

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Academic Standards Committee - Friday 26 May 2006

**Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment:
Report of the Review of the School of Law held on 8 March 2006**

Mr Jim Craig, Clerk to the Review Panel

Professor Bob Matthew	Learning and Teaching Centre [Convener]
Professor Alan Page	External Subject Specialist, University of Dundee
Professor Susan Castillo	Senate Assessor on Court and Professor of American Literature
Dr Barry O'Toole	Member of Cognate Department (Department of Politics)
Dr Mary McCulloch	Learning and Teaching Centre
Mr Jim Craig (Clerk)	Administrative Officer, Senate Office

A. Introduction

- A.1 The School of Law was the subject of an academic review conducted by the QAA in May 2001. This review concluded that the quality of teaching and learning, student progression and learning resources were all commendable. Since that time, the LLB curriculum has been considerably revised and postgraduate taught provision greatly expanded.
- A.2 The School had provided a Self-Evaluation Report (SER) and supporting documentation in accordance with the University's requirements for the Review of Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment. The SER had been developed by a small drafting group before being shared with the staff of the School at large; comments and suggestions from the latter had been taken into account before the report was completed and made available to the Review Panel.
- A.3 The Review Panel congratulated the School for producing an SER that was well written and informative; it noted, however, that the School might have taken the opportunity to engage more self-critically in its analysis of teaching and learning programmes.
- A.4 The Review Panel met with Professor Noreen Burrows, the Dean of the Faculty of Law, Business and Social Sciences, the Head of Department, Professor Tom Mullen, and with several members of academic staff who played prominent roles in terms of the teaching and learning provision in the School. The Panel also met the four probationary members of staff.
- A5 The Panel met 13 undergraduate students representing all levels of the LLB programme, but was disappointed by the extent to which this group was dominated by Senior Honours students taking the Human Rights course. This did not, however, prevent Levels 1 and 2 students voicing various criticisms of the LLB provision, and these criticisms are discussed under the appropriate heading below. The Panel would have had greater cause for concern had it not received from the School a large quantity of Course Evaluation Reports based on student feedback. An analysis of these reports revealed a generally high level of satisfaction with the undergraduate provision.

- A.6 The Review Panel anticipated meeting three 'hourly paid' staff but were disappointed to meet only one – an occasional lecturer who was patently not typical of the Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) who take a leading part in tutorials and seminars. Of still greater concern was the fact that the Panel met only two students to discuss taught postgraduate provision, one an MLL student the other from the Master of Medical Law by distance learning programme. It must be apparent that the Panel's confidence in its findings and recommendations with respect to postgraduate provision is undermined by its perception that it may not have received a representative presentation of student opinion.
- A.7 The Review Panel considered the following range of provision offered by the Department:
- Bachelor of Laws
 - Master of Laws
 - Master of Medical Law

The Panel noted that the Bachelor of Accounting and Law was run jointly with the Department of Accounting and Finance but that there had been no student intake since October 2003. Programmes which are supported jointly with the University of Strathclyde but which are administered by that University were not included – these falling, by convention, to the University of Strathclyde to review.

B. Overall aims of the School's provision

- B.1 The Review Panel noted the statement of the overall aims of the School's provision. This statement was expressed in clear and concrete terms and provided some useful reference points for the review. The aims were found by the Panel to be entirely appropriate.

C. Undergraduate and Taught-Postgraduate Provision

C.1 Aims

- C.1.1 The Review Panel noted the statement of aims provided in the SER for both the LLB programme and the School's taught postgraduate provision. It noted also that although the aims of the LLB programme were expressed in the same clear terms as those published on the School's website, there was no equivalent online statement for postgraduate students. As greater reliance is placed on web publication – and no student handbooks were made available to the review - the Panel concluded that it was important that the website should convey statements of programme aims. A recommendation arising from this observation is included in paragraph C.5.6 below.
- C.1.2 The Review Panel found the aims stated for the LLB programme to be consistent with the School's overall aims, the QAA's benchmark statement for Law, and the requirements of the Law Society of Scotland and the Faculty of Advocates. It acknowledged that the aims of the postgraduate provision were appropriate in the context both of law as an academic discipline and as preparation for employment.

