



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FAIR JUSTICE PROJECT

METHODOLOGY FOR INDEPENDENT ON-SITE LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

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

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

Draft Version: July 29, 2014



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FAIR JUSTICE PROJECT

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.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	4
II. Executive Summary	5
III. Methodology Description	7
Annex A: Model Questions for Each Assessment Element	13
Annex B: Model Questions for Interviews and Focus Group Discussions with Employers	18
Annex C: Model Questionnaires for On-Line Surveys	19
Students	19
Graduates	22
Teaching Staff	25
Administrators	28
Employers	31
Annex D: Model Protocol for Classroom Teaching Observation	33
Annex E: Model Schedule for On-Site Assessment Legal Education Quality Assessment	35
Annex F: Biographies of Assessment Toolkit Developers	40

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-year period. In its Option Period from October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2016, FAIR is building upon the advances made during the previous period and providing focused technical assistance to Ukrainian counterparts in the judicial reform process.

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

Legal education quality has been a matter of concern for some Universities and Law Schools Deans nationwide for many years in the context of no objective criteria system access to significant state budget funding portion Ministry of education used to assign o some schools to train legal professionals upon the state order. One can believe the quality criteria has to be applied and to effect the fair distributions of public funds to these who do the better job. It's very true in the situation where more than 200 higher education institutions are dealing with legal education program delivery.

During last few years there were organized and conducted a number of events with donor's support, where a number of Ukrainian Law schools representatives have participated to discuss the problems and to improve the content of legal education in Ukraine curricula and syllabus review.

FAIR decided to join this topic from a different prospective in addressing the challenges in legal education quality assurance. Staying focused on its policy related issues. FAIR invited the cooperation of the authorized governmental agencies such as Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Education to consider the implementation of relevant pilot projects.

The first matter to be resolved was about the need to develop a proper methodology to implement independent quality of education assessment in a selected Law School. The aim was to have a set of clear qualitative criteria in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area to be applicable in the Ukrainian context.

The Ivan Franko Lviv National University Law School (hereinafter – Lviv Law School) volunteered to serve as a site for the first ever kind of assessment in Ukraine, following a timely initiative of Prof. Andrii Boiko, Lviv Law School Dean. To reach the goal FAIR has identified and involved foreign Legal Education Experts (Dr. Delaine Swenson (US), Mr. Finley Young (UK) to work on the methodology development.

The proposed by Experts draft Methodology paper was reviewed and commented on by an independent US Legal Expert Ms. Catherine Carpenter, who has many years of experience in the US, working on Law School accreditation on behalf of the American Bar Association.

A team of four experts, including the Methodology paper developers and two Ukrainians, conducted a one-week site visit to Lviv Law School to apply the Methodology, meet students, academics, administration reps & employers to get their opinion and anonymous feedback on the internal policy to assure the quality of education.

Findings from the site visit have been reflected in the Assessment Report and presented to the leadership of both Lviv Law School and University with a list of recommendations to be considered at the law school, the university and the government levels.

It was expected that the pilot external legal education quality assessment findings would not only help to enhance the quality of legal education at the pilot law school, but in the long run, help to inculcate a quality assurance policy within the nationwide system of legal education considering the labor market expectations from legal services providers.

Following the positive feedback received on the relevance of used Methodology, FAIR sincerely hopes that the ***Methodology for independent external legal education quality assessment*** will garner the adequate attention from MoE and MoJ side as well as the interest from Ukrainian legal education community reps to make this kind of assessment a traditional evolving tool for Ukrainian law schools to measure and improve the quality of legal education they provide.

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

The variety of assessment methods during the assessment process are recommended to be used and include:

- *computer-based surveys powered by Monkey Survey;
- * individual interviews;
- *focus group discussions;
- *site and classroom visits;
- * the review of relevant documents, examinations, student papers and textbooks.

The criteria for quality assessment were adapted from the European Higher Education Quality Standards.

