

University of Glasgow**Academic Standards Committee - Friday 25 May 2012****Periodic Subject Review: Report of the Review of School of Law
held on 1 and 2 March 2012****Mrs Lesley Fielding, Clerk to the Review Panel****Review Panel:**

Professor Steve Beaumont, Vice Principal (Research and Enterprise)
Professor Douglas Brodie, University of Stirling, External Subject Specialist
Professor Billy Martin, Senate Assessor on Court
Professor Jo Danbolt, School of Accounting & Finance, Cognate Member
Dr Vicky Gunn, Learning & Teaching Centre
Ms Gill Hope, Students' Representative Council
Mrs Lesley Fielding, Senate Office, Clerk to the Review Panel
Mrs Mary Ramsey (Observer)

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The School of Law is one of five schools within the College of Social Sciences. The School of Law had previously been part of the Faculty of Law, Business & Social Sciences prior to restructuring in 2010.
- 1.2 The previous internal review of the School (DPTLA) took place in March 2006.
- 1.3 The Self Evaluation Report (SER) had been prepared by Professor Tom Mullen following consultation with five members of staff. It had been revised and amended following feedback from student representatives.
- 1.4 The Review Panel met with the Dean for Learning & Teaching, Professor Tom Guthrie, the Deputy Head of School, Professor Lindsay Farmer and the author of the SER, Professor Tom Mullen. The Review Panel also met with 13 members of staff, two probationary members of staff, six Graduate Teaching assistants (GTAs), nine Hourly Paid Tutors, 10 postgraduate students and 19 undergraduate students representing all levels of provision. The undergraduate students were split into two groups of similar composition and each group met with half the Review Panel. One member of the Review Panel met with the probationary members of staff, two members of the Review Panel met with the GTAs and the remainder of the Panel met with the Hourly Paid Tutors.
- 1.5 *Background Information*
 - 1.5.1 The School of Law has 62 staff, 44 of which were academic staff (35.825 FTE).
 - 1.5.2 Student numbers for 2010-11 were as follows:

Students	Headcount
Level 1	255
Level 2	241
Level 3	185
Honours	166
Undergraduate Total	847
Postgraduate Taught	
LLM/MML/MRes	134
Diploma in Professional legal Practice	166
Postgraduate Research*	70

*(for information only - research is not covered by the Review)

The Review Panel considered the following range of provision offered by the School

- Bachelor of Laws (LLB)
- Master of Laws (LLM)
- Master of Medical Law (MML)¹
- Diploma in Legal Practice

The School of Law contributes to the following degree programmes offered with other Schools or colleges

- Bachelor of Accountancy and Engineering undergraduate degree programmes
- Masters of Finance in Financial Regulations and Ethics (Business School)
- MSc in Human Rights and International Politics (Politics)
- Law Access course (DACE)

2. Overall aims of the Department's provision and how it supports the University Strategic Plan

The Review Panel considered that the School currently met a number of the aims of the University's Strategic Plans, including internationalisation and research-led teaching. However, the Review Panel had reservations regarding the School's current Strategic Plan which was developed in 2009. The Review Panel considered there was evidence of a lack of guiding principles with no strong sense of direction. The Review Panel believed that in order to achieve the University's ambitions the School should clearly articulate the School's strengths and highlight features that are distinctive to the School of Law. The Review Panel appreciated that there have been a number of circumstances that contributed to this loss of focus and direction including the on-going problem of staff shortages. These will be addressed in more detail at a later stage in the report. The Review Panel considered that a pivotal element in countering these difficulties would be for the School to refocus on its priorities. Therefore, the Review Panel **recommends** that the School, as a matter of priority, should revise the current strategic plan, including the formulation of a Learning and Teaching Strategic Plan, in order to identify a more clearly defined and focussed way forward for the School of Law.

¹ The Master of Medical Law (MML) is under review and may be withdrawn in the near future

The Review Panel, guided by the views of the External Subject Specialist, confirms that the programmes offered by the School/Subject Area remain current and valid in light of developing knowledge in the discipline, and practice in its application.

