceptions of quality assurance, while well established among the law faculty, are very limited, inhibiting the effectiveness of initiatives in this area. Department chairs described their own specific methods of quality assurance used in their departments. However, there seemed to be a general perception of quality assurance as consisting of

formal, specified, goals, not a process of continuing improvements that inform and improve the life of the school and motivates the actions of teachers, administrators and Dean in an ongoing manner. Initiatives to improve quality, and the existing formal mechanisms of assurance and enhancement, seem largely disconnected.

- On a formal level, the law school provides an organised, systematic, and rigorous legal education. However, organisational imperatives and meeting formal requirements (that students pass exams and know the law) seem emphasised over the pursuit of excellence in legal education (engaging creativity and free critical thinking). The school currently does not challenge the students sufficiently in terms of critical analysis, nor does it employ modern teaching and assessment methodologies consistently that test student creativity and creative thinking.

Recommendations:

- Administration should lead school stakeholders to think of “quality” as an on-going process ensuring the delivery of agreed high quality education standards, and “quality assurance” as the means through which the school guarantees that the quality of the education it provides is being maintained and improved. It should seek to develop a “quality culture”; that is, the creation of meaningful internal institutional quality assessment mechanisms and their ongoing use. Thus “quality” should be evident in the day-to-day work of the institution, fundamental to the institutions operations, not just periodic assessments.
- For this to become a reality, the faculty must seek to encourage an understanding of quality assurance as a process that engages the participation of, and is relevant to, all stakeholder groups in the school (students, teachers, and administrators).
- The law school must consider, as a starting point, what the School’s mission and goals are should, promoting a common understanding among all faculty staff of the kind of education the institution seeks to provide. This should be the first step in a broad-based process of self-evaluation and strategic planning (see other criteria under element one).
- The encouragement of excellence should be a fundamental focus of all initiatives, while faculty should be made comfortable with quality assurance as including self-critique, colleague suggestions and support. Engaging and challenging the students in the research and teaching process will be an effective way to inspire excellence in student academic standards.

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

Key findings:

- In 2010, on its own initiative, the Law School developed the “Concept of Improving Legal Education for Professional Training of Lawyers Following the European Standards

of Higher Education and Legal Profession at the Faculty of Law of Chernivtsi Yuri Fedkovych National University (Concept)". This document is annually amended by the Law School Academic Council and is available for the public on the Law School website (see <http://lawfaculty.chnu.edu.ua/about/files/accreditation/2.pdf>). The Concept outlines plans for the development of the law school, including a section on guarantees of high quality legal education. This document should be considered as a very positive first step forward. It now needs further development to expand its scope and focus.

- In terms of quality enhancement, Heads of departments noted that the school's procedure is as follows: an initiative will be proposed by department heads, discussed by the faculty council, the faculty in general, and after that adopted at the Faculty of Law meeting. This approach, as described, is not continuous, systematic or in accordance with specific benchmarks or overarching strategic goals, and seemed to include no mechanism for ensuring implementation. In general, initiatives of quality assurance and improvement within the school emphasize formal over truly quality-focused requirements.

Recommendations:

- The existing Concept should be a starting point for a faculty-wide consultative and participatory process of self-assessment and strategic planning, where the faculty's overall mission, and its goals and objectives in pursuit of that mission, can be developed further, formulated in concrete terms, with timeframes for achievement. Institutional self-assessment (as outlined under the first criteria) can then evaluate the success of the school in achieving its goals. These processes should engage all stakeholder groups included in this external assessment, and where appropriate, draw on this assessment's findings. Devising a plan for improved quality assurance process should be a central focus of the participatory strategic planning process recommended. The outcome of this process should be a plan that it is clear and understandable to all faculty and students, and accessible to the wider public. This plan should be used not only to orient the school's internal processes, but also as a tool to contribute to national discussions on the direction of legal education and higher education in general.
- The concept, or the strategic plan that emerges from it, should be considered an active "living" document, never really fixed and permanent, to be updated in line with the findings of internal self-assessments. The results of the meetings on the Concept/strategic plan should be made an annual addendum to the updated Concept/strategic plan on the web page and become an annual benchmark for assessing long-term improvements. Additionally, the European Higher Education Area issues regular Communiqués from important meetings. These Communiqués should also be considered and inform the reassessment of the Concept/strategic plan at regular intervals.

2. Approval, Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programs and Awards

Element 2: Notable Survey Findings

- While perceptions were generally positive, there was a clear discrepancy between teacher perceptions of monitoring of quality within the law school, and those of students and graduates. While almost all teachers (94.1%) agreed or strongly agreed that the law school monitors the quality of legal education provided, around a third of students (32.2%) and graduates (34.5%) did not agree or strongly agree that the law school monitored the quality of legal education.

2.1 Institution has formal mechanisms for the approval, periodic review and monitoring of programs and awards.

Key Findings

- The law school has mechanisms for approval, review and monitoring of programs and awards, but these mechanisms are not optimal. In particular, interviews suggested they rely to a large extent on the subjective judgement of the departmental commissions and department heads, all of whom, at the time of writing, have occupied their positions for less than a year.
- Monitoring of programs and awards takes place via heads of the departments (Chairs) and their participation in the Scholarly meeting of faculty. This process is limited in scope, although all the changes are discussed among the Chairs. The final decision is dependent upon the decisions of the Academic Council of Law School and University.
- Faculty members stated that the curricula and programs can be revised every year before the semester starts. Faculty members can initiate the revision, although the decision to revise documents is up to the Chairs. Teacher products are subject of peer evaluation and administrator assessment, though there are no set criteria for this review. Legislative changes and “societal changes” will be considered. Students are not able to initiate or inform this process.
- As a rule, the Chairs control teacher revisions to the teaching method of a course, including the instructions for students (методички), questions for the exams, and questions for in class testing, textbooks. However, no clear regulations exist on how often questions for the exams, questions for the in-class testing, etc should be revised.
- Not all the courses are supplied with the full collection of these documents; there are no strict regulations on how often the chair should revise the questions for the exams, questions for the in-class testing etc. Instructions for students do not contain practical cases, only issues of theory and recommended theoretical sources to be used for study. These instructions lack references to judicial practice, court and other state agency

websites, and other practical references. As the faculty members stated in interviews, they revise the practical cases used in classes each year and do not publish them. However, it is not clear if all the chairs supply all the courses with such training cases and who is responsible for revising them. Where courses do not have textbooks of the Faculty members, textbooks of other authors and Faculties are used.

Recommendations:

- The Faculty should work out a clear and efficient process for revision of the taught courses. Those instructions should come in line with the provisions of the Law of Ukraine "On Higher Education" adopted on July 1, 2014 concerning the autonomy of universities that includes the right of the university to set up its own standards and forms of teaching. There should be positive and aspirational guidelines for course excellence and an expectation that courses will be reviewed annually for improvement and revisions with necessary collegial support.
- Teachers should seek to incorporate a wider variety of possible sources into the to instructions for the teaching of courses (методички). For example, they could contain more practical sources, references to judicial practice, court and other state agencies websites and other practical references and should include practical cases and scenarios of varying complexities for students to study and solve. Separate instructions could be created for the written works of the students (курсовые и магистерские работы). These could contain the topics of the written works, instructions for the structure, content and volume of the works and the literature recommended for usage, but also ensure scope is left for the student to conduct independent research to contribute to his/her written works.
- Internal bureaucracy in these processes should be minimized, with each teacher given as much latitude as possible in designing courses, devising syllabus, and choosing course materials.

3. Admission and Assessment of Students

Element 3: Notable Survey Findings

- Significant numbers of students and graduates do not believe law school admission is fair. Over a third of students (36.7%) were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that the law school admission process is transparent, fair and meritocratic. However, an even greater number of graduates, over half (55.2%) replied in this way. While it is likely graduates feel more comfortable answering in a manner critical of the school, this still suggests that while a significant number of students still perceive there to be problems with the admissions process, perceptions have perhaps improved over time.
- A similar relationship between student and graduate results could be seen in relation to assessment. Less than two thirds of students (57.2%) agreed or strongly agreed that assessment arrangements in the school are transparent and fair, compared to less than half (44.8%) of graduates. This, again, indicates that many current students lack faith in the system of assessment in the school, but perhaps a lower percentage than former students. Less than half of graduates agreed that it was transparent and fair (44.8%).
- Students were quite divided over whether the law school provided an effective avenue/forum through which law students can challenge performance evaluation. A majority (59.9%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, while 40.1% of respondents were neutral or disagreed.
- Over two thirds (67.5%) of students agreed or strongly agreed that they receive detailed feedback on their work, though a slightly lower percentage agreed they had received this feedback promptly. Interestingly, the trend of graduates being more critical than current students was not borne out in questions relating to feedback, with a slightly higher proportion of graduates (73.9%) agreeing or strongly agreeing with this statement. Also, while it is to be expected that teachers perceive their feedback to be helpful in clarifying things students don't understand, 35% of students did not agree or strongly agree with them that this was the case.

3.1 Institution students are admitted via a transparent, fair, and meritocratic process.

Key Findings:

- The two-tiered system of the law school admissions, admitting both a limited number of government-funded (“budget”) students and a much larger number of privately funded students, appears to be transparent and fair, relying on the results of a national exam. However, the overall admission system remains flawed. Admittance to the school is not truly competitive and meritocratic, as due to the limited allocation of budget students, and

in order to fill in the licensed number of places, universities have to admit more fee paying students, even though they are at a lower level.