They focus on seven key elements:

- *Policy and Procedures for Internal Quality Assurance;
- * Approval, monitoring and periodic review of programs and awards;
- *Admission and Assessment of students;
- * Quality assurance of Teaching Staff;
- *Curriculum, teaching methodologies, learning resources and student Support;
- *Administration and Information Systems;
- * Public information.

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

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

The lessons learned when implementing the assessment methodology resulted in the following suggestion for future assessments:

1. Distribute surveys at least a week before an on-site visit to allocate more time for data aggregation and analysis before proceeding with interviews and focus groups;
2. Collect data from students of each year separately to be able to compare and contrast students' perceptions depending on their year of study;
3. Nominate in advance one team member to moderate interviews and focus group discussions so that he/she can prepare for this function;
4. Make sure that there is enough time (7 – 10 min.) between working sessions for a mental break, quick discussion, and interview/focus group discussion room management purposes;
5. Allocate some time at the end of a working day so that the project team can get together, quickly share their views and, discuss this day's findings, and systematize the information obtained during this day;
6. Try not to overuse respondents' attention while conducting the introductory part of each working meeting;
7. Conduct interviews first. Focus group discussions should follow the interviews, since this allows for a better information management as well as creates a momentum for generating new ideas;
8. Allocate enough time for informal communication with the faculty and students;

9. Stick to the questions tailored for interviews and focus group discussions and the questions' structure while moderating both interviews and focus group discussions;
10. Allocate the time for employers towards the end of a working week.

USAID FAIR Justice Project is expressing its deep appreciation for the fruitful cooperation to assessment team members, Prof. Andrii Boiko, Lviv Law School Dean, his deputies, administrators, teachers, students, graduates, legal employers for their kind assistance in this Pilot Project implementation and the level of their commitment to the Legal Education process in Ukraine improvement and modernization.

III. METHODOLOGY DESCRIPTION

A. INTRODUCTION

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

The draft methodology was to all relevant stakeholders (FAIR project staff, Lviv Law School, international and national consultants), for feedback and agreement before being finalized.

B. OBJECTIVES

The external assessment sought to articulate best practices, providing a basis for future assessments in Ukraine. Drawing on the European Standards for External Quality Assurance of Higher Education, it provided for the following:

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

By adopting this methodology the assessment team sought to use a collaborative approach to engage law school leadership and stakeholders in a constructive dialogue focused on quality improvement, and providing a basis for future assessments in Ukraine.

One of the main outcomes of the assessment is this methodology, which is designed to be clear, concise, and readily accessible to the intended readership, is to provide practical recommendations on how to use this methodology to assess the quality of legal education at a given law school.

C. STRUCTURE

This methodology considers overall legal education quality using seven key elements and institutional criteria based on and adapted from the European Standards for Internal Quality Assurance Within Higher Education Institutions, specifically,

- Element 1: Policy and Procedures for Internal Quality Assurance
- Element 2: Approval, Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programs and Awards
- Element 3: Admission and Assessment of Students
- Element 4: Quality Assurance of Teaching Staff
- Element 5: Curriculum, Teaching Methodologies, Learning Resources and Student Support
- Element 6: Administration and Information Systems
- Element 7: Public information

The methodology is structured around these seven elements and thirteen associated criteria and draws on a variety of primary and secondary research sources.

D. ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT

1. Secondary Research Sources:

- “Concept of Development of Higher Legal Education in Ukraine” proposed by the ABA ROLI.
- “The Status of Legal Education and Science in Ukraine” – a report developed under the auspices of the OSCE.
- “European Standards and Guidelines for Internal Quality Assurance Within Higher Education Institutions” – a paper developed thanks to the European Commission.
- “Standards for Approval of Law Schools and Legal Education Reform Legal Education Reform Index Factors” – an ABA-developed document.
- “Concept Paper on Education Reform” – a paper designed owing to the IRF support.
- Law of Ukraine ‘On Higher Education’.
- Regulation on Accreditation Commission in Ukraine.
- Regulation on State Education Inspection in Ukraine.
- State Requirements to Accreditation of Higher Educational Establishments.
- Translated documents from a law school under assessment (where possible)
 - i. Admissions criteria/process documents
 - ii. Assessment and Evaluation protocols, examples
 - iii. Law School Curricula