3. An Evaluation of the Student Learning Experience

3.1 *Aims*

The aims of the School's undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes were clearly laid out in programme specifications. The Review Panel considered they were innovative, interdisciplinary, research-led and internationally relevant. To this end the Review Panel **commends** the aims of the School. The aims of all programmes take account of relevant benchmarks and other external reference points such as the Law Society.

3.2 *Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)*

3.2.1 The Review Panel noted that the ILOs were provided to students as part of the course handbooks and programme specifications. The students had advised the Review Panel that the quality of the ILOs were inconsistent across the individual courses. Criticisms levelled at the ILOs were they were too generalised and did not provide an adequate guide to what was expected of students. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School ensure that there is more consistency in the provision of information in the ILOs.

3.3 *Assessment, Feedback and Achievement*

3.3.1 The Review Panel was impressed by the range of assessment methods that the School provided. These included unseen examination questions, written assignments, independent dissertations and group assessments.

3.3.2 The Review Panel perceived from their discussions with both the undergraduate and postgraduate students that there was some concern regarding the consistency of the implementation of the University marking scheme across the courses. There was a perception among students that it was harder to achieve a first class degree at Glasgow and of reluctance by some staff to fully implement the University marking scale. A more specific concern was expressed by some of the Diploma in Legal Practice (DLP) students that some of the tutors lacked academic awareness and were inexperienced in applying the marking scale. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School should seek a resolution of this problem and ensure that the marking scheme is fully implemented.

3.3.3 The postgraduate students had expressed reservations about the current system of assessment whereby there was no formal assessment until the second semester. Whilst the students were aware they could undertake optional practice essays and valued this, they would welcome some formal assessment in semester one in order to gauge their performance. The Review Panel would suggest the School reviews the current policy with regard to assessment to identify whether an earlier assessment would be appropriate.

3.3.4 At the meeting with the students, the Review Panel learned that the peer and group assessments were viewed unenthusiastically as methods of assessment. The students were aware of the aims of such exercises but considered that, in practice, there were disadvantages due to lack of effort by some team members. Whilst this is a perennial problem, the Review Panel would encourage the School to consider ways in which to assure the students of the benefits of this form of assessment.

3.3.5 The Review Panel was most concerned about the lack of engagement with the Learning & Teaching Centre which was evident from the SER and the meetings with students and GTAs. The issue of the GTAs will be explored more fully under item 3.8.1. The Review Panel ascertained from the School's SER that the issue of assessment and feedback had been an ongoing problem dating back to the National Student Survey (NSS) scores in the previous review in 2006.

The postgraduate students were, overall, satisfied with feedback, although they acknowledged that there was variability between individual staff. However, at the meetings with staff and undergraduate students the Review Panel observed some disparity between staff and students on this subject. The undergraduate students were dissatisfied with the current system for providing feedback. The students advised feedback was variable across the courses and that very few students received feedback within the four week period. Conversely, staff, whilst acknowledging that the system was flawed, did not consider feedback as an area for concern, highlighting that many students failed to collect feedback despite notification of its availability.

The Review Panel deemed that there were specific problems relating to communication and the return of feedback within the School. The Review Panel was aware that there were, as outlined in item 2, contributing factors which had exacerbated the problem. The ongoing issue of staff shortages had prevented any form of policing of the return of feedback. Nevertheless, whilst the Review Panel agreed that these particular circumstances had impacted on the School, it concluded that the School lacked the necessary processes to adequately address this issue. The Review Panel **recommends** that, in cooperation with the Learning & Teaching Centre, the School should develop a systematic structure to address the concerns relating to feedback and communication.

3.3.6 The Level 1 and 2 students expressed concern regarding the lack of information pertaining to pre-requisite courses or grades for certain Honours options. Whilst the Review Panel understood that this information was conveyed to the students at Level 1 and was included in the on-line Level 3 and 4 guides, the relevance of this information appeared to have bypassed many of the students at that time. The Review Panel considered there was an obvious need to remind the students of the significance of this information and therefore **recommends** that the School should implement procedures to ensure students are made aware of any pre-requisites or grades which would affect their eligibility or choice of Honours options at key points during their years of study.