- Overall, a situation is created where there is, according to most teachers, a disparity between the quality of government-funded students and privately funded students. It is important to note that this situation lies out of the Faculty administration's control, as the Rules of the Admission are drafted and adopted by the Ministry of Education and are therefore obligatory. Under this system, as the administration pointed out, the law faculty does not get enough state budgeting places for enrollment of students. The faculty, according to the license from the Ministry of Education, is allowed to enroll up to 250 students each year, from which the number of state budgeting places normally does not exceed 5. The procedure through which the Ministry of Education allocates these places among law schools is not transparent, or based on the quality of education provided by the faculty. Large law schools such as Kharkiv or Odesa Law Universities traditionally get the biggest allocation of state budgeting in legal education. As a local law school, the Chernivtsi law faculty struggles to effectively lobby for resources in Kyiv.
- Nevertheless, Chernivtsi Law Faculty enrolls around 250 students annually, the full complement under its Ministry granted license. This reflects well on the school's reputation - some other law schools struggle to enroll the number of students allowed by their license. The law faculty was abolished in 1940 by Soviet authorities, and only restored in 1991. The administration should be applauded for its efforts to overcome a lack of finance and human resources to develop a strong local tradition of legal education in the years since. The Law Faculty is a popular and prestigious educational establishment within the region, with students opting to study there due to its geographic proximity, the good reputation of the faculty members, and the recommendations of relatives and friends.

Recommendations:

- The law faculty should better promote the strengths of the law faculty to prospective students in order to attract more qualified applicants. In particular, it should look for opportunities to promote some of the strong programs at the faculty that would give it a marketing advantage in attracting the best students. It is also recommended that it explore setting up international study programs and partnerships together with other European Law Faculties.
- There should be clear guidelines and perhaps testing in order to transparently select only the best of the privately-funded applicants. If the law faculty can enroll up to 250 students, from which the number of state budgeting places normally do not exceed 5, then the other 245 should be competitively chosen so that the paying students are the best that the school can enroll. This would require altering national legislation related to the admission of students following the results of the external independent assessment of high school students' learning outcomes.

- The law faculty should also develop a comprehensive orientation program for new students to be implemented in the first few weeks of study to assist students making the transition to the study of law for the first time.

3.2 Institution students are assessed using published criteria, regulations and procedures that are applied consistently.

Key findings

- The law school's system of assessment operates in accordance with published regulations and procedures, and can therefore be said to be formally consistent. Standards of QA of the Faculty are based on the previously mentioned University Standards of QA. Regulation on the System of the Internal QA Assessment the Chernivtsi Yuri Fedkovych National University Standards (adopted on February 2015). However, the assessment regimen used by the law school is problematic for a number of reasons.
- A variety of methods of student assessment are used, including both oral answers and written papers. However, exams are predominantly oral, with students selecting at random tickets which include mainly theoretical questions that are available beforehand in the form of lists at each department for each discipline. From interviews, it seemed the commitment to oral exams stemmed at least in part from the fact that grading of papers is not included in the teaching load – oral exams do not require marking.
- The heavy reliance upon oral exams is not in accordance with modern higher education best practice. While the limited use of such exams can be a useful test of a student's ability to communicate verbally, this does not justify their central position in the law school. Oral exams do not allow sufficient exploration of depth of understanding, they are highly subjective, and their nature precludes the existence of evidence upon which appeals can rely.
- There is a rating system of students grading, and grades for modules and exams are made public and are published on the advertising board. They can be appealed to the Dean in order for a student to retake an exam.
- One consideration for the administration is that in the open-ended section of the anonymous surveys of students and graduates there was frequent mention of the existence of corruption, in particular for grades. As one student put it, "if there were no corruption at the faculty would be all perfect!" However, it should be noted that a lower proportion of students than graduates mentioned this. This could either be because graduates felt more confident to express their feelings, or, more positively, because there have been improvements over recent years.

Recommendations

- The faculty should modify its approach to examination, decreasing the reliance on oral exams, and finding a much greater role for written exams with a variety of problem and

scenarios based exam questions. Similarly, extended essays requiring independent research should be a more regular feature of student assessment than seems currently to be the case.

- Exams should fit the nature and objectives of the course. Anonymous written exams work well in some courses, research and written papers in others, and oral exams in still others. The faculty members should be able to explain why a chosen exam method works best in her or his class. Exams should be designed to test a wide range of skills, in particular knowledge, critical thinking and relevant legal procedure, not only to demonstrate memorization skills (the memorization method also promotes cheating). For certain subjects, teachers may wish to consider open book examinations as, constructed and marked properly, they minimize credit for memorization or “surface” learning, instead testing on understanding and “deep” learning.
- Facilitating this will require a change in how teacher work is quantified. The work-load of the teachers should be accounted in real time, in accordance with the quantity of work that has been really done, including significant time for preparation of tasks for exams and modules, grading papers, and consulting with students out of classes and through the Internet.
- Training in different modern assessment methodologies would be of great benefit to many of the teaching staff. This could include instruction on how to maximize the effectiveness of conventional essay based questions, problem fact patterns, and multiple choice exams, but also group examination, peer assessment, self-assessment, oral presentations and exams, and simulations. See for more examples:
http://www-tc.pbs.org/teacherline/courses/inst325/docs/inst325_stiggins.pdf

4. Quality Assurance of Teaching Staff

Element 4: Notable Survey Findings

- Encouragingly for the law school, over 90% of students agreeing or strongly agreeing that law school-teachers are well qualified and competent, while a similar vast majority believe law school teachers are well organized and prepared for class. However, graduate experiences were slightly different, with only just over half (53.4%) stating they agreed or strongly agreed that law school teacher are well organized and prepared for class. Over two thirds of students agreed or strongly agreed that they receive sufficient advice and support with studies, and that they are able to contact teachers when needed, and that they receive good advice when needed.
- Survey results in this area did confirm one significant issue relating to quality assurance of teaching staff. Fewer than half of students (46.1%) agreed or strongly agreed they had the opportunity to evaluate their teachers performance. Interestingly, this was a lower percentage than that of the graduate respondent group, 64.8% of which said they agreed or strongly agreed that they had an opportunity to provide teacher feedback. Of course, this discrepancy may partly be attributable to the fact that compared to the student respondents who were drawn from all year groups, all graduates had completed all years of legal education and therefore had a longer timeframe, and perhaps higher possibility of having had the chance to offer feedback.

4.1 Institution has process for selection and continuing assessment, including by students, to ensure teachers are qualified and competent

Key findings

- The Law School has a clear plan to ensure all its teachers have attained the highest qualification (doctors of law) by 2020. Currently, all the six heads of departments are doctors of law, and the majority of deputy deans have either defended their doctor theses or are working on them. This plan for enhancing the level of faculty qualifications is outlined in the Law School's Concept Paper on Improving Legal Education for Professional Training of Lawyers in Accordance with European Standards of Higher Education and Legal Profession.
- The law school has a formal process for the selection of new staff, though most enter teaching directly after graduating from the school. To facilitate this internal progression the departments organize internal records of the best students. Upon graduation the administration may propose they stay and work at the Faculty. According to one administrator, Chernivtsi graduates make up 80% of the teaching staff.

- For external recruitment, the administration may identify future teachers among practicing lawyers and propose they come to work at the Faculty. In both cases the Faculty comes up with such propositions when a new position opens. A special Recruitment Commission of the Faculty organizes the official procedure of the assessment of the future teacher on the issues of his / or her compliance with the demands of the Faculty and legislation. As described by the administration, open recruitment through advertising did not seem to be the norm.
- In terms of continuing assessment of teachers, within the law faculty department heads take the lead in ensuring the performance of teachers in the department. This process operates informally.
- If a teacher's work is deemed to be substandard, this will be noted by the department head and discussed at the meeting of chair. The chair works out specific recommendations on how to improve the teacher's work. If the teacher does not follow the given recommendations, he/she is released when his/her contract ends.
- The Faculty also has its own internal system of classroom assessment. Once a semester a teacher will be supervised at random by his colleagues. There was no clear process identified for how this system operated, how classes and teachers are chosen, and which teachers conduct the assessment.
- There is no standardized Teacher/Course evaluation form or method through which some or all of the students can evaluate their teachers on each course. Sometimes (normally once a year) the administration of the Faculty organize discussions with the students about the quality of the teaching. However, those inquiries are not regular and their forms are formulated by the administration of the University. Not all the students take part in these inquiries (only randomly selected students).
- In addition, at the end of each year all faculty members fill out a detailed report, on a standard form approved by the university administration, that details their achievements. The report is filed to the University administration; the Faculty administration does not take part in this assessment. The results of this assessment determine the sum of bonuses paid each year. Due to the lack of financing the sums of the bonuses granted to the teachers are very poor.
- In terms of career development, a significant problem for the Faculty is that there is no Specialized Academic Council where teachers can defend their PhD theses. To defend the research a teacher must go to another law school (which has special facilities).
- Low salary level, in conjunction with very high teaching load, was identified as a huge problem by almost all teachers in open-ended survey questions. Figures cited backed this up. Though the Law School earns more than a quarter of university income from contract students, this money does not come to the Law School as additional payments to teachers or for other needs (conference participation, publications, etc.).

- In terms of research, key academic research of the teachers is discussed at the regular Faculty academic seminar that functions on an ongoing basis. This helps the teachers to formulate the key findings of their research and gives them an opportunity to receive feedback from their peers.

Recommendations:

- The Faculty administration should play a more active role in assessment of the faculty members' achievements. The results of this assessment should be used for career promotion of the faculty members (granting the positions of Associate Professors and Professors). The Faculty administration should have a possibility to stimulate the faculty members that have outstanding academic and teaching achievements through granting bonuses, financing the publications of the faculty members abroad, financing the participation of the faculty members in academic conferences and study programs in European countries.
- The Faculty administration should be provided with more financial autonomy from the University. Administering part of the money that the Faculty earns would allow the faculty to consider different ways of incentivizing teachers, and more latitude to support teacher and student programs or activities it deems worthwhile.
- With the current system of informal quality assessment of teachers led by chairs, it is hard to ensure objectivity and consistency between departments. There should be more clear and detailed criteria for faculty assessment to lessen subjectivity in assessment by Chairs and the dean.
- Peer review and evaluation of teaching can be very helpful, but the current system when only teachers assess each other's work, and where this process seems in some way ad hoc, is insufficient to ensure high quality teaching and objective feedback. Instead, a bifurcated process may work well in this setting. For new teachers there would be assigned a teaching mentor whose role is to observe preparation and teaching on occasion, be available to answer any questions or assist with improvement, and may critique as appropriate. However, this person is excluded from the reporting and evaluation process. The evaluator(s) independently do the teaching evaluation and recommendations.
- All students should have the ability to anonymously use a standardized teacher/course evaluation form at the end of every semester but before grades are issued. The forms should be deposited with a neutral or independent holder until after grades are issued and then provided to the faculty member for self-assessment and improvement. This data can also be used for Chairs to evaluate teachers, as part of ongoing internal self-assessment, and for administrative purposes.