- iv. Basic information (how many students, in which year, annual intake, number of faculty etc.)
- v. Information regarding the law school advancement process
- vi. Sample of student assessment methods (exams) or student produced material (papers).
- vii. Law school governance and the role of the University in the governance process (i.e. samples of relevant policies and procedures).

2. Primary Research Methods:

1) Surveys/questionnaires

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

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

2) Key Informant Interviews

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

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

- 3) Focus Group Discussions (FGD)
 - FGDs are to provide an opportunity for assessment team members to gather more detailed information about particular issues and themes arising from the surveys and interviews.
 - Typical FGD are to consist of 8-10 persons.
 - Proposed participants in individual FGDs are to include law students, law teachers, legal employers and alumni.
- 4) Classroom Observations
 - Assessment team members are to observe some classroom teaching at a law school under evaluation. A variety of types and levels of classes are to be selected for observation.
 - A simple standardized assessment protocol is to be used to assess the teaching methodologies employed and ensure consistent analysis of classes.

E. INTERVIEWEES/SUBJECTS

1. University
 - Rector and relevant Vice Rectors or Directors who deal with law school issues.
 - Administrators who deal with law school issues.
 - Directors or Administrators who deal with University wide departments that impact on the law school, i.e. admissions, University Development; Foreign Relations; etc.
2. Law School
 - Dean and Vice Deans
 - Sub-department Heads
 - Professors
 - Associate Professors
 - Assistants
 - PhD Students, including those who work as Assistants
 - Specialized Faculty Members, including those dealing with clinical education, internships, thesis supervision, etc.
3. Students
 - First Year Bachelor
 - Upper Year Bachelor
 - Specialist Students
 - Master Students
 - PhD Students
4. Alumni
 - Last year graduates
 - Within 3 years

- 3-6 years
- Older Alumni

5. Legal Employers

- Public: prosecutors, judges, law enforcement officers, administration officers, etc.
- Private: representatives of large firms, medium firms, small firms or sole practitioners, representatives of non-governmental organizations, including professional associations of lawyers.

F. SCOPE OF ASSESSMENT AND PROPOSED CRITERIA

The assessment is to consider overall legal education quality as relying on seven key elements adapted from the European Standards for Internal Quality Assurance Within Higher Education Institutions. Institutional criteria are proposed under each key element.

Element 1: Policy and Procedures for Internal Quality Assurance:

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

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

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.

Element 2: Approval, monitoring and periodic review of programs and awards:

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

Element 3: Admission and Assessment of students

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

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

Element 4: Quality assurance of Teaching Staff

4.1 Institution has process for selection and continuing assessment to ensure teachers are qualified and competent.

4.2 Student evaluation of faculty is a part of the continuing assessment process and is used to enhance teacher quality.

Element 5: Curriculum, teaching methodologies, learning resources and student Support

- 5.1 Institution curriculum effectively prepares students for legal careers in government, private, or academic work.
- 5.2 Institution employs modern teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning
- 5.3 Institution ensures resources available for the support of student learning are adequate and appropriate.

Element 6: Administration and Information Systems

- 6.1 Institution effectively manages and administers programs of study to ensure conducive learning environment for students.
- 6.2 Institution has an effective process to collect, analyze and use relevant information for the effective management of programs of study.

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.

G. ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTATION

- 1) Quality of Legal Education Surveys:
 - a. Students
 - b. Graduates
 - c. Law Teachers
 - d. Law School Administrators
 - e. Legal Employers
- 2) Key Informant Interview Questions
 - a. Students
 - b. Graduates
 - c. Law Teachers
 - d. Law School Administrators
 - e. Legal Employers
- 3) Focus Group Discussion Notes
- 4) Classroom Teaching Observation Protocol

ANNEX A: MODEL QUESTIONS FOR EACH ASSESSMENT ELEMENT

KEY QUESTIONS FOR EACH ASSESSMENT ELEMENT

Element 1: Policy and Procedures for Internal Quality Assurance:

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

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

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 Questions:

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

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

- Are the perspectives of students sought in the process of quality improvement?
- What are the main barriers to the improvement of legal education quality in Ukraine?
- Tell us about your role in the law school?
- What are the main barriers to the improvement of legal education quality in Ukraine?
- Law School as an academic institution or lawyer training institution - balance of the two.

Element 2: Approval, monitoring and periodic review of programs and awards:

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

Key Questions:

- What degrees does the law school offer its students?
- What are the respective purposes and differences between these degrees?
- How is/was this program of awards determined?
- How does the law school monitor and review its programs?
- How can the law schools programs be adjusted?

Element 3: Admission and Assessment of students

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

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

Key Questions:

- Explain the process of how a student gains admission to the law school.
- What is the law school looking for in prospective candidates?
- Is the admissions process effective in identifying the strongest candidates?
- What is the proportion of applications to admissions?
- How is the number of admitted students determined?
- Why do students apply to study law at the law school under assessment?
- What methods are used to assess students at the law school?
- How does the law school's grading system work?
- How does the law school ensure that the grading and demands of different professors and courses are consistent?

Element 4: Quality assurance of Teaching Staff

4.1 Institution has process for selection and continuing assessment to ensure teachers are qualified and competent.

4.2 Student evaluation of faculty is a part of the continuing assessment process and is used to enhance teacher quality.

Key Questions:

- How are law teachers selected to teach at the school?
- What are the different professional ranks of law teachers at the university?
- Are there formal academic requirements for law teachers?
- Once selected, is there any program of continuing assessment of law teachers?
- Do students have a role to play in the assessment of law teachers?
- Do law teachers have formal requirements to publishing academic work alongside their teaching?
- Preparation of faculty - academic and teaching methods.

Element 5: Curriculum, teaching methodologies, learning resources and student Support

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

5.2 Institution employs modern teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning

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

Key Questions:

- How is the curriculum at the law school designed?
- What is the intended outcomes of the law school's curriculum?
- Do students have a choice regarding which courses they pursue?
- Are their full and part time options?
- How can the curriculum be adjusted?
- How much control do faculty have over how they teach their courses?
- What teaching methods do faculty most rely upon in their teaching?
- Are there other methods you would like to see developed in the law school?

- What are the main learning resources relied upon by students?
- To what extent are computers used in legal education at the law school under assessment?
- Role of the Departments in academic and student affairs
- Independence of departments, relationship with the law school and the university.
- Role in Curriculum development and changes.

Element 6: Administration and Information Systems

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

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

Key Questions:

- How is the administration of the law school structured?
- How could the administration of the law school be strengthened?
- How does the university collect, manage and use information? (Online? Paper-based?)
- Who is responsible for managing information and data at the law school?
- Does the law school have sufficient resources to achieve its goals in administration and information management?
- How do students access to key information about their studies? (grades, courses etc)

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 Questions:

- Who is responsible for external relations at the law school?
- What information about the law school is currently available to prospective students?

- What information would the law school like to be made available?
- How does the law school seek to attract the best students?
- Does the law school have a website? Who runs it?
- Does the law school have a process to keep in touch with its graduates?
- Does the law school maintain links with foreign law schools? For what purposes?