3.3.7 The Level 1 students on the accelerated degree expressed some dissatisfaction with their tutorial experiences and expressed a sense of being "disenfranchised". The students attributed the problem to the lack of contribution by the Level 1 students which, in turn, left the students on the accelerated course to maintain the momentum of the tutorial discussion. To address this issue, the accelerated degree students planned to set up their own informal tutorial groups. The Review Panel was sympathetic to the students, however acknowledged that tutorial scenarios are notoriously difficult venues to engage all students and hence would suggest that the School consult with the Level 1 accelerated degree students to address their concerns.

3.3.8 The postgraduate students on the LLM and DLP courses had expressed their satisfaction with their experience of their degree course. The students had chosen Glasgow for its reputation and for many who had undertaken their first degree at Glasgow it was considered a natural progression.

3.3.9 The postgraduate students had some concerns regarding the linguistic capabilities of some overseas students which impacted on discussions within seminars. The students saw this as being detrimental to their own experience as it limited the opportunity for meaningful discussion, particularly as lecturers were reluctant to press overseas students to contribute. The Review Panel learned from the Deputy Head of School that

the School had tried to increase the base English language entry requirement from IELTS 6.5 to 7 but had been unsuccessful. The Review Panel is concerned that the language limitations of overseas students may impact on the experience of other students and therefore **recommends** that RIO should review the language entry requirements for overseas students to the School of Law and that all Schools and the English as a Foreign Language Unit should review the language support for overseas students.

3.3.10 The postgraduate students advised that there were difficulties in accessing certain materials in the library at peak times. The students would welcome the opportunity to purchase study packs which could address these shortages. The School may wish to consider this as an option but the Review Panel **commends** the School's library on the excellent range of provision.

3.4 *Curriculum Design, Development and Content*

3.4.1 The Review Panel **commends** the School of Law on its development of LLM courses which had been excellent for the internationalisation strategy. Further developments such as a programme for North American students were planned. Additionally, the development of the DLP programme and the implementation of e-learning methods have been most successful. The review Panel was pleased to note that in its second year the DLP was well established.

3.4.2 The Review Panel explored the issue of the School's provision of Graduate Attributes. This had not been fully addressed within the SER; however, further to discussions with staff and students, the Review Panel ascertained that the School's Employability Officer had been active in implementing the shift from Employability to Graduate Attributes. The students were most complimentary about the advice and guidance provided by both the Employability Officer and the Careers Service. However, the Review Panel concluded, that, in relation to those students who were not intending to become practitioners of law, a more pro-active approach to their needs was required. Therefore, the Review Panel **recommends** that the School should, in conjunction with the Learning & Teaching Centre and the Careers Service, explore ways in which Graduate Attributes could be developed further for those students opting for a career outwith law.

3.4.3 During the meeting with undergraduate students, the Review Panel learned that the students would welcome more forms of oral assessments particularly in relation to mooting and in the construction of legal arguments. A student who had studied abroad advised that mooting had been part of her course abroad and that it had been an invaluable experience. The School advised that there were numerous opportunities for group presentations throughout the curriculum, and for those third year students who did not go abroad there were individual and group presentations in semester one. However, the Review Panel considers that additional opportunities for the students to practice their presentation skills would be advantageous and **recommends** that the School should review the curriculum with a view to identifying ways to incorporate additional mooting/presentation opportunities with the possible option of offering this provision as a credit bearing course.

3.4.4 The Review Panel discerned, through discussions with the students, a perception that other HEIs, such as the University of Strathclyde, adopted a more practical approach to the teaching of the subject of law than the University. The students cited the University of Strathclyde Law Clinic which a student on the LLB degree course regularly attended. The students considered that they were disadvantaged by the absence of such a commodity at the University. The Deputy Head of School had advised that the main obstacle to the development of a law clinic was resources. Whilst the Review Panel appreciated the financial implications of such a development, the Panel considered that

such a provision would be an asset to the University as well as the School of Law particularly within the global market. Hence, the Review Panel **recommends** that the College of Social Sciences should consult with the School of Law regarding the resources required for the provision of a law clinic.