4.2 Institution shall have clearly established and published responsibilities of its teachers to ensure the quality of the academic program.

Key findings

- There are very clearly established responsibilities of teachers; indeed, teachers were able to give incredibly precise contractually obliged numbers of hours to be spent on each element of their work. All teachers have a detailed understanding of their responsibilities, and seem highly committed. However, it seems the articulation of responsibilities in the law school is not focused on the development of quality and ensuring excellence in teaching, but rather on sound organization. Moreover, there is not enough time allocated to certain fundamental elements of legal teaching. The teachers reported an extremely low allocation of time for grading and meeting with each student, which seemed to undermine any ability for individual improvement and learning from the grading by the students.
- Overall, the teacher workload, as prescribed and in reality, is too high. While teaching loads have been decreased over the past few years, teachers, like students, still spend too high a proportion of their time in class. Where teaching loads are too high, creativity and quality improvement can be stymied. Some teachers interviewed stated they had spent as many as 28 hours per week teaching (though the administration disputes this figure). Regardless, there is consensus that efforts must continue to lessen teaching loads. Teachers need more time to develop their courses, to reflect on and adapt their methodology, to be available for student consultations, to devise and subsequently mark high quality exams. In surveys, many teachers said high teaching loads had a negative impact on their motivation.

Recommendations

- The law school needs to be given more autonomy, both from the university, and from ministry of education regulations. The current teaching load needs to be reassessed, with increased importance accorded to the work teachers and students do outside of the direct teaching environment. It is provided by 2014 Law on Higher Education which limits the maximum teaching load to 600 hours and provides for the correlation of class hours and independent study as one to three. Quality, not quantity, should be the goal. For students, this should mean more independent study and project work. For teachers, it should allow for more preparation, academic work, and especially marking of exams.
- The faculty's teaching staff are its most important resource. Their hard work in pursuit of student learning is obvious, and their commitment to their role was clear in interviews. To maximize their potential, they need to have the time and support to develop and reflect on their teaching approaches, to think creatively and experiment with new approaches.

5. Curriculum, Teaching Methodologies, Learning Resources and Student Support

Element 5: Key Survey Points

- Perhaps predictably, most students (75%) agree or strongly agree their legal education will prepare them adequately for a future legal career. The even higher percentage of graduates (82.6%) who agree with them having actually graduated and sought jobs is a very positive endorsement of the school's teaching.
- A similar percentage (75.3%) agreed or strongly agreed that teachers use a variety of different learning methods, while students seemed happy with the standard of teaching, with 84.5 % agreeing or strongly agreeing that teachers explain key concepts well, and over three quarters agreeing or strongly agreeing that teachers are enthusiastic about their subjects. However, it is important to note when viewing these findings that undergraduate student exposure to modern teaching methodologies and higher education teaching quality in general is normally limited to that they have experienced at the law school.
- Interestingly, despite limited computing facilities and internet availability within the school, the vast majority of students still agreed or strongly agreed that they had internet access for research purposes (85.8%). The limitations of the survey did not allow for researchers to establish where students were accessing the internet (whether home or at university).

5.1 Institution curriculum effectively prepares students for legal careers in government, private, or academic work.

Key findings

- While there is no doubt that Chernivtsi graduates leave the school with the strong understanding of the law necessary for legal careers in Ukraine, other elements of the legal education seem less strong. When given the opportunity to answer an open-ended anonymous survey question on weaknesses of the school, both students and graduates (those who recently left the school to enter the job market and are therefore best placed to comment) frequently mentioned that the law school education, while in their view strong, was overly theoretical, with too little a focus on practice. As one student simply put it, “A lot of theory and a little practice!”
- This also seemed to be borne out through interviews, classroom observations and assessment of syllabi. Generally, classes do not tend to emphasize either the practical skills essential for lawyering, nor the application of law to complex fact (problem solving). Too often, wrote one student in an open ended survey question, learning at the law school is “similar to just simple "memorization" of material (articles of the law,

theories, books) ... in the absence of conditions for proper reflection and learning.” Often what teachers would describe as “understanding the law”, was really just memorizing, while complex problem solving requiring the application of law to facts, is underutilized.

- The Faculty does currently invite a number of practicing professionals for teaching (for instance forensic experts for teaching forensic science). They could contribute to practically focused classes. There is also a functioning legal clinic. These exceptions aside, Instruction for students tend not to contain practical cases, only issues of theory and recommended theoretical sources to be used for study. References to judicial practice, court and other state agencies websites and other practical references are not frequently included.
- This situation stands to improve in the academic year starting in 2015, as the new curricula of the Law developed under the new Law “On Higher Education” for bachelor and for master programs, includes 25 % of elective courses. In particular, it includes legal clinics as a course.
- One important area for improvement if graduates of the school are to be employable internationally, is foreign language instruction and learning. The law school has taught English as a compulsory subject for all Bachelors students since 2010, and there is a group of students fluent in English and who take courses in English. However many more students interviewed mentioned that they cannot communicate in English, and in their view there is still not enough attention paid to foreign languages. Cognizant of this, the school has already decided that from next year each department is introducing at least two elective courses in English.
- The current system of internship, entailing a large group of students spending 2-3 weeks within a local institution, serves more to acquaint students with the general workings of different state institutions through observation, than to develop their practical skills. To experience a longer-term internship, students must be proactive and facilitate the process and find a receiving institution themselves. In general, as in other countries, this will favor students who are already connected to these institutions through friends and family

Recommendations:

- Teaching and examination should emphasize more the understanding and application of knowledge. For this to happen, not only must teaching and assessment methodologies be updated (see below 5.2), but the content and focus of courses should be re-appraised.
- To better develop core skills, the law school should consider developing skills specific courses such as “legal methods”, “legal writing”, “legal research” during the first year of student studies. These courses would give students a better range of basic tools with which to approach their legal education.
- To improve the development of practical skills and to help students gain experience allowing them to make informed choices about their career path, the internship program

should be improved. The law school should consider including a wider range of receiving institutions, including local government, courts, prosecutors, law firms, and civil society groups. These institutions should be engaged in the design of the internship program, which should allow for the receipt of credit. Internship or practical credits should be a required aspect of the law school curriculum. Students should be distributed for internship (practice) in smaller numbers spread throughout the academic year.

- Many teachers combine teaching and practice. Interview with employees (mainly this Law School graduates) - judges, prosecutors and lawyers - confirmed their strong interest in giving guest lectures or teaching separate courses at the Law School. Where possible, their skills should be utilized. Law School graduates (judges, prosecutors, lawyers) should more frequently be invited as guest lecturers or to teach separate guest courses.
- Legal clinic should be extended to allow for more time on task. Academic credit should be awarded for practical class. Assessment should be based on practical learning and specific to the type of clinic or internship in court or other state institutions. Members of the legal community should be engaged as adjunct professors in any clinical or practical based course. A community based Board of Advisors could be established for valuable input and promotion of sustainability.
- More elective and English language law courses, and supplemental English based programs should be introduced into the curriculum and life of the school so that students have increased possibilities for specialization, and are more employable internationally. Resources used could include European Court of Human Rights cases (watchable in English on line), the wide variety of useful legal video footage available. These could form the basis of, for example, internal English presentations, workshops, and competitions etc.

5.2 Institution employs modern teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning

Key findings

- In general, the law school has much scope for improving its utilisation of modern teaching methodologies. Lectures and seminars observed, while generally well structured and organised were often one dimensional in teaching style.
- Teaching remains primarily lecture-based, with questions and answers in other classes and PowerPoint in some classes but the sole dimension in all of them being centred around a memorized answer, not critical thinking or legal analysis. Even during seminars it is mainly “questions-answers” of the theoretical issues presented during lectures. There are some very progressive teachers, with many utilizing elements of the Socratic method during the classes, seeking to follow up answers with further questions, and selecting questions which advance the discussion and stimulate student thinking. However, even in these classes emphasizing the Socratic method, an atmosphere of high formality remained.

- As mentioned, the schedule of classes remains overloaded despite the efforts of the administration to address this. Modern learning methodologies emphasize the importance of independent study in developing student skills, but law school students have too many classes resulting in insufficient time for independent study and reading. There are two “shifts” at the Law School – morning and afternoon. Sometimes the administration adds the third “shift” – when the classes end at 20.30 PM. This situation was criticized by students as well as teachers
- Faculty has limited access to modern teaching methods due to the budget restrictions on travel and exchanges with faculty from international law schools. Use of PowerPoint does not mean modern teaching methods are being used, especially with the modern study and assessments of the best use of PowerPoint in the learning environment.