OTHER QUESTIONS

- How much control does the law school have over its budget?
- How is this budget allocated?
- Does the law school have the facility to generate its own funds?
- How do law students fund their education?
- How is the cost of legal education at the law school under assessment determined?
- Use of university-wide standards and application to the law school.
- Law school control vs. university wide policies and procedures
- Role of law school in university context.
- Role of the law school in governance vs. role of the university.
- Centralized services available to law students (all students).
- Central authorities and the law school.
- How much control does the law school have over its budget?
- How is this budget allocated?

Budget is implicated in a variety of sections – administration, curriculum creation, among others. For future, it is advisable either to expand questions regarding budget into other sections, or to make a separate category just for budget.

ANNEX B: MODEL QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS WITH EMPLOYERS

MODEL QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS WITH EMPLOYERS

- What makes a law graduate become a successful lawyer?
- Do graduates normally arrive with sufficient knowledge and understanding of the law?
- What specific practical skills are needed?
- Generally, do law graduates arrive with these practical skills?
- What kind of approaches could help develop these practical skills in students?
- How do you choose which students to employ? What are the criteria and considerations?
- How do you rank Ukraine's law schools?
- Are good law school grades a reliable indicator of potential to be a good lawyer?
- Do you have formal or informal links with law schools?
- Would you be interested in fostering stronger/formal links with law schools?
- Do you have an internship or work experience schemes for law students?
- Would such schemes help prepare students for work?
- How do you prepare new graduates for success in their work?
- What are the general strengths of law graduates in Ukraine? Weaknesses?
- Do you have experience of working with the graduates of the law school under assessment?
- Why did you select those graduates?
- What do you think are the main strengths and weaknesses of the graduates of law school under assessment?
- Are these the same general strengths and weaknesses as in other law schools?

LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

SURVEY 1 – CURRENT STUDENTS

About this Survey: This survey is being conducted by _____ in cooperation with _____, as part of a wider legal education quality assessment. The survey is entirely anonymous. Results will be used only to help support improvements in the quality of legal education offered in Ukraine.

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

SECTION 1: STATEMENT	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.1 The law school recognizes, values, and encourages quality legal education					
1.2 The law school has policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
1.3 There are opportunities for students to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
2.1 The Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students					
3.1 The Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic					
3.2 Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair					
3.3 I have received detailed feedback on my work					
3.4 I have received this feedback promptly					
3.5 This feedback has helped me to clarify things I did not understand.					
4.1 Law school teachers are well qualified					

and competent					
4.2 Law school teachers are well organized and prepared for classes					
4.3 I have the opportunity to evaluate my law school teachers performances					
4.4 I receive sufficient advice and support with my studies					
4.5 I am been able to contact law school teachers when I need to					
4.6 Good advice is available when I need to make study choices					
5.1 I believe my legal education will prepare me adequately for a future legal career					
5.2 Law school teachers use a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning					
5.3 Law School teachers adequately explain key concepts					
5.4 Law School teachers are enthusiastic about the subject they are teaching					
5.5 My law school education is interesting and intellectually stimulating					
5.6 Adequate learning resources are available for me to learn course materials					
5.7 I have access to the internet for research purposes					
6.1 The law school is well organized and administers courses effectively					
6.2 The timetabling of my classes works efficiently					
6.3 Any changes in my courses or teaching are communicated effectively					

6.4 I can access important information and data about the my courses and progress					
SECTION 2: GENERAL COMMENTS					
What are the main strengths of the Law School?					
What are the main weaknesses of the Law School?					
Please use this space to make any other comments on the Law School:					

LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT
SURVEY 2 – LAW SCHOOL GRADUATES (LAST FIVE YEARS)

About this Survey: This survey is being conducted by _____ in cooperation with _____, as part of a wider legal education quality assessment. The survey is entirely anonymous. Results will be used only to help support improvements in the quality of legal education offered in Ukraine.