- 3.4.5 The Review Panel explored the experiences of the Level 3 and 4 students in studying Law with Languages. The students considered there was a lack of information on some aspects of the joint degree; particularly in relation to the weighting of examinations. Moreover, the students believed there was an absence of communication and coordination between the School of Law and the School of Modern Languages & Cultures (SMLC) which impacted on the efficiency of the course. The Review Panel would encourage the School of Law to clarify these issues with the students and consult with the SMLC in order to develop a clearer and more cohesive partnership.
- 3.4.6 The Postgraduate students, whilst very happy with their course, expressed the view that the Masters degree would benefit from incorporating more practical elements into its design. The students perceived the LLM as an employability pathway and considered that, with regard to the assessment of skills and other mechanisms to enhance practical skills, the academic element was covered to the detriment of practical skills. The Review Panel would encourage the School of Law to review the curriculum for the LLM to identify where changes could be made to accommodate a more practical element.

3.5 *Student Recruitment*

- 3.5.1 The Review Panel **commends** the School of Law on its success in the recruitment of a high calibre of student. However, the Review Panel had concerns that by continuing to retain responsibility for student recruitment the School placed an unnecessary burden on staff, particularly at a time when resources have been stretched. Further to this the Review Panel considered that the School's recruitment processes could be vulnerable to the perception of subjectivity particularly in relation to the scoring of potential students' personal statements. Likewise the School's Widening Participation process, whilst it showed an increase in the uptake by ethnic minorities from three percent to five percent, reflects only a modest improvement. The Review Panel **recommends** the School should explore the possibility of devolving responsibility for some aspects of recruitment to RIO.
- 3.5.2 As stated previously, the postgraduate students were most positive about their choice of Glasgow for postgraduate study and, for many it was viewed as a "natural progression" from undergraduate study. The students also cited the reputation of the School of Law and the University as features which influenced their choice. With regard to DLP recruitment, the students had been made aware of the Diploma and its entry criteria via emails and had been well informed about this option. The postgraduate students on the Masters and PhD programmes had not received any such direct communication from the School re the availability of such programmes and most had learned about the LLM programme from posters placed around the School. The Review Panel considered that the School of Law had an admirable range of programmes and specialisms which would appeal to an international market and it was essential that this message should be relayed to prospective students. Therefore, in order for the School to fully realise its international and postgraduate market the Review Panel **recommends** that the College of Social Sciences provide additional resources to enable the School of Law to undertake an intensive marketing and advertising exercise for postgraduate study.

3.6 *Student Progression, Retention and Support*

- 3.6.1 The Review Panel explored the role of advisers with both staff and undergraduate students and was concerned at the disparity between each group's views of the situation. The Review Panel was informed that some Level 4 students had never met their adviser of studies with the only communication being via email. The staff, meanwhile, observed some reluctance by students to meet with advisers, despite efforts by staff to do so. Staff also considered that, given the numbers of students, it was unrealistic to expect advisers to meet all students individually. The Review Panel was troubled that the compulsory annual meeting had been abandoned and as a result many students had no contact at all with an adviser. There was also a recurring theme with regard to communication between students and staff which was evident regarding the issue of feedback. Whilst, under the new advising system this should be redressed, the Review Panel **recommends** that the School ensures that all staff are made aware of the importance of the role of adviser and communication with students and that procedures are developed to ensure the advising system is robust and pro-active.

3.7 *The Quality of Learning Opportunities*

- 3.7.1 The Review Panel **commends** the School for its positive and strong study overseas programme. The Panel was most impressed with the high uptake of students for this experience and with the large number of partner institutions and considered that there are certainly elements of the programme that could be shared with other Schools as an example of Good Practice.