Recommendations

- The school must change the emphasis of its quality assurance in teaching (with regard to teaching methods especially), from the formal to truly quality-focused requirements. Specifying that courses must use PowerPoint whenever possible is not in itself a guarantee of better teaching. Interviews and surveys did not reveal the existence of any system for researching new teaching methods, colloquium discussions of various teaching methods, or encouragement for learning and experimentation of teaching styles and methods.
- The law faculty should consider changing the class format that seems to be predominant in current classroom teaching. The current format is very formal, with students being called upon, standing and responding. There is limited ability for effective interaction or full use of critical thinking in this format.
- Teachers must instead have the opportunity to consider different teaching options or methods, discussing various and differentiated methods relevant to the needs of each course or subject. They should be encouraged and supported to develop distinctive content, methodologies and testing. The law faculty could promote innovation through an annual teaching seminar where teachers are invited to present on new teaching techniques and methodologies, while law school strategic planning, building from the concept, should encourage individual study and experimentation with individual teaching styles and the sharing of results in a body designed to promote teaching excellence.
- Whatever teaching methods are used, they should seek to be interactive, using case studies, role plays (including moot cases), presentations and the Socratic dialogue (among others), to develop key transferable skills such as problem solving and analytical thinking among the students. An emphasis should be made on the potential of students to apply the knowledge, which had been obtained in and out of classes. Students should have ample opportunity to pursue independent research outside of prescribed texts.

- In particular group work should be an integral part of law school academic life. This kind of work is more replicative of the team-based work most students will be required to participate in after graduation. Group work will help students to develop the “soft” interpersonal skills that are currently not the focus of the curriculum. These skills would include the ability to collaborate, to contribute in a team setting, to problem solve, and to effectively communicate with others.
- To aid faculty in improving the effectiveness of their teaching to include these methods, The Faculty should organize a comprehensive training for teachers on modern interactive teaching methods with an emphasis on those methods appropriate for legal studies including experiential learning, using case studies, role plays, and the Socratic dialogue among others. These should complement the basic teaching methodology some teachers are getting from the University Pedagogy Department. New teachers should undergo this training before teaching in the faculty.
- The law faculty should consider establishing a teaching innovation and excellence committee to research the wealth of innovative teaching methods discussed on-line. There should be encouragement for new teaching styles and a cultural permission to have class conversations with students not just call upon and answer. Some teachers and courses can be selected to be teaching laboratories with new methods are tried out, allow for faculty observation and recommendations from the teaching innovation and excellence committee.
- The University should seek to fund a minimum of two faculty trips to law teaching conferences annually with a requirement that the attending faculty produce a collegial seminar and training for the rest of the faculty. Similarly, the school should seek to fund teachers from regional schools recognized for teaching excellence to visit the school for demonstrations of new teaching methods.
- The law faculty should actively encourage participation in skills based activities such as the legal clinic (laboratory), as well as local, regional and International moot court and mock trial competitions. Faculty and students who work in these areas should be give appropriate assistance and support as well as credit for the time spent on these activities.
- It is recommended the law school seek, where possible to reduce the quantity of students in academic groups (from 25 to 15 persons). The number of hours for independent work of students should also increase in proportion to at least 1 to 2 (e.g. for 2 class hours 4 hours of independent work). Students should be given more opportunities to present their results of independent work.
- The law school must seek to improve the availability of multimedia equipment, in particular power point technology in its lecture theatres. Currently only two lecture rooms have such technology available, severely inhibiting the ability of teachers to utilise modern visual aids etc.

- The law school should make greater use of videoconferencing for seminars on teaching methodologies and possibly joint video classes with international law faculties.

5.3 Institution ensures resources available for the support of student learning are adequate and appropriate.

Key findings

- Designated learning materials are freely available to students via the library, the departments libraries and online. This free provision is a strength of the law school. However, there is no access to a package of online databases, local or international.
- The University library also comprises a huge collection (over 2 million editions), but upon visiting the law section itself did not seem particularly large, nor up to date with new volumes. In addition, each department maintains its own “electronic library” of resources (a USB drive held at each law school department with free access for students upon request) generally expanded during periods where access to online resources is possible. If they choose, students can use them for classes’ preparation and for their paper writings.
- Students report limited work space other than in the library, which does not permit group discussions or other perhaps disruptive learning methods. Students also report that there is not easy access to the internet for student research and study.
- The law school is insufficiently equipped with multimedia equipment, with only 3 classrooms currently supplied with projectors, PC etc. This limits teacher ability to use presentations and other modern technologies during the classes. There is also no computer lab for students without laptops to work in.
- Overall, without universal internet access for students within the school, and access to online legal resources, resources cannot be said to be optimal for student learning.

Recommendations

- Courses should ensure there is an extended list of more detailed available reading beyond prescribed texts, so students may pursue independent study beyond what the current curriculum allows. The Library’s collection, particularly of foreign and comparative law, should be expanded.
- As a particular priority, the Law School must seek funding to access online legal databases. This is absolutely essential in widening student access, developing online research, and encouraging distinctive individual academic work for teacher and student alike.

- As the curriculum is revised, textbooks should also be edited to include additional practical materials for use in class. They should include cases, case studies or fact patterns, discussion points, samples and exercises directed to the practical implementation of the legal theory in each chapter.
- All the classrooms should be equipped with multimedia equipment (such as projectors, PC etc) in order that teacher's may have the option of utilizing all methodologies in their teaching.
- All classes should have access to wifi that the teacher can control for enhanced student learning and class research. Student laptops in class do present some challenges but there are many ways to address these issues and use the wifi resources to enhance student learning.
- There should be more student gathering and working space. Perhaps unused classroom can be reserved by student groups for extra class meetings or the library can have set time where the silence requirement is not enforced.
- Students should have a dedicated Wi-Fi with substantial bandwidth for student reading, research, and independent study. This would also permit greater teacher assignments and lessen the printing / textbook issues. Students can be required to have individual sign-ins and password as well as specific written guidelines on use and misuse. The students we spoke with all seemed willing to sign and abide by such guidelines in exchange for wifi access. Additionally, current software can restrict many sites and audio/video downloads.

6. Administration and Information Systems

Element 6: Key Survey Points

- While students generally agreed or strongly agreed that the law school is well organized and administers courses effectively (73.6%), surveys revealed a substantial proportion of students do not believe the timetabling of their classes is effective. Almost half of students (48%) did not agree or strongly agree that the timetabling of their classes works effectively. And with teacher survey responses across the whole survey being generally very positive, it was noticeable that 22.4 percent of teachers were only neutral or disagreed that timetabling was effective. Timetabling, in particular the “third shift” was identified as sub-optimal in interviews with teachers and students alike.
- While it is positive for the school, that 63% of graduates agreed or strongly agreed that their law degree enabled them to get a legal job upon graduation, this nonetheless means that over a third of graduates surveyed did not agree or strongly agree this was the case. It is important to place this in perspective: the legal jobs market in Ukraine is over-saturated with graduates, and in recent years the market has further compressed amid nationwide economic challenges.

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

Key findings

- The law school has good administrative capacity, and is generally well-organized in how it manages and administers legal education. The roles and expectations of teachers and students are clearly established and understood, and interviews revealed a strong collective work ethic among teachers. However, this environment, while ordered, did not seem particularly conducive to thinking creatively about teaching and learning, while the strictures of state regulation – actual and perceived – seem to inhibit reform focused thinking.
- Communication on administrative matters seems generally effective, notwithstanding that some students noted in their open-ended question survey answers that changes in scheduling or events were not effectively communicated to them. Notice boards are still in frequent use, though on line communication with students is in the process of being developed by the faculty, with each department making up lists of students’ emails. However, while online communication is clearly the best way to communicate, the potential for error and inefficiency is high with current system. Further, the lack of consistent student access to Wi-Fi means this system cannot be used for issues or communications that in a short time-frame.

- Surveys showed the relationship between teachers and students is considered a strength by teacher and student alike. A particularly positive scheme, outlined in faculty interviews, are the extra-curricular academic communities run by each chair, where students can prepare and discuss research and present their results under the supervision of teachers. Each year (in April) students can publish the key findings of their research in a special Faculty yearbook. Overall, relations are certainly very respectful and cordial, but the school would perhaps benefit from developing a less formal atmosphere in order to encourage more participatory and creative modes of learning between teachers and students.
- Students do not feel they have a significant role in decision-making. Although there are representatives of student self-government bodies in the Academic Council of the Faculty, students do not believe or see their perspectives being considered when adjusting the Curricular and study plans.
- In surveys, some teachers expressed discontent with what was termed an “authoritarian style of leadership”, with a sense that decisions are not made collectively, but instead imposed by the heads of department alone. This linked with comments on a lack of transparency in faculty decisions making.

Recommendations

- The faculty, in particular the administration, should seek to cultivate a more open and participatory environment, and ensure decision-making is transparent and the logic and basis of decisions are understood. The more teachers and students can play a role in school planning and decision-making, the more they will respect and implement the positive changes the faculty is looking to implement.
- To this end, the use of student representatives in the faculty’s government should be expanded where possible. Each law school department should consider instituting a student advisory group that can provide meaningful feedback to the administration on educational and administrative matters from the student perspective.
- Online communication via email should be made uniform across the school, with a standard university email identity issued to students. In conjunction with increasing internet access within the school, this would greatly improve the effectiveness of communication and administration.

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

Key findings

- The law school is integrated into the university-wide E-University system (<http://e-learning.law.chnu.edu.ua/>). This is a modern e-resource where all students and teachers are registered with personal passwords for access. This system is designed to decrease the

current work burden associated with paper based information management, decrease the need for students to take up administrator time seeking basic information on class scheduling and grades, and bring the law school in line with international best practices for information management. Students can get materials for their classes in this system.

Recommendations

- The Faculty should develop this E-University on-line system further. This system should include profiles for all students including details, grades, schedules, and any other relevant information. It should be systematically updated. The responsibility of updating the e-courses could be given to the chairs of the Faculty. This would bring the law school in line with international best practices for information management.
- Developing distance-learning options should be a priority for the further development of the Faculty. Where appropriate videos of lectures could be posted to aid student learning. Administration should also seek to address the resistance some teachers have to their lectures being available online in print form. Concerns about how this would affect student motivation and learning betray a reality that student note-taking is often based on copying what the teacher has said word for word. This is a sub-optimal process in terms of active learning and student engagement.
- These recommendations highlight the very clear need for a computer lab sufficient for the anticipated online workload, and to facilitate student access to Wi-Fi for learning purposes.