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

SECTION 1: STATEMENT	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.1 The law school recognizes, values, and encourages quality legal education					
1.2 The law school had policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
1.3 There were opportunities for students to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
2.1 The Law School monitored the quality of my legal education					
3.1 The Law School admission process was transparent, fair, and meritocratic					
3.2 Law School assessment arrangements and marking were fair					
3.3 I received detailed feedback on my work					
3.4 I received this feedback promptly					
3.5 This feedback helped me to clarify things I did not understand.					
4.1 My law school teachers were well qualified and competent					

4.2 My law school teachers were well organized and prepared for classes					
4.3 I had the opportunity to evaluate my law school teachers performances					
4.4 I received sufficient advice and support with my studies					
4.5 I was able to contact law school teachers when I needed to					
4.6 Good advice was available when I needed to make study choices					
5.1 I believe my legal education prepared me adequately for my current legal career					
5.2 Law school teachers used a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning					
5.3 Law School teachers adequately explained key concepts					
5.4 Law School teachers were enthusiastic about the subject they were teaching					
5.5 My law school education was interesting and intellectually stimulating					
5.6 Adequate learning resources were available for me to learn course materials					
5.7 I had access to the internet for research purposes					
6.1 The law school was well organized and administered my courses effectively					
6.2 The timetabling of my classes worked efficiently					
6.3 Any changes in my courses or teaching were communicated effectively					
6.4 I could access important information and data about the my courses and					

progress					
SECTION 2: GENERAL COMMENTS					
What are the main strengths of the Law School?					
What are the main weaknesses of the Law School?					
Please use this space to make any other comments on the Law School:					

LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

SURVEY 3 – LAW SCHOOL TEACHERS¹

About this Survey: This survey is being conducted by _____ in cooperation with _____ as part of a wider legal education quality assessment. The survey is entirely anonymous. Results will be used only to help support improvements in the quality of legal education offered in Ukraine.

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

SECTION 1: STATEMENT	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.1 The law school recognizes, values, and encourages quality legal education					
1.2 The law school has policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
1.3 There are opportunities for faculty to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
2.1 The Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students					
3.1 The Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic					
3.2 Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair					
3.3 I provide detailed feedback on student work					

¹ 'There is little to be gained by asking self-serving type questions to the faculty. It is much better to ask these questions of students and ask different questions of the faculty. Such as what kind of feedback to you give. When do you return the student work. Then outsiders can assess whether it is sufficient feedback and whether it is prompt.'

For future visits, survey questions to administrators should be designed so that they do not require self-serving answers.'

3.4 I provide this feedback promptly					
3.5 This feedback is designed to help students clarify things they did not understand.					
4.1 Law school teachers are well qualified and competent					
4.2 Law school teachers are well organized and prepared for classes					
4.3 I have the formal opportunity to evaluate my own performance as a law teacher					
4.4 I offer sufficient advice and support to students					
4.5 I am available for students to contact me when they need to					
4.6 Students receive good advice when they need to make study choices					
5.1 I believe the law school prepares students adequately for a future legal career					
5.2 I use a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning					
5.3 I adequately explain key concepts to students					
5.4 I am enthusiastic about the subject I am teaching					
5.5 I ensure my classes are interesting and intellectually stimulating					
5.6 Adequate learning resources are available for students to learn course content					
5.7 I have access to the internet for research purposes					
6.1 The law school is well organized and administers courses effectively					

6.2 The timetabling of my classes works efficiently					
6.3 Any changes in my courses or teaching are communicated effectively					
6.4 I can access important information and data about the courses and students I teach					
SECTION 2: GENERAL COMMENTS					
What (if any) interactive teaching methods do you use?					
What are the main strengths of the Law School?					
What are the main weaknesses of the Law School?					
Please use this space to make any other comments on the law school:					

LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

SURVEY 4 – LAW SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

About this Survey: This survey is being conducted by _____ in cooperation with _____, as part of a wider legal education quality assessment. The survey is entirely anonymous. Results will be used only to help support improvements in the quality of legal education offered in Ukraine.