C.2 Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)

- C.2.1 The Review Panel noted the statement of ILOs for the LLB programme and that these were usefully categorised according to the prescription for Programme Specifications. It noted further that they were accessible in the same terms from the 'Teaching and Quality Assurance' page on the School's

website. The Panel agreed that these articulated well with the corresponding programme aims.

- C.2.2 The SER contained a statement of ILOs for the LLM in Commercial Law – these being described as indicative of the learning outcomes of the postgraduate provision as a whole. The Panel was satisfied as to the appropriateness of the ILOs presented but noted, again, that they appeared not to be available to students online.

C.3 *Assessment*

- C.3.1 The Review Panel congratulated the School for the positive approach it had taken to implementing the University's Code of Assessment. The School's web pages included an extensive explanation of the *rationale* of assessment and of the mechanisms employed for delivering assessment outcomes. The Panel noted that it was the School's experience that the improved transparency of the process had resulted in a reduction in the number of student appeals.
- C.3.2 The Panel was concerned, however, to note that staff unease with the distribution of assessment grades at Levels 1 and 2 – a dissatisfaction which was vigorously reflected by students who were most unhappy that 'A' grades were virtually unobtainable in some courses – remained unresolved. The Panel noted the absence of a consensus among staff as to the cause of the problem, the introduction of the Code of Assessment having coincided with the revision of the LLB curriculum, and the view of others that the problem predated both. The Panel was concerned for the effect of the problem both on the morale of students and on the distortion of learning effort in response to an unequal balance of effort and outcome ratios. It **recommends** that the School continues to seek a resolution of the problem and, in particular, that it determines whether the local glosses supplementing the Code's primary verbal descriptors are being applied at Levels 1 and 2 and, if so, whether their use is appropriate.
- C.3.3 While the provision on the website of generous quantities of information relating to assessment and progression was welcomed, the Panel noted with concern the statement in the SER that, "It is apparent that a number of students have an imperfect grasp of these matters, but it is not due to any deficiencies in the information provided." It **recommends** that the School reconsiders how information relating to all aspects of assessment and progression is delivered to students, taking account of the fact that repetition in different forms may be appropriate.
- C.3.4 The Review Panel heard various complaints about assessment feedback. From postgraduates it was reported that some students had not received feedback on essays submitted in the first semester and that they felt this to be a hindrance to the planning of their dissertations. Undergraduates expressed frustration at the lack of feedback from examinations – there was uncertainty as to whether such feedback might be available if requested - and frustration derived from scripts not being returned and a sense that no convincing explanation was given for this. To some extent this negativity appeared to have its origins in the poor results returned in some Level 1 and Level 2 courses (paragraph C.3.2 refers) and was a collective response to criticism of class performance as a whole expressed by teaching staff.
- C.3.5 The Panel recognised that, with such large numbers of students, the occasional hiccup is inevitable and that the expectations of students may sometimes be unreasonable and their demands impossible to meet. It noted

also that, conscious of criticisms that student workloads might be too high, staff had been reluctant to introduce further instruments of formative assessment. The Panel was concerned, nevertheless, that there appeared to be a perception shared by some students that staff were dismissive of their efforts, and deaf to their suggestions and complaints. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School takes urgent steps to discover how far student expectation of assessment feedback differs both from what it provides and is capable of providing, and that it devises appropriate means of bridging the gap between expectation and reality.

- C.3.6 The Panel congratulated the School on the generally very favourable reports submitted by External Examiners. It did note, however, that in 2004-05 reports in respect of Civil Law, etc. and European Law referred to aspects of the administration of the assessment process which had given rise to concern, and that responses from the School in respect of these matters were some time overdue. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School revisits the External Examiner reports cited, and submits its response to the Senate Office as a matter of urgency.