Element 7: Public Information

7.1 Institution regularly publishes up to date, impartial and objective information, both quantitative and qualitative, about the programs and awards they are offering.

Key Findings

- The Law School has a page on the site of Chernivtsi University that is regularly updated with information for students, applicants and graduates, but at present the potential of this page is not maximized. While it does include the School's concept note on quality development, it otherwise focuses on information on the school's teachers and history, without including vital information such as curricula and statistics (e.g. on admissions and graduations). Further, the page only exists in the Ukrainian language.
- At the university level, there is an NGO called Union of Alumni and Friends of the Yuri Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, which reflects the increasing interest the university has in facilitating relations with alumni. At the law faculty level, the Dean and Vice deans, do maintain close relations with some of the school's alumni. However, there is no official body or framework dealing with alumni, no designated manager of external relations, and now plan to increase their involvement. This is a pity, as alumni almost universally said they would like to play a more active role in the life of the Faculty.

Recommendations

- The content of the website should be enriched to include all data on applications, courses, students, as well as important information on employability statistics of law graduates. While the law school administration believes the percentage of its graduates involved in legal work far exceeds the national average, the lack of a graduate employment database means it cannot substantiate these claims, or use this apparent success as a selling point to attract the strongest future applicants. All advertisements about upcoming events and extra curricular activities should also be published to demonstrate a varied academic life within the school. In the ideal scenario, the website would also be available in English to allow those from other countries (and potential foreign students) learn about the school, and should be further developed to become a one stop portal for all law school information, for current and prospective students, teachers, and administrators.
- In particular, information about the Legal Clinic should be more visible. The teachers who lead it should provide the web site with the information concerning time schedule of the Clinic, the activities of the Clinic, the right of the citizen to pro bono legal consultations and the methods the Clinic can provide for legal consulting (as well as the services the Clinic cannot provide according to the Law of Ukraine "On Free Legal Aid", adopted on June 2, 2011).
- To initiate such improvements, an administration, faculty and student group should be organized to explore numerous law faculty websites and make recommendations of the best from each of the sites reviewed. This could be the basis of an interesting

collaboration with all stakeholders in the law faculty and provide the material for fully developed web pages on the law school.

- One of the Vice-deans should be nominated to execute the functions of development of the external relations, facilitating and increasing meaningful links between the Faculty and other institutions, collect the information of internship programs with potential employers, law fairs, and alumni relations.
- The Faculty, through this vice-dean, should then consider setting up an official organization of its alumni. The alumni could contribute to the life of the school through official fund raising for projects, administrated by the Faculty. Such Projects could involve students and teachers in legal practice, financing publications and projects of the teachers, and assisting students in finding the jobs upon graduation.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS TO GOVERNMENT

Ukrainian higher education authorities have a vital role to play in ensuring and encouraging the provision of quality legal education across Ukraine. Under the Soviet system of State University, law faculties have traditionally been viewed as training academies for state law enforcement agencies including police, prosecution, and the judiciary. However, the modern context of a government based on democratic principles and the rule of law requires legal professionals with the skills and knowledge not only to work for the state, but also to hold the state to account and play an important role in a fast changing economy. The role of legal education in developing high quality lawyers is therefore fundamental both to safeguard the rule of law and to the operation of the private sector. Higher education authorities must acknowledge this vital importance of legal education, ensuring a requisite standard of legal education is provided, while affording law schools the autonomy to respond creatively to the evolving demands of the market place.

In light of the above, the following recommendations are suggested:

- An independent National Agency for Ensuring the Quality of Higher Education should be formed as soon as possible under the new Law of Ukraine “On Higher Education” similar to those employed in other countries for accreditation. It should have a coordinating role, acting independently of government politics and policies. The specific Expert Council on Legal Education Quality Assurance provided for under the law should be empowered to play a vital role in ensuring this National Agency meets the specific needs of law schools.
- A system for the accreditation of universities with clearly formulated accreditation standards should be created, including accreditation standards specific for law faculties. National standards specific to legal education should be designed. Standards for law faculties should be based on best practices and principles for effective legal education meeting international standards. While basic standards should be set for each law faculty, the individual faculties should be given broad flexibility in choosing methods to implement those standards and develop their own areas of excellence. A series of high standards or goals that are aspirational and encourage academic excellence should be devised alongside minimum accreditation standards that are necessary for all licensed law faculties. How to teach and what to emphasis should be left to the individual law faculties.
- In conjunction with a system of accreditation, agency should develop a system of independent external evaluation of the quality of education that the law schools provide. This could draw on this methodology developed by FAIR, modifying, simplifying, and developing benchmarks so it could operate as a nationwide external assessment tool.
- The Ministry should encourage the Law Faculties to develop a continuous system of internal quality assessment that includes all stakeholders in the law school, as detailed under Element 1 of this report. The existence and effectiveness of a law school’s internal quality assurance mechanisms should be one focus of any external evaluation process.

- The Ministry of Education and Science must fairly and transparently distribute the number of budget places offered at each Law Schools. The main criteria of this distribution should be the quality of legal education provided by the Law School, which is illustrated, to an extent, by the demand for the Law School among the students.
- The Ministry should allow law faculties to decrease the mandatory course load of students and foster the creation of an effective elective course of studies as a regular part of the curriculum following the provision of the Law of Ukraine “On High Education” adopted on July 1, 2014.
- The Ministry should initiate elaboration and adoption of the Law School Codes of Conduct for Faculty, Administration, Students and Staff, which should incorporate various provisions on the teachers’ models of behavior, standards of the best teaching methods and practices and integrity as well as criteria of the internal quality assessment of teaching.
- The main criteria of the career promotion of a teacher should be clear and objective and should include the number of the peer reviewed publications in national and international journals, involvement in out of class activities of the Faculty, participation in national and international conferences, personal and professional integrity and ability to practice modern (including multimedia) teaching methods.
- The Ministry should develop and encourage anticorruption policies within the higher educational institutions. A good starting point of study on the subject can be found at: <http://www.track.unodc.org/Education/Pages/ACAD.aspx>
- The procedure of PhD dissertations defense should be changed as soon as possible following western-type system of defense and in accordance with the provisions of the Law of Ukraine “On High Education” adopted on July 1, 2014.

APPENDIX 1 – ASSESSMENT TEAM BIOGRAPHIES

Dr. Thomas H. Speedy Rice is currently a Professor of Practice at Washington & Lee School of Law's Transnational Law Institute in Lexington, VA. He designed, 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 promoting the UN Principles and Guidelines on Access to Legal Aid in Criminal Matters in Palestine, a third 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. 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.

Mr. 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, the American Bar Association Rule of Law Initiative, and the Council of Europe. 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.

Dr. Myroslava Antonovych is the Head of International Law Department and Associate Professor of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. She also serves as the Director and was the founder of the Center for International Human Rights at Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. She has five years of experience in the European Court of Human Rights as an ad hoc judge. Dr. Antonovych has been teaching Public International Law and International Human Rights for more than 20 years. She has been a visiting professor at the law schools of the USA and Europe. She holds law degrees from Lviv Ivan Franko National University, McGill University, Canada (LL.M) and Ukrainian Free University, Germany (Doctor of Law). She participated in quality assurance projects through FAIR, OSCE and AFP HESP.

Dr. Olena Ovcharenko is a Ukrainian judicial operations and judicial selection specialist with solid research and teaching experience. She is an Associate Professor at the Yaroslav the Wise Kharkiv National Legal University. She also works as a part-time researcher at the V.V. Stashis Institute of Organized Crime Studies of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine, Kharkiv. Her current research projects are focused on judicial integrity and accountability and international criminal justice standards.

APPENDIX 2 – SCHEDULE OF EXPERTS’ ACTIVITIES DURING ON-SITE VISIT

<u>DAY</u> <u>I</u>	MONDAY May 18, 2015			
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contacts
09:00 - 10:00	All experts	Introductory meeting of experts at the Dean’s office of the law school with its leadership Petro Patsurkivskyi, Doctor of Law, Professor, Dean Serhii Savchuk, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Deputy Dean on Methodological Work Serhii Melenko, Doctor of Law, Associate Professor, Deputy Dean on Full-Time Department Ivan Toronchuk, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Deputy Dean on Part-Time Department Viktoriya Vasylchuk, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Deputy Dean on Educational Work Dmytro Kostia, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Deputy Dean on Scientific Work	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Dean’s Office)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyi 050-338-40-40 Dr. Serhii Savchuk 095-525-87-18 Dr. Serhii Melenko 050-511-62-00
10:00 - 11:00	All experts	Tour – acquaintance with material and technical base of the law school and University (lecture rooms, conference halls, labs, etc.)	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi	Dr. Serhii Melenko 050-511-62-00
11:00 - 12:00	Two experts (Group A)	Interviews with deputy deans upon the experts’ choice Serhii Savchuk, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Deputy Dean on Methodological Work Serhii Melenko, Doctor of Law, Associate Professor, Deputy Dean on Full-Time Department Ivan Toronchuk, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Deputy Dean on Part-Time Department Viktoriya Vasylchuk, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Deputy Dean on Educational Work Dmytro Kostia, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Deputy Dean on Scientific Work	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council meeting room)	Dr. Serhii Savchuk 095-525-87-18
11:00 - 12:00	Two experts (Group B)	Time to systematize the collected information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional lessons, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and record impressions based on results of the work	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Office of the Head of Department of Constitutional,	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyi 050-338-40-40