Some issues arose, however, regarding the publication of overseas grade conversions. The students' experience of the converted grades on-line table was that it was difficult to understand and some had experienced delays in receiving their converted grade. The Review Panel was assured by the Dean (Learning & Teaching) that whilst delays or problems sometimes arose with new partnerships and established institutions, the School endeavoured to address these promptly. Further to discussions with staff, including the Dean for Learning & Teaching and Deputy Head of School, the Review Panel considered that to address the problems encountered in the on-line conversion tables satisfactorily, investment in the development of IT software for this purpose would be essential. Therefore, the Review Panel **recommends** that the College provide resources to facilitate the School of Law in developing a practical and comprehensive on-line conversion table.

3.8 *Resources for Learning and Teaching*

- 3.8.1 As mentioned previously in item 2 the Review Panel considered that the School urgently required to develop a Learning & Teaching Strategy as underlined by the absence of any reference to the GTAs within the SER and accompanying documentation. This absence of detail in the SER alerted the Review Panel to possible breaches of policy in relation to supervision and this was reinforced in the subsequent meeting with the group. The Review Panel established that the School had not provided formal support and development. It also identified that not all the GTAs currently teaching had undergone the statutory session on learning and teaching for GTAs provided by the Learning & Teaching Centre.

The GTAs were happy with the level of support provided to them on a personal level. However, due to the lack of structured support and involvement in other learning and teaching initiatives, such as formal committees and feedback from the students, they did not consider themselves an integrated part of the staff team. The GTAs also considered that there was a lack of communication between the academic staff and the administration which resulted in lapses in administrative procedures. The Review Panel was surprised to learn that the GTAs were not automatically granted access to the

course material on Moodle; each individual had to request access to this information. The Review Panel deemed that access to this facility should be granted automatically.

The Review Panel received contradictory information in relation to the role of the GTAs in assessment; staff advised that GTAs undertook only moderated diagnostic assessments whilst the GTAs advised that at least one GTA had undertaken the marking of assessments.

The Review Panel considered that all these issues require urgent attention and **recommends** that the School develops a Learning & Teaching Strategy to address the issues of training within the School for GTAs and to ensure a more fully developed role within the School.

- 3.8.2 The probationary members of staff with whom the Review Panel met were most positive about their experience in the School. Both probationers considered they were well supported within the School, had an equitable work load and learned much from their colleagues. The only inconsistency was in the area of Performance and Development Review (P&DR) whereby only one probationer had undergone a P&DR. The Review Panel understands that this is due to University policy whereby P&DR is compulsory only after the probationary period has finished. The Review Panel **recommends** the University review the P&DR policy and consider whether procedures should be implemented to ensure that all staff members, including probationers, undergo an annual P&DR.
- 3.8.3 As mentioned in items 3.3.5, the School had experienced staff shortages over a number of years that had impacted on various key administrative functions. Whilst the impact on feedback and the advising system had been noted, a further area affected by the staff shortages had been communication with the School's external examiners. The Review Panel gleaned from the external examiners' reports recurring themes of dissatisfaction including inadequate provision of course materials, inadequate administrative support to external examiners, lack of consultation on course changes and insufficient time to review assessed material. The Review Panel was pleased to note that an examinations officer would be recruited shortly which should address the areas of discord raised by the external examiners. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School implements appropriate procedures to ensure that communication with the School's external examiners is improved.
- 3.8.4 A recurring message that the Review Panel received throughout the various meetings with staff was the limited administrative resources that had been placed under considerable pressure over a number of years. As a result of staffing shortages there had been a loss of continuity resulting in the failure of a number of key administrative procedures. The Review Panel was pleased to note a number of key staff would either be returning from leave of absence or would be appointed in the near future which should improve the situation considerably. However, the Review Panel noted that the Head of Administration had a relatively heavy workload covering a diverse range of duties. The Review Panel had concerns that this resulted in a limited overview of key administrative processes and, therefore, the Review Panel **recommends** that the Head of School clarifies the remit of the Head of Administration to ensure adequate time is provided. In addition, in order to address the ongoing problem of staff shortages due to leave of absence and academic staff turnover, the Review Panel **recommends** that the College and School review the current level of staffing and invest accordingly.
- 3.8.5 The Review Panel was advised, through various meetings with the DLP students and staff, of the physical limitations of the accommodation provided in the Alexander Stone Building. Post review, the School of Law advised that Diploma staff had been relocated to the Stair Building in 2011. Both staff and students had referred to inadequate room size and the lack of sufficient technological support for laptops, which was a requirement for DLP students. The Review Panel **recommends** that consideration be

given to resolving the issues of room size and technological limitations experienced by students and staff on the DLP course.