C.4 Curriculum Design and Content

- C.4.1 The Review Panel recognised that the School had radically altered the design of the LLB programme in 2002-03 and subsequently with a view to increasing the choice available to students, permitting greater emphasis on the development of specific and transferable skills, and allowing advantage to be taken of opportunities to study abroad without overloading the curriculum in the first two years. It recognised further that this redesign had been constrained by the requirements for the practise of law in Scotland.
- C.4.2 The Review Panel further recognised and welcomed the further changes to the curriculum which had been introduced in 2004-05 and which had for the first time established a formal distinction between junior and senior Honours courses. It recognised that a number of new courses had been initiated at Level 3, and that the principal object had been to provide a stepped progression from Level 3 to Level 4.
- C.4.3 The Panel noted that the School had addressed the logistical problem of increased numbers of students seeking admission to popular Honours courses by limiting the number of places available and by setting selection criteria referencing performance in cognate courses at lower levels of the curriculum. The Panel was concerned both that some students were, as a result, being denied access to their first choice Honours courses, and that some were reportedly unaware of the implications for their careers of their performance – relative to that of other class members – in lower level assessments. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School gives consideration to ways in which the practice of limiting admission to popular Honours options might be discontinued.
- C.4.4 In its meeting with undergraduates the Review Panel heard from some Level 2 students a description of a semi-detached academic life which, because the number of class meetings was lower than they had expected, and pragmatically they studied mainly at home, left them with no sense of belonging to an academic community. While these students' timetable might have been closer to one end of the spectrum than the other, the School has indicated that, on average across Level 2, students will attend 4.25 hours of lectures per week and a further 2 hours in seminars or workshops. The Review Panel was surprised that the combined figure should be so low and

recommends that the School seek to determine the extent to which a sense of detachment prevails and, informed by the outcome, that it consider what action might be appropriate to reduce perceived levels of isolation.

- C.4.5 The Review Panel heard also from undergraduates about student-led seminars which they likened to “the blind leading the blind”. Although staff didn’t recognise the description, and other students defended the practice as being a useful mode of learning as long as the tutor was ready to intervene, the Panel was troubled by the vehemence with which, on yet another topic, even a few students in the group were critical of the School’s provision. A recommendation referencing this concern is included in paragraph C.5.9.
- C.4.6 The Review Panel noted that the School didn’t support a Learning and Teaching Committee, course matters being discussed in the appropriate ‘Year’ committee and broader subjects in the full School Meeting. The Panel recognised that, as the new curriculum was being developed, such an arrangement made excellent sense but it **recommends** that the School give consideration now to establishing a forum with responsibility for reviewing the delivery of the curriculum as a whole.

C.5 Student Recruitment, Support and Progression

- C.5.1 The success of the School in attracting applicants of the highest calibre in greater numbers than it might accommodate provides clear testimony that it is doing most things well. The Review Panel recognised this and acknowledged that at least some of its concerns identified above derived from that recruitment success. In recent years, despite adjusting its forecast of offers likely to be accepted, the School had exceeded its recruitment target.
- C.5.2 The Review Panel recognised that the School’s entrance requirements, expressed in terms of Scottish ‘Highers’ and ‘A-levels’, were already set at the highest practicable level. It welcomed, therefore, the School’s initiative in introducing the National Admissions Test for Law (LNAT) and monitoring its success as an indicator of aptitude for the LLB programme.
- C.5.3 While the School was, of necessity, turning away applicants who had obtained the required grades in ‘Highers’ or ‘A-levels’, the Review Panel noted and congratulated it for its commitment to the University’s widening participation agenda. The School acknowledged, however, that ethnic minorities were relatively under-represented in the LLB programme and, though some consideration had been given to the matter, no explanation had emerged. The Review Panel recognised that applicants should compete for places on a level playing field but **recommends** that the School continues its exploration of the matter and consider, as appropriate, how it might encourage more applications from ethnic minorities.
- C.5.4 Judged on the oral evidence presented to the Review Panel, one of the School’s greatest successes - and one that the Panel would wish to identify as an exemplar of good practice – was the induction and support afforded distance learners on the Master of Medical Law programme. The student who met the Panel was enthusiastic about all aspects of the provision.
- C.5.5 Distance learners have less adjustment to make in terms of their study environment than students entering the LLM programmes from overseas. While the student who met the Review Panel described the orientation meetings provided by the School as helpful, he reported that some of his colleagues had found settling into Glasgow difficult, and that some would have appreciated more assistance. The Panel **recommends**, therefore, that

the International and Postgraduate Service should be advised of this response so that, whether independently or in conjunction with the School, it might consider whether it would be practicable to offer further support to postgraduate students from overseas, or whether more might be done to advise overseas students of the support that is already available on request.