12:00 - 13:00	All experts	Focus-group discussion with deputy deans Serhii Savchuk, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Deputy Dean on Methodological Work Serhii Melenko, Doctor of Law, Associate Professor, Deputy Dean on Full-Time Department Ivan Toronchuk, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Deputy Dean on Part-Time Department Viktoriya Vasylychuk, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Deputy Dean on Educational Work Dmytro Kostia, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Deputy Dean on Scientific Work	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council meeting room)	Dr. Serhii Savchuk 095-525-87-18
13:30 - 14:30	Lunch Time			
15:00 - 16:00	All experts	Meeting at the Rector's Office, communication with Vice-Rectors Rector – Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Professor, Stepan Melnychuk; First Vice-Rector – Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Professor, Roman Petryshyn; Vice-Rector on Science – Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Professor, Oleksandr Ushenko; Vice-Rector on Scientific and Pedagogical Work on Educational and Teaching Process – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Tamara Marusyk.	2, Kotsubynskogo St., Chernivtsi (Building N 5, Rector's Office)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyi 050-338-40-40
16:00 - 17:00	Two experts (Group B)	Interviews with heads of departments of the law school Dr. Prof. Mykhailo Nykyforak, Department of Philosophy and Theory of Law Dr. Prof. Petro Patsurkivsky, Department of Constitutional, Administrative and Financial Law Dr. Associate Prof. Serhiy Melenko, Department of European Law and Comparative Jurisprudence Dr. Associate Prof. Oksana Shcherbaniuk, Department of Justice Dr. Associate Prof. Serhiy Nezhurbida, Department of Criminal Law and Criminalistics (acting) Dr. Associate Prof. Oleg Orlovsky, Department of Civil Law (acting)	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council meeting room)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyi 050-338-40-40
16:00 - 17:00	Two experts (Group A)	Time to systematize the collected information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional lessons, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and record impressions based on results of the work	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Office of the Head of Department of Constitutional, Administrative and Financial Law) (Room 301)	Dr. Serhii Melenko 050-511-62-00

17:00 - 18:00	All experts	Focus-group discussion with heads of departments of the law school Dr. Prof. Mykhailo Nykyforak, Department of Philosophy and Theory of Law Dr. Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyy, Department of Constitutional, Administrative and Financial Law Dr. Associate Prof. Serhiy Melenko, Department of European Law and Comparative Jurisprudence Dr. Associate Prof. Oksana Shcherbaniuk, Department of Justice Dr. Associate Prof. Serhiy Nezhurbida, Department of Criminal Law and Criminalistics (acting) Dr. Associate Prof. Oleg Orlovskyy, Department of Civil Law (acting)	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council meeting room)	Dr. Serhii Savchuk 095-525-87-18
<u>DAY</u> <u>2</u>	TUESDAY May 19, 2015			
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contacts
09:00 - 11:30	Two experts (Group B)	Time to systematize the collected information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional lessons, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and record impressions based on results of the work	12, Korduby St., Chernivtsi	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyy 050-338-40-40
11:30 - 12:50	Two experts (Group A)	Observation of teaching in the lecture room (according to the law school schedule)	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi	Dr. Serhii Melenko 050-511-62-00
11:30 - 12:50	Two experts (Group A)	Observation of teaching in the lecture room (according to the law school schedule)	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyy 050-338-40-40
12.50 - 13.30	All experts	Time to systematize the collected information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional lessons, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and record impressions based on results of the work		Dr. Serhii Melenko 050-511-62-00

13:30 - 14:30	Lunch Time			
14:30 - 15:30	All experts	Interviews with faculty of the law school – one representative from each department: Department of Constitutional, Administrative and Financial Law – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Vitalii Vdovichen; Department of European law and Comparative Legal Studies – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Oksana Voloshchuk; Department of Philosophy and Theory of Law – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Svitlana Karvatska; Department of Criminal Law and Criminalistics – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Halyna Zharovska; Department of Justice – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Aurika Paskar; Department of Civil Law – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Natalia Protskiv	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council meeting room)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyi 050-338-40-40
15:30 - 16:00	All experts	Time to systematize the collected information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional lessons, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and record impressions based on results of the work	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Office of the Head of Department of Constitutional, Administrative	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyi 050-338-40-40
16:00 - 17:00	All experts	Focus-group discussion with faculty of the law school – two representatives from each department Department of Constitutional, Administrative and Financial Law – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Nataliia Fedoruk, Assistant Liudmyla Kostia; Department of European law and Comparative Legal Studies – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Olha Chepel, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Assistant, Viktoriia Cheban ; Department of Philosophy and Theory of Law – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Oksana Bunchuk, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Assistant, Serhii Bodnar; Department of Criminal Law and Criminalistics – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Andrii Shevchuk, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Olena Yushchuk; Department of Justice – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Oleksii Chernovskyi, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Assistant, Nataliia Turman; Department of Civil Law – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Volodymyr Nykyforak, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Assistant, Yana Odovichen.	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council Meeting Room)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyi 050-338-40-40

17:00 - 17:40	All experts	Interview with graduates of the law school, interview with postgraduates	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council Meeting Room)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyi 050-338-40-40
17:40 - 17:50	All experts	Time to systematize the collected information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional lessons, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and record impressions based on results of the work	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council Meeting Room)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyi 050-338-40-40
17:50 18:30	Two experts (Group B)	Focus-group discussion with postgraduate students and	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Room 301)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyi 050-338-40-40
<u>DAY</u> <u>3</u>	WEDNESDAY May 20, 2015			
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contacts
09:00 - 09:45	All experts	Meeting with judges at the court of appeals. Interviews with judges, including those who are graduates of the law school	4, Eminesku St., Chernivtsi	Dr. Serhii Melenko 050-511-62-00
9:45 - 10:00	All experts	Time to systematize the collected information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional lessons, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and record impressions based on results of the work	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Room 301)	Dr. Serhii Savchuk 095-525-87-18
10:00 - 10:45	All experts	Focus-group with judges, including those who are graduates of the law school	4, Eminesku St., Chernivtsi	Dr. Serhii Melenko, 050-511-62-00
10:45 - 11:00	All experts	Travel to law school		
11:30 - 12:50	All experts	Observation of teaching in the lecture room (according to the law school schedule)	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi	Dr. Serhii Savchuk 095-525-87-18

	Two experts (Group B)	Observation of teaching in the lecture room (according to the law school schedule)	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi	Dr. Seghii Melenko, 050-511-62- 00
13:30 - 14:30	Lunch Time			
14:30 - 15:30	Two experts (Group B)	Visiting the office of legal clinic on the base of the law school. Communication with students	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Department of Justice)	Dr. Seghii Melenko, 050-511-62- 00
14:30 - 15:30	Two experts (Group A)	Acquaintance with facilities and funds of the library/reading room of the law school	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Departments of the law school,	Prof. Petro Patsurkivsky i 050-338-40- 40
15:30 - 18:00	All experts	Familiarizing with internal regulations/rules of the law school, Updating notes, collating notes	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council Meeting Room)	

<u>DAY</u> 4	THURSDAY May 21, 2015			
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contacts
09:00 - 09:45	All experts	Informal meeting with all students	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council Meeting Room)	Dr. Serhii Savchuk 095-525-87- 18
09:45 - 10:30	All experts	Interviews with practicing lawyers	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Room 218)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivsky i 050-338-40- 40
10:30 - 10:45	All experts	Time to systematize the collected information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional lessons, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and record impressions based on results of the work	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council meeting room)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivsky i 050-338-40- 40

10:45 - 11:30	All experts	Focus-group discussion with practicing lawyers , including those who are graduates of the law school	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyi 050-338-40-40
11:50 - 13:10	All experts	Model Class by Professor Speedy Rice on the jury trial in the US	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi	Dr. Viktoriia Vasylchuk 050-519-51-78
13:30 - 14:30	Lunch Time			
15:00 - 16:00	Two experts (Group B)	Focus-group discussion with penultimate and ultimate year students of the law school	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyi 050-338-40-40
15:00 - 16:00	Two experts (Group A)	Focus-group discussion with PhD students of the law school	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Room 01)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyi 050-338-40-
16:00 - 17:00	All experts	Time to systematize the collected information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional lessons, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and record impressions based on results of the work	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyi 050-338-40-40
17:00 - 18:00	All experts	Review of students' papers	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Departments)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivskyi 050-338-40-40
<u>DAY</u> 5	FRIDAY May 22, 2015			
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contacts
09:00 - 11:00	All experts	Time to systematize the collected information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional lessons, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and record impressions based on results of the work	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council Meeting)	Dr. Serhii Melenko, 050-511-62-00
11:50 - 13:10	Two experts (Group A)	Observation of teaching process in the lecture room (according to the law school schedule)	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council)	Dr. Serhii Melenko, 050-511-62-00

11:50 - 13:10	Two experts (Group B)	Observation of teaching process in the lecture room (according to the law school schedule)	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council Meeting Room)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivsky i 050-338-40- 40
13:30 - 14:30	Lunch Time			
15:00 - 15:40	All experts	Time to systematize the collected information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional lessons, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and record impressions based on results of the work	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivsky i 050-338-40- 40
16:00 - 17:00	All experts	Wrap-up meeting with the dean/deputy deans of the law school Presentation of survey report based on evaluation results. Brief summary of recommendations	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivsky i 050-338-40- 40
17:00 - 18:00	All experts	Discussion of the process of integration of some parts of report based on evaluation results. Distribution of roles and agreeing upon coordination of work on the draft report and its deadline to be submitted to the dean of the law school for his comments. Agreeing upon the format of team work on the final report based on evaluation results	19, Universytetska St., Chernivtsi (Academic Council Meeting Room)	Prof. Petro Patsurkivsky i 050-338-40- 40

APPENDIX 3 – ON-LINE SURVEY RESULTS

SURVEY 1 – STUDENTS – 185 RESPONDENTS

1. The law school recognizes, values, and encourages quality legal education		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.6%	3
Disagree	4.4%	8
Neutral	9.3%	17
Agree	59.6%	109
Strongly agree	25.1%	46
<i>answered question</i>		183
<i>skipped question</i>		2

2. The law school has policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.6%	3
Disagree	4.3%	8
Neutral	13.6%	25
Agree	61.4%	113
Strongly agree	19.0%	35
<i>answered question</i>		184
<i>skipped question</i>		1