4. Maintaining the Standards of Awards

The Review Panel **commends** the School for many of its procedures for enhancing and maintaining quality assurance. There was good evidence of appropriately rigorous procedures for course design, course evaluation with a number of highly satisfactory examination outcomes.

5. Assuring and Enhancing the Quality of the Students' Learning Experience

The Review Panel **commends** the investment that the School of Law has shown in a number of areas including the study abroad programme and excellent links with the profession.

6. Summary of Perceived Strengths and Areas for Improvement in Learning and Teaching (referencing both good practice and recommendations for improvement)

The following key strengths were noted:

- Innovative, interdisciplinary, and internationally relevant aims.
- Research-led teaching
- Wide range of assessment methods
- Overall student satisfaction
- Range of postgraduate provision and development of courses including the DLP which used the innovative e-teaching methodology
- Internationalisation
- Quality assurance procedures.
- Study Abroad Programme

Areas for Improvement

- Review of the School Strategic Plan
- Development of a Learning and Teaching Strategy
- Communication and feedback
- Implementation of key administrative policies

Conclusion and Recommendations

Conclusion

The Review Panel commends the School on the overall scope and quality of its provision. Despite the number of recommendations the Review Panel would stress that the School of Law has many commendable attributes and an impressive record particularly in the high quality of their students and results which were consistently impressive. The School's Study Abroad programme was particularly noteworthy and the School should be congratulated for this. The Quality Assurance standards initiatives were also impressive. In order to sustain

and improve on the School's successes, however, the Review Panel would stress that it is imperative that the School establish a strong and innovative strategic plan to address current issues and to ensure that the aims of the strategic plan reflect those of the University's. The Review Panel would urge the College of Social Sciences to support the School in its endeavours to maintain and develop its reputation and status within the global community.

Commendations

The Review Panel commends the School on the following, which are listed in order of appearance in this report:

Commendation 1:

The Review Panel **commends** the aims of the School which were innovative, interdisciplinary, research-led and internationally relevant. *[paragraph 3.1]*

Commendation 2:

The Review Panel **commends** the School's library on the excellent range of provision. *[paragraph 3.3.10]*

Commendation 3:

The Review Panel **commends** the School of Law on its development of LLM courses which had been excellent for the internationalisation strategy. Further developments such as a programme for North American students were planned. *[paragraph 3.4.1]*

Commendation 4:

The Review Panel **commends** the School of Law on its success in the high calibre of student. *[paragraph 3.5.1]*

Commendation 5:

The Review Panel **commends** the School for its positive and strong study overseas programme. The Panel was most impressed with the high uptake of students for this experience and with the large number of partner institutions and considered that there are certainly elements of the programme that could be shared with other Schools as Examples of Good Practice. *[paragraph 3.7.1]*

Commendation 6:

The Review Panel **commends** the School for many of its procedures for enhancing and maintaining quality assurance. There was good evidence of appropriately rigorous procedures for course design, course evaluation with a number of highly satisfactory examination outcomes. *[paragraph 4]*

Commendation 7:

The Review Panel **commends** the investment that the School of Law has made in a number of cases including the study abroad programme and excellent links with the profession. *[paragraph 5]*

Recommendations

The recommendations interspersed in the preceding report are summarised below. The recommendations have been cross-referenced to the paragraphs to which they refer in the text of the report. They are listed in order of priority.