- C.5.6 It was noted in paragraph C.1.1 that the Panel was unable to discover any reference to the aims or intended learning outcomes of the postgraduate provision on the School's website. It was also noted that the link from the *Virtual Classroom* contents page to the LLM handbook was broken. The Review Panel **recommends** that support for postgraduate students published on the website be brought up to the same standard as that provided for undergraduates.
- C.5.7 The Review Panel congratulated the School for its initiative in establishing the Student Development Committee which provided a clear example of good practice. The Committee, which relied heavily on input from Senior Honours students, supported provision of advice to those at Levels 1 and 2 about study abroad and work experience placements, and appeared to have become a medium for advice more widely on course selection and other matters.
- C.5.8 Students who spoke to the Review Panel were not, however, enthusiastic about the formal adviser system. Some suggested that advisers appeared not always to be well informed and their advice not always impartial. The students appeared to resent their being anonymous to their advisers. The Panel noted that in 2002 the School had removed the obligation on students to meet their advisers at least once a session and had, in its place, established the student's right to see an adviser as required. The Panel noted also that the Faculty of Law, Business and Social Sciences, having inherited different traditions from the components which had merged in 2005, was to conduct a review of the advisory system. The Panel welcomed this development and **recommends** that the review should include a survey of student opinion, and that the results of that consultation should be taken into account.
- C.5.9 The Review Panel noted that the opportunities for student representation to be expressed formally were limited. The Staff-Student Liaison Committee had been abolished in what appeared to be a positive rationalisation with students sitting on the 'Year' committees and attending School Meetings. The 'Year' committees, however, meet not more than three times a session – the Year 1 Committee only twice – with their final meetings in June typically with no students present. The minutes of the 'Year' committees indicated a focus on review of Annual Course Monitoring Reports and, while School Meetings afford student representatives the opportunity to learn about what is going on, the relative numbers of students and staff present, and the construction of agendas, mean that the student voice will not be heard in the same way as it would in a traditional liaison committee. The Review Panel concluded that the degree of frustration and irritation expressed by some students might not be unrelated to the absence of effective communications channels, and **recommends** that the School consider how such channels might be opened.
- C.5.10 The Review Panel recognised, however, that the learning environment provided by *Virtual Classroom* afforded students new communication opportunities. These were acknowledged by students who reported, however, that there were practical constraints on their use. It was said that some questions were withheld out of a fear of "appearing stupid," and that staff sometimes posted dismissive replies, or didn't answer at all.

- C.5.11 Of all the concerns voiced by students, that which had perhaps greatest impact on the Review Panel was one which, though closely related to the issue of formative assessment, was subtly distinct. What came across was a sense of frustration from not knowing what was expected – what was it about an essay or examination answer that made it a good essay or an answer deserving of an ‘A’? The Panel concluded that, if answers to such questions could be easily supplied, they would be given as part of the induction process and that, since they couldn’t, the logical solution was to effectively extend the process of induction. The Review Panel recognised also, however, the frustration of staff discovering that many students, despite their excellent school grades, began their LLB careers ill-prepared for the demands it would make on them. The Panel **recommends** that the School should consider how students might be made more aware of its expectations of them, and how they might be assisted to acquire the necessary skills. This is distinct from but clearly related to the recommendation in paragraph C.3.5 on formative assessment.

C..6 The Effectiveness of Provision

- C.6.1 The Review Panel, while concerned about the critical comments from students reported above, was encouraged to hear from the Senior Honours group a very positive account of life in the School. There was a consensus that students were thrown in at the deep end and expected to swim. The low drop-out rate and the high proportion of students who graduated with a First Class Honours degree or an Upper Second suggested that few did actually drown. The Panel, while it congratulated the School on its success, concluded that its recommendations in respect of student support (paragraphs C.5.8 and C.5.11 refer) remained valid.
- C.6.2 The Review Panel met the four probationary members of staff and were impressed by their description of the School as a friendly and supportive department in which to work. They all reported that they were very busy and happy to be so, but none appeared overwhelmed. Arrangements for induction, mentoring and support were in place, and appeared to work well.
- C.6.3 The Review Panel congratulated the School on its workload model which illustrated the distribution of teaching and administrative work, and was designed to ensure the availability of research time. Colleagues in the Key Staff meeting acknowledged that it was a planning tool rather than a reliable predictor of what staff would actually be doing but, with passing reference to the vicissitudes of life, agreed that it was useful and helped ensure a fair distribution of work
- C.6.4 The Review Panel noted that a significant amount of teaching in the School was conducted by occasional lecturers – whether lecturers in other institutions or members of the legal profession – and by graduate teaching assistants. The single, and unrepresentative, teacher from this category that met the Panel spoke very highly of the support he received from course coordinators, particularly in respect of seminar materials which were of high quality and delivered in good time to allow adequate preparation. Some students, however, expressed dissatisfaction with the quality of some seminars, and suggested that assistants were not allocated to subjects with enough sensitivity to the expertise they possessed. The Panel noted that comments submitted by students in course feedback questionnaires were read by the Head of Department who would make changes to the assignment of teaching responsibilities as necessary, but it **recommends** that the School

play a more proactive role in determining whether teaching being delivered - other than by members of School staff - is of appropriate quality.

- C.6.5 Undergraduates were very happy with Library provision and were particularly enthusiastic about the Workshop. The postgraduate distance learner was highly appreciative of the support she received from the Subject Librarian. The MLL student was also happy with the Library but suggested that, at least in his own class, it was sometimes difficult to get hold of material recommended for study.
- C.6.6 The School drew attention briefly in its SER to concerns about the limitations on IT support and the quality and equipment of the teaching rooms it used. Although the first of these was not developed in the Review Panel's discussions with students and staff, reference was made by the MLL student representative to cramped accommodation and difficulty seeing teaching aids. The Panel **recommends** that the matter of IT support be explored by the School with the Dean of the Faculty, and that a statement of the deficiencies of the teaching accommodation used should be made available to the Director of Estates and Buildings.

D The Maintenance and Enhancement of Standards of Awards

The Review Panel noted that the School has adopted a most positive approach to the implementation of the Code of Assessment, and that its External Examiners have expressed full confidence in the standard of the degrees awarded. As noted above (paragraphs C.3.2 and C.5.11 refer) the Panel expressed concerns, however, that the requirements in Levels 1 and 2 might be too demanding, and that students seemed unclear as to the standards expected of them.

E. The Maintenance and Assurance of Quality

The Review Panel was entirely satisfied that the School supported policies and procedures to ensure the maintenance and assurance of quality. It could not, however, read the reports – including the most recent report – of the School's Quality Assurance Officer on the Annual Course Monitoring Reports (ACMRs) without noting that these policies are not always strictly adhered to by all colleagues. The practice of reviewing ACMRs in 'Year' committees at the end of the session to which they refer is a good one, but it can only be effective if the reports are prepared promptly. The Panel congratulated the Quality Assurance Officer on her diligence, and acknowledged the support given her by the Head of Department, but it **recommends** that staff be reminded again of the importance of adhering in a timely manner to quality assurance requirements.

F. Enhancing the Student Learning Experience

Honours undergraduates and postgraduate students appeared conscious and appreciative of studying in a highly regarded research environment. The Review Panel acknowledged the inevitable tensions that resulted from heavy teaching and research demands but it recognised also the extent to which the student learning experience may be enhanced if teachers are engaged in new work and students are allowed to be aware of it - not in the sense of being in the way, but as a group privileged to an understanding of what is going on. The Panel noted also how the LLB curriculum had been developed with an eye to quality enhancement, and that use of *Virtual Classroom*, if developed sensitively, is capable also of enhancing the learning experience.

G. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas to be Improved or Enhanced in relation to Learning and Teaching and Conclusions and Recommendations

Key strengths

- The School has a considerable reputation as a centre of excellence for teaching and research in Scots law. This is amply borne out by the difficulty it has controlling intake numbers despite setting the highest qualification standards for admission.
- The School has clearly given thought to what are the appropriate aims of its LLB programme in the context of the requirements of the legal profession in Scotland and preparation for employment across a much wider spectrum. On this basis it has articulated a commendable set of learning outcomes associated with its undergraduate provision, and created a curriculum marked by clear steps of progression to the Senior Honours year.
- The School has adopted a positive approach to the implementation of the University's Code of Assessment and, emphasising the transparency of the process, has been rewarded with a reduction in the number of student appeals.
- Judged on the oral evidence presented to the Review Panel, one of the School's greatest successes - and one that the Panel would wish to identify as an exemplar of good practice - was the induction and support afforded to distance learners on the Master of Medical Law programme.
- In another clear example of good practice, the School had established a Student Development Committee which, relying heavily on input from Senior Honours students, supported provision of advice for those at Levels 1 and 2 about study abroad and work experience placements, and which appeared to have become a medium for advice more widely on course selection and other matters.
- Discussions with staff suggested that the School was very busy but a warm, friendly and supportive place to work. Arrangements for the induction, mentoring and support of new staff were in place and appeared to work well. All staff shared a workload model which, although inevitably subject to change in response to unforeseen circumstances, was widely regarded as fair.
- The Workshop appeared to be regarded by students as a particularly valuable asset, complementing the provision of the University Library which itself was seen to provide a particularly helpful service.

Areas to be improved or enhanced

- A good beginning has been made under the *Virtual Classroom* umbrella to provide information for students in a web environment. Further work is, however, required, particularly in terms of provision for postgraduate students.
- Although the numbers of First Class and Upper Second Honours Degrees awarded was highly satisfactory, the Review Panel shared the concern expressed by both students and staff that the assessment outcomes of some courses in Levels 1 and 2 were disappointing. The Panel endorsed the view of the Head of Department that this matter should be investigated further.
- The School has been commended in the past for the quality of the handbooks it produced for students but its own admission that students are failing to

assimilate assessment and progression rules published on the web suggests that further consideration should be given to this matter.

- The Panel heard a number of complaints about late or inadequate formative assessment and, although students' expectations may sometimes be unrealistic, there appeared to be a case for the School to consider how feedback (or explanations about feedback) to students might be improved.
- The reduction in the number of formal teaching hours appears to have created an environment in which it is easy for students, and particularly students living at home, to become isolated from the academic community to the detriment of the learning experience. While this is by no means a phenomenon unique to the School of Law, it is an issue that might usefully be explored.
- Although there is student representation at the School Meeting and there are places for students on the 'Year' committees, it is perhaps difficult for students to register collectively their criticisms and concerns. The School might usefully consider how the present arrangements might be adjusted so that students have a clearer sense of being heard and being answered.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

The Review Panel was impressed by the industry of the School and the extent of its accomplishments over the past ten years which had seen enormous growth in its research activity and major revision of its flagship LLB programme, the latter partly to accommodate the highly commendable increase in the numbers of Honours students studying abroad in their third year.

The Panel was impressed also by the unprecedented numbers that the School was teaching despite its entrance qualifications being as high as they could reasonably be set. It congratulated the School on its decision to introduce the National Admissions Test for Law and to monitor its effectiveness in predicting performance in the LLB programme.

The Panel noted the enthusiasm expressed by the Honours and postgraduate students that it met. It was concerned, however, by the fact that it met only two postgraduates and, while the Panel appreciated that the School was not in a position to compel its students to attend, it formed the view that a better turnout might have been achieved if the School had made the students aware of the importance of the occasion.

The Panel noted also a higher than usual level of criticism of various aspects of the degree programme being expressed by Level 2 students. It acknowledged that these criticisms should be weighed in the context of course evaluation reports which generally indicated a high level of satisfaction with the provision at Levels 1 and 2, but the Panel found it difficult to dismiss entirely a sense that new students were regarded as unprepared for their choice of career and, by their own efforts, should 'shape up' as quickly as possible.

Recommendation 1:

The Panel recommends that the School continues to seek a resolution of the problem of grade profiles in some Levels 1 and 2 courses being abnormal and, in particular, that it determines whether, if local glosses supplementing the Code of Assessment's descriptors are being applied at these Levels, their use is appropriate.. (*Paragraph C.3.2*)

Action: The Head of Department

Recommendation 2:

The Panel recommends that the School reconsiders how information relating to all aspects of