3. There are opportunities for students to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.1%	2
Disagree	10.3%	19
Neutral	21.7%	40
Agree	50.0%	92
Strongly agree	16.8%	31
<i>answered question</i>		184
<i>skipped question</i>		1

4. The Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.1%	2
Disagree	12.0%	22
Neutral	19.1%	35
Agree	50.8%	93
Strongly agree	16.9%	31
<i>answered question</i>		183
<i>skipped question</i>		2

5. The Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	2.8%	5
Disagree	13.9%	25
Neutral	20.0%	36
Agree	37.2%	67
Strongly agree	26.1%	47
<i>answered question</i>		180
<i>skipped question</i>		5

6. Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.6%	3
Disagree	17.6%	32
Neutral	23.6%	43
Agree	39.6%	72
Strongly agree	17.6%	32
<i>answered question</i>		182
<i>skipped question</i>		3

7. I have received detailed feedback on my work

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.7%	3
Disagree	10.1%	18
Neutral	20.7%	37
Agree	54.7%	98
Strongly agree	12.8%	23

<i>answered question</i>	179
<i>skipped question</i>	6

8. I have received timely and detailed feedback on my work

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.6%	3
Disagree	10.4%	19
Neutral	27.9%	51
Agree	47.0%	86
Strongly agree	13.1%	24
<i>answered question</i>		183
<i>skipped question</i>		2

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.7%	3
Disagree	11.1%	20
Neutral	22.2%	40
Agree	48.3%	87
Strongly agree	16.7%	30
<i>answered question</i>		180
<i>skipped question</i>		5

10. Law school teachers are well qualified and competent

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	1.7%	3
Neutral	7.8%	14
Agree	50.6%	91
Strongly agree	40.0%	72
<i>answered question</i>		180
<i>skipped question</i>		5

11. Law school teachers are well organized and prepared for classes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	2.2%	4
Neutral	7.7%	14
Agree	47.8%	87
Strongly agree	42.3%	77
<i>answered question</i>		182
<i>skipped question</i>		3

12. I have the opportunity to evaluate my law school teachers performances

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	7.2%	13
Disagree	23.9%	43
Neutral	22.8%	41
Agree	33.9%	61
Strongly agree	12.2%	22
<i>answered question</i>		180
<i>skipped question</i>		5

13. I receive sufficient advice and support with my studies

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.7%	3
Disagree	13.8%	25
Neutral	17.1%	31
Agree	51.4%	93
Strongly agree	16.0%	29
<i>answered question</i>		181
<i>skipped question</i>		4

14. I am been able to contact law school teachers when I need to

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	4.4%	8
Disagree	13.2%	24
Neutral	13.7%	25
Agree	42.3%	77
Strongly agree	26.4%	48

<i>answered question</i>	182
<i>skipped question</i>	3

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	2.2%	4
Disagree	9.4%	17
Neutral	22.2%	40
Agree	50.0%	90
Strongly agree	16.1%	29
<i>answered question</i>		180
<i>skipped question</i>		5

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	2.8%	5
Disagree	8.9%	16
Neutral	12.8%	23
Agree	45.0%	81
Strongly agree	30.6%	55
<i>answered question</i>		180
<i>skipped question</i>		5

17. Law school teachers use a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	2.2%	4
Disagree	10.1%	18
Neutral	12.4%	22
Agree	47.8%	85
Strongly agree	27.5%	49
<i>answered question</i>		178
<i>skipped question</i>		7

18. Law School teachers adequately explain key concepts

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.1%	2
Disagree	5.0%	9
Neutral	9.4%	17
Agree	54.7%	99
Strongly agree	29.8%	54
<i>answered question</i>		181
<i>skipped question</i>		4

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.5%	1
Disagree	3.3%	6
Neutral	20.3%	37
Agree	51.1%	93
Strongly agree	24.7%	45
<i>answered question</i>		182
<i>skipped question</i>		3

20. My law school education is interesting and intellectually stimulating

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.7%	3
Disagree	8.3%	15
Neutral	17.1%	31
Agree	47.0%	85
Strongly agree	26.0%	47
<i>answered question</i>		181
<i>skipped question</i>		4

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	2.7%	5
Disagree	10.4%	19
Neutral	9.9%	18
Agree	57.7%	105
Strongly agree	19.2%	35

<i>answered question</i>	182
<i>skipped question</i>	3

22. I have access to the internet for research purposes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	2.7%	5
Disagree	6.6%	12
Neutral	4.9%	9
Agree	47.3%	86
Strongly agree	38.5%	70
<i>answered question</i>		182
<i>skipped question</i>		3

23. The law school is well organized and administers courses effectively

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	2.2%	4
Disagree	5.5%	10
Neutral	18.7%	34
Agree	56.0%	102
Strongly agree	17.6%	32
<i>answered question</i>		182
<i>skipped question</i>		3

24. The timetabling of my classes works efficiently

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	11.7%	21
Disagree	19.6%	35
Neutral	16.8%	30
Agree	39.7%	71
Strongly agree	12.3%	22
<i>answered question</i>		179
<i>skipped question</i>		6

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	3.4%	6
Disagree	15.6%	28
Neutral	16.8%	30
Agree	51.4%	92
Strongly agree	12.8%	23
<i>answered question</i>		179
<i>skipped question</i>		6

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.1%	2
Disagree	13.2%	24
Neutral	20.3%	37
Agree	46.2%	84
Strongly agree	19.2%	35
<i>answered question</i>		182
<i>skipped question</i>		3

27. The law school provides for the opportunity to appeal against the evaluation result which seems to be incorrect or unfair

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	4.4%	8
Disagree	10.6%	19
Neutral	26.1%	47
Agree	45.0%	81
Strongly agree	14.4%	26
<i>answered question</i>		180
<i>skipped question</i>		5

28. Year of study

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Year 1	26.8%	49
Year 2	19.7%	36
Year 3	21.3%	39
Year 4	11.5%	21
Year 5	23.0%	42

<i>answered question</i>	183
<i>skipped question</i>	2

29. What are the main strengths of the Law School?

Answer Options	Response Count
	108
<i>answered question</i>	108
<i>skipped question</i>	77

30. What are the main weaknesses of the Law School?

Answer Options	Response Count
	98
<i>answered question</i>	98
<i>skipped question</i>	87

31. Please make any other comments on the Law School

Answer Options	Response Count
	63
<i>answered question</i>	63
<i>skipped question</i>	122

SURVEY 2 – LAW SCHOOL GRADUATES – 88 Respondents

1. The law school recognizes, values, and encourages quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.1%	1
Disagree	2.3%	2
Neutral	14.8%	13
Agree	54.5%	48
Strongly agree	27.3%	24
<i>answered question</i>		88
<i>skipped question</i>		0

2. The law school had policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.1%	1
Disagree	8.0%	7
Neutral	14.8%	13
Agree	53.4%	47
Strongly agree	22.7%	20
<i>answered question</i>		88
<i>skipped question</i>		0

3. There were opportunities for students to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	2.3%	2
Disagree	11.4%	10
Neutral	18.2%	16
Agree	46.6%	41
Strongly agree	21.6%	19
<i>answered question</i>		88
<i>skipped question</i>		0

4. The Law School monitored the quality of my legal education

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

Strongly disagree	4.6%	4
Disagree	11.5%	10
Neutral	18.4%	16
Agree	43.7%	38
Strongly agree	21.8%	19
<i>answered question</i>		87
<i>skipped question</i>		1

5. The Law School admission process was transparent, fair, and meritocratic

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	18.4%	16
Disagree	18.4%	16
Neutral	18.4%	16
Agree	26.4%	23
Strongly agree	18.4%	16
<i>answered question</i>		87
<i>skipped question</i>		1

6. Law School assessment arrangements and marking were fair

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	8.0%	7
Disagree	19.5%	17
Neutral	20.7%	18
Agree	36.8%	32
Strongly agree	14.9%	13
<i>answered question</i>		87
<i>skipped question</i>		1

7. I received detailed feedback on my work

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	2.3%	2
Disagree	14.8%	13
Neutral	9.1%	8
Agree	50.0%	44
Strongly agree	23.9%	21
<i>answered question</i>		88
<i>skipped question</i>		0

8. I received this feedback promptly

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	2.3%	2
Disagree	14.9%	13
Neutral	14.9%	13
Agree	44.8%	39
Strongly agree	23.0%	20
<i>answered question</i>		87
<i>skipped question</i>		1

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	2.3%	2
Disagree	17.2%	15
Neutral	20.7%	18
Agree	32.2%	28
Strongly agree	27.6%	24
<i>answered question</i>		87
<i>skipped question</i>		1

10. My law school teachers were well qualified and competent

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.1%	1
Disagree	3.4%	3
Neutral	11.4%	10
Agree	52.3%	46
Strongly agree	31.8%	28
<i>answered question</i>		88
<i>skipped question</i>		0

11. My law school teachers were well organized and prepared for classes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0

Disagree	4.5%	4
Neutral	18.2%	16
Agree	43.2%	38
Strongly agree	34.1%	30
<i>answered question</i>		88
<i>skipped question</i>		0

12. I had the opportunity to evaluate my law school teachers performances

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	8.0%	7
Disagree	20.5%	18
Neutral	18.2%	16
Agree	37.5%	33
Strongly agree	15.9%	14
<i>answered question</i>		88
<i>skipped question</i>		0

13. I received sufficient advice and support with my studies

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.1%	1
Disagree	14.8%	13
Neutral	19.3%	17
Agree	36.4%	32
Strongly agree	28.4%	25
<i>answered question</i>		88
<i>skipped question</i>		0

14. I was able to contact law school teachers when I needed to

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	4.5%	4
Disagree	18.2%	16
Neutral	10.2%	9
Agree	39.8%	35
Strongly agree	27.3%	24
<i>answered question</i>		88
<i>skipped question</i>		0