Recommendation 1:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School, as a matter of priority, revise the current strategic plan, including the formulation of a Learning & Teaching Strategy, in order to identify a more clearly defined and focussed way forward for the School of Law and to further meet the aims of the University's Strategic Plan *[paragraph 2]*

For the attention of: **Head of School**

Recommendation 2:

The Review Panel **recommends** that, as a matter of priority, the School develops a Learning & Teaching Strategy to address the issues of training and the development of the role of GTAs within the School. *[paragraph 3.8.1]*

For the attention of: **Head of School**

Recommendation 3:

The Review Panel **recommends** that, in cooperation with the Learning & Teaching Centre, the School should develop a systematic structure to address the issues of feedback and communication. *[paragraph 3.3.5]*

For the attention of: **Head of School**

Recommendation 4:

The Review Panel recommends that, in order to address the ongoing problem of staff shortages due to leave of absence and academic staff turnover, the College and School review the current level of staffing and invest accordingly. *[paragraph 3.8.4]*

For the attention of: **Head of College**
Head of School

Recommendation 5:

The Review Panel **recommends that** the School implements appropriate procedures to ensure that communication with the School's external examiners is improved. *[paragraph 3.8.3]*

For the attention of: **Head of School**

Recommendation 6:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Head of School clarifies the role of the Head of Administration to ensure that the time for the supervision of administrative processes is adequate. *[paragraph 3.8.4]*

For the attention of: **Head of School**

Recommendation 7:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the College of Social Sciences provide resources to enable the School of Law to undertake an intensive marketing and advertising exercise for postgraduate study. *[paragraph 3.5.2]*

For the attention of: **Head of College**
For information: **Head of School**

Recommendation 8:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School should, in conjunction with the Learning & Teaching Centre and Careers Service, explore ways in which Graduate

Attributes could be developed further for those students who did not intend to pursue a career in law. *[paragraph 3.4.2]*

For the attention of: **Head of School**

Recommendation 9:

The Review Panel recommends that the School should devolve responsibility for some of its recruitment procedures to RIO. *[paragraph 3.5.1]*

For the attention of: **Head of School**

For Information: **Director of RIO**

Recommendation 10:

The Review Panel **recommends** that RIO should review the language entry requirements for overseas students to the School of Law and that all Schools and EFL should review the language support for overseas students. *[paragraph 3.3.9]*

For the attention of: **Director of RIO**

All Heads of School

Director of Studies EFL

Recommendation 11:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School should resolve the problem pertaining to the variability of marking by staff and ensure that the marking scheme is fully implemented. *[paragraph 3.3.2]*

For the attention of: **Head of School**

Recommendation 12:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School ensures that all staff are made aware of the importance of the role of adviser and that procedures are developed to ensure the advising system is robust and pro-active. *[paragraph 3.6.1]*

For the attention of: **Head of School**

Recommendation 13:

The Review Panel **recommends** that consideration be given to resolving the issues of room size and technological limitations experienced by students and staff on the DLP course. *[paragraph 3.8.5]*

For the attention of: **Head of School**

Recommendation 14:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University review the P&DR policy to consider whether procedures should be implemented to ensure that all staff members, including probationers, undergo an annual PDR. *[paragraph 3.8.2]*

For the attention of: **Director of Human Resources**

Recommendation 15:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School implement policy to ensure there is more consistency in the provision of information in the ILOs. *[paragraph 3.2.1]*

For the attention of: **Head of School**

Recommendation 16:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School should undertake to ensure students are made aware of any pre-requisites or grades which would affect their eligibility or choice of Honours options at varying points during their years of study. *[paragraph 3.3.6]*

For the attention of: **Head of School**

Recommendation 17:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the College of Social Sciences provide resources to enable the School of Law to undertake a project to develop a practical and comprehensive on-line overseas grade conversion table. *[paragraph 3.7.1]*

For the attention of: **Head of College**

Recommendation 18:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the College of Social Sciences should consult with the School of Law regarding the resourcing of the establishment of a law clinic. *[paragraph 3.4.4]*

For the attention of: **Head of College**

Recommendation 19:

The Review Panel recommends that the School of Law reviews its current provision at Levels 3 and 4 to identify opportunities to incorporate additional oral assessments. *[paragraph 3.4.3]*

For the attention of: **Head of School**