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

SECTION 1: STATEMENT	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.1 The law school recognizes, values, and encourages quality legal education					
1.2 The law school has policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
1.3 There are opportunities for students to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
2.1 The Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students					
3.1 The Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic					
3.2 Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair					
4.1 Law school teachers are well qualified and competent					
4.2 Law school teachers are well organized and prepared for classes					
4.3 I am able to contact law school teachers when I need to for administrative purposes					

5.1 I believe our legal education will prepare students adequately for a future legal career					
5.2 Law school teachers use a variety of teaching methodologies to ensure effective learning					
5.3 Law School teachers adequately explain key concepts					
5.4 Law School teachers are enthusiastic about the subject they are teaching					
5.5 Adequate learning resources are available for students to learn course materials					
6.1 The law school is well organized and administers courses effectively					
6.2 The timetabling of classes works efficiently					
6.3 Any changes in courses or teaching are communicated effectively to students and faculty					
6.4 Important information and data about courses and student progress is available to faculty and students					
6.5 As an administrator I have adequate resources to effectively and efficiently carry out my responsibilities					
SECTION 2: GENERAL COMMENTS					
What are the main strengths of the Law School?					

What are the main weaknesses of the Law School?	
Please use this space to make any other comments on the law school:	

LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

SURVEY 5 – LEGAL EMPLOYERS

About this Survey: This survey is being conducted by _____ in cooperation with _____, as part of a wider legal education quality assessment. The survey is entirely anonymous. Results will be used only to help support improvements in the quality of legal education offered in Ukraine.

Instructions: This survey contains two sections. For section 1, please read each statement and indicate to what extent you agree or disagree. Please mark only one box for each statement. For section 2, please make any general comments you have in response to the questions asked. Please complete the survey in relation to law graduates of ___/full name of the law school under assessment/ ___, to the best of your knowledge.

SECTION 1: STATEMENTS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.1 The law school recognizes, values, and encourages quality legal education					
1.2 The law school has policies and procedures for ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
1.3 There are opportunities for students to participate in ensuring the provision of quality legal education					
2.1 The Law School monitors the quality of legal education provided to students					
3.1 The Law School admission process is transparent, fair, and meritocratic					
3.2 Law School assessment arrangements and marking are fair					
4.1 Law school teachers are well qualified and competent					
4.2 Law school teachers are well organized and prepared for classes					
5.1 The legal education received by students from the University prepared them adequately for a future legal career					
5.2 Law graduates of the University have					

the required substantive knowledge (legal system, legislation, principles and doctrines) necessary for success in a legal career					
5.3 Law Graduates of the University have the required practical skills (research, analysis, writing, communication, legal ethics; prevention conflict of interest) necessary for success in a legal career.					
6.1 The law school is well organized and administers courses effectively					
6.2 The law school has a good working relationship with the legal community.					
SECTION 2: GENERAL COMMENTS					
What are the main strengths of the Law School?					
What are the main weaknesses of the Law School?					
Please use this space to make any other comments on the law school:					

ANNEX D: MODEL PROTOCOL FOR CLASSROOM TEACHING OBSERVATION

LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT CLASSROOM TEACHING OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

Faculty Member Observed: _____
Date of Observation: _____
Course Observed: _____

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

<u>CONTENT</u>					
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
<u>ORGANIZATION</u>					
Introduction captured attention	1	2	3	4	5
Introduction stated organization of lecture	1	2	3	4	5
Effective transitions (clear w/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
<u>INTERACTION</u>					
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
<u>VERBAL/NON-VERBAL</u>					
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			
<u>USE OF MEDIA</u>								
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:								
Opportunities for improvement:								
Threats for effectiveness:								
Overall Effectiveness Rating:				1	2	3	4	5