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	4.5%	4
Disagree	18.2%	16
Neutral	22.7%	20
Agree	30.7%	27
Strongly agree	23.9%	21
<i>answered question</i>		88
<i>skipped question</i>		0

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.2%	1
Disagree	10.5%	9
Neutral	17.4%	15
Agree	34.9%	30
Strongly agree	36.0%	31
<i>answered question</i>		86
<i>skipped question</i>		2

17. Law school teachers used a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	2.3%	2
Neutral	15.1%	13
Agree	50.0%	43
Strongly agree	32.6%	28
<i>answered question</i>		86
<i>skipped question</i>		2

18. Law School teachers adequately explained key concepts

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	2.3%	2

Neutral	18.2%	16	
Agree	51.1%	45	
Strongly agree	28.4%	25	
<i>answered question</i>			88
<i>skipped question</i>			0

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0	
Disagree	9.1%	8	
Neutral	21.6%	19	
Agree	44.3%	39	
Strongly agree	25.0%	22	
<i>answered question</i>			88
<i>skipped question</i>			0

20. My law school education was interesting and intellectually stimulating

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	
Strongly disagree	1.1%	1	
Disagree	12.5%	11	
Neutral	18.2%	16	
Agree	35.2%	31	
Strongly agree	33.0%	29	
<i>answered question</i>			88
<i>skipped question</i>			0

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	
Strongly disagree	2.3%	2	
Disagree	16.1%	14	
Neutral	10.3%	9	
Agree	50.6%	44	
Strongly agree	20.7%	18	
<i>answered question</i>			87
<i>skipped question</i>			1

22. I had access to the internet for research purposes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	3.4%	3
Disagree	25.3%	22
Neutral	11.5%	10
Agree	44.8%	39
Strongly agree	14.9%	13
<i>answered question</i>		87
<i>skipped question</i>		1

23. The law school was well organized and administered my courses effectively

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	2.3%	2
Disagree	6.9%	6
Neutral	24.1%	21
Agree	42.5%	37
Strongly agree	24.1%	21
<i>answered question</i>		87
<i>skipped question</i>		1

24. The timetabling of my classes worked efficiently

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	9.3%	8
Disagree	10.5%	9
Neutral	23.3%	20
Agree	30.2%	26
Strongly agree	26.7%	23
<i>answered question</i>		86
<i>skipped question</i>		2

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	4.6%	4
Disagree	13.8%	12
Neutral	16.1%	14

Agree	40.2%	35	
Strongly agree	25.3%	22	
<i>answered question</i>			87
<i>skipped question</i>			1

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	
Strongly disagree	1.1%	1	
Disagree	12.5%	11	
Neutral	20.5%	18	
Agree	42.0%	37	
Strongly agree	23.9%	21	
<i>answered question</i>			88
<i>skipped question</i>			0

27. My degree from this Law School helped me find a job in the field of law

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	
Strongly disagree	4.5%	4	
Disagree	13.6%	12	
Neutral	27.3%	24	
Agree	23.9%	21	
Strongly agree	31.8%	28	
<i>answered question</i>			88
<i>skipped question</i>			0

28. The number of years after graduation from the Law School

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	
1-3 years	64.8%	57	
4-6 years	15.9%	14	
7-9 years	5.7%	5	
10-12 years	1.1%	1	
13+ years	12.5%	11	
<i>answered question</i>			88
<i>skipped question</i>			0

29. Employment field

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Non-legal	19.5%	17
Legal - private	27.6%	24
Legal - public	37.9%	33
Legal - judiciary	11.5%	10
Legal - academia	9.2%	8
<i>answered question</i>		87
<i>skipped question</i>		1

30. What are the main strengths of the Law School?

Answer Options	Response Count
	61
<i>answered question</i>	61
<i>skipped question</i>	27

31. What are the main weaknesses of the Law School?

Answer Options	Response Count
	59
<i>answered question</i>	59
<i>skipped question</i>	29

32. Please make any other comments on the Law School

Answer Options	Response Count
	46
<i>answered question</i>	46
<i>skipped question</i>	42

SURVEY 3 – TEACHERS – 72 RESPONDENTS

1. The law school recognizes, values, and encourages quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	1.4%	1
Agree	23.9%	17
Strongly agree	74.6%	53
<i>answered question</i>		71
<i>skipped question</i>		1

2. The law school has policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.5%	1
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	7.4%	5
Agree	48.5%	33
Strongly agree	42.6%	29
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

3. There are opportunities for faculty to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	1.5%	1
Agree	43.3%	29
Strongly agree	55.2%	37
<i>answered question</i>		67
<i>skipped question</i>		5

4. The Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students

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

Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	5.9%	4
Agree	57.4%	39
Strongly agree	36.8%	25
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

5. The Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.5%	1
Disagree	3.0%	2
Neutral	6.0%	4
Agree	26.9%	18
Strongly agree	62.7%	42
<i>answered question</i>		67
<i>skipped question</i>		5

6. Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	4.4%	3
Neutral	1.5%	1
Agree	50.0%	34
Strongly agree	44.1%	30
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

7. I provide detailed feedback on student work

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	4.4%	3
Agree	50.0%	34
Strongly agree	45.6%	31
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

8. I provide this feedback promptly

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	1.5%	1
Neutral	9.1%	6
Agree	53.0%	35
Strongly agree	36.4%	24
<i>answered question</i>		66
<i>skipped question</i>		6

9. This feedback is designed to help students clarify things they did not understand

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	1.5%	1
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	41.2%	28
Strongly agree	57.4%	39
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

10. Law school teachers are well qualified and competent

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	2.9%	2
Neutral	2.9%	2
Agree	48.5%	33
Strongly agree	45.6%	31
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

11. Law school teachers are well organized and prepared for classes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0

Disagree	1.5%	1
Neutral	4.4%	3
Agree	45.6%	31
Strongly agree	48.5%	33
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

12. I have the formal opportunity to evaluate my own performance as a law teacher

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	3.0%	2
Neutral	17.9%	12
Agree	46.3%	31
Strongly agree	32.8%	22
<i>answered question</i>		67
<i>skipped question</i>		5

13. I offer sufficient advice and support to students

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	44.1%	30
Strongly agree	55.9%	38
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

14. I am available for students to contact me when they need to

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	20.9%	14
Strongly agree	79.1%	53
<i>answered question</i>		67
<i>skipped question</i>		5

15. Students receive good advice when they need to make study choices

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	2.9%	2
Agree	27.9%	19
Strongly agree	69.1%	47
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

16. I believe the law school prepares students adequately for a future legal career

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	5.9%	4
Agree	47.1%	32
Strongly agree	47.1%	32
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	2.9%	2
Agree	41.2%	28
Strongly agree	55.9%	38
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

18. I adequately explain key concepts to students

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

Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	44.1%	30
Strongly agree	55.9%	38
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

19. I am enthusiastic about the subject I am teaching

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	20.6%	14
Strongly agree	79.4%	54
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

20. I ensure my classes are interesting and intellectually stimulating

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	30.9%	21
Strongly agree	69.1%	47
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	1.5%	1
Agree	57.4%	39
Strongly agree	41.2%	28
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

22. I have access to the internet for research purposes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Agree	16.2%	11
Strongly agree	83.8%	57
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

23. The law school is well organized and administers courses effectively

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	1.5%	1
Disagree	1.5%	1
Neutral	9.1%	6
Agree	42.4%	28
Strongly agree	45.5%	30
<i>answered question</i>		66
<i>skipped question</i>		6

24. The timetabling of my classes works efficiently

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	3.0%	2
Disagree	10.4%	7
Neutral	9.0%	6
Agree	49.3%	33
Strongly agree	28.4%	19
<i>answered question</i>		67
<i>skipped question</i>		5

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	4.4%	3
Neutral	10.3%	7

Agree	36.8%	25	
Strongly agree	48.5%	33	
<i>answered question</i>			68
<i>skipped question</i>			4

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0	
Disagree	0.0%	0	
Neutral	4.4%	3	
Agree	45.6%	31	
Strongly agree	50.0%	34	
<i>answered question</i>			68
<i>skipped question</i>			4

27. I have the opportunity to participate in developing/reviewing the law school curriculum as well as lecture/seminar plans

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0	
Disagree	1.5%	1	
Neutral	1.5%	1	
Agree	37.3%	25	
Strongly agree	59.7%	40	
<i>answered question</i>			67
<i>skipped question</i>			5

28. I can use multimedia technologies when teaching in-class

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0	
Disagree	1.5%	1	
Neutral	4.5%	3	
Agree	53.7%	36	
Strongly agree	40.3%	27	
<i>answered question</i>			67
<i>skipped question</i>			5

29. The Law Schools provides for the opportunity to appeal against the evaluation result which seems to be incorrect or unfair

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly disagree	2.9%	2
Disagree	5.9%	4
Neutral	7.4%	5
Agree	33.8%	23
Strongly agree	50.0%	34
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		4

30. How long have you taught at the law school?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
0-3 years	25.0%	18
4-7 years	11.1%	8
8-11 years	18.1%	13
12-15 years	22.2%	16
16+ years	23.6%	17
<i>answered question</i>		72
<i>skipped question</i>		0

31. What kind of interactive methods of teaching do you use, if any?

Answer Options	Response Count
	54
<i>answered question</i>	54
<i>skipped question</i>	18

32. What are the main strengths of the Law School?

Answer Options	Response Count
	54
<i>answered question</i>	54
<i>skipped question</i>	18

33. What are the main weaknesses of the Law School?

Answer Options	Response Count
	51
<i>answered question</i>	51
<i>skipped question</i>	21

34. Please make any other comments on the Law School

Answer Options	Response Count
	39
<i>answered question</i>	39
<i>skipped question</i>	33

APPENDIX 4 – CLASSROOM OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

Date: May_____, 2015

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	

Expert's Name _____ Signature _____