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

EXTERNAL ON-SITE LEGAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE

Day 1	Monday			
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contact
09:00- 10:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Introductory meeting with the law school leadership		
10:00- 11:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Observation of the law school facilities available.		
11:00- 12:00	Two experts (Group A)	Interview with deputy deans		
11:00- 12:00	Two experts (Group B)	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional classes, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and develop an assessment report		
12:00- 13:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Focus group discussion with deputy deans		
13:30- 14:30	Lunch			
15:00- 16:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Meeting with the university leadership		
16:00- 17:00	Two experts (Group B)	Interview with heads of law school sub-departments		
16:00- 17:00	Two experts (Group A)	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional classes, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and develop an assessment		

		report		
17:00-18:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Focus group discussion with heads of law school sub-departments		
Day 2	Tuesday			
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contact
09:00-10:00	Two experts (Group A)	Interview with judges, including those who are alumni of the law school under assessment		
09:00-10:00	Two experts (Group B)	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional classes, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and develop a report		
10:00-11:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Focus group discussion with judges, including those who are alumni of the law school under assessment		
11:50-13:10	Two experts (Group A)	Classroom teaching observation		
11:50-13:10	Two experts (Group B)	Classroom teaching observation		
13:30-14:30	Lunch			
15:00-16:00	Two experts (Group A)	Inspection of the law school legal clinic		
15:00-16:00	Two experts (Group B)	Inspection of the law school library		
16:00-18:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Inspection of the law school internal regulations		
Day 3	Wednesday			
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contact

09:00-10:00	Two experts (Group B)	Interview with representatives of the public prosecutor's office, including those who are alumni of the law school under assessment		
09:00-10:00	Two experts (Group A)	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional classes, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and develop a report		
10:00-11:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Focus group discussion with representatives of the public prosecutor's office, including those who are alumni of the law school under assessment		
11:50-13:10	Two experts (Group A)	Classroom teaching observation		
11:50-13:10	Two experts (Group B)	Classroom teaching observation		
13:30-14:30	Lunch			
15:00-16:00	Two experts (Group A)	Interview with law school teachers One representative from each law school sub-department		
15:00-16:00	Two experts (Group B)	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional classes, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and develop a report		
16:00-17:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Focus group discussion law school teachers. Two teachers from each law school sub-department		
17:00-18:00	Two experts (Group A)	Interview with law school graduate students		
17:00-18:00	Two experts (Group B)	Interview with law school postgraduate students		
Day 4	Thursday			
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contact
09:00-	Two experts	Interview with legal practitioners, including		

10:00	(Group A)	those who are alumni of the law school under assessment.		
09:00-10:00	Two experts (Group B)	Informal meeting with students taking law school courses taught in cooperation with other universities, if any.		
10:00-11:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Focus group discussion with legal practitioners, including those who are alumni of the law school under assessment.		
11:50-13:10	Two experts (Group A)	Classroom teaching observation		
11:50-13:10	Two experts (Group B)	Classroom teaching observation		
13:30-14:30	Lunch			
15:00-16:00	Two experts (Group B)	Focus group discussion with law school graduate students		
15:00-16:00	Two experts (Group A)	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional classes, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and develop a report		
16:00-17:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Focus group discussion with law school postgraduate students		
17:00-18:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Inspection of students' papers		
Day 5	Friday			
Time	Participants	Activity	Address	Contact
09:00-11:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional classes, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and develop a report		
11:50-13:10	Two experts (Group A)	Classroom teaching observation		

11:50-13:10	Two experts (Group B)	Classroom teaching observation		
13:30-14:30	Lunch			
15:00-15:40	All experts (Group A and B together)	Time to systematize the obtained information and ask clarifying questions (if any), visit additional classes, conduct additional meetings, exchange opinions and develop a report		
16:00-17:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Final meeting with the law school leadership. Presenting preliminary assessment findings and outlining recommendations.		
17:00-18:00	All experts (Group A and B together)	Discussion on the process of integrating the developed parts of the assessment report, further development and finalization of the report and coordination of this work. Wrap-up.		

ANNEX F: BIOGRAPHIES OF ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY DEVELOPERS

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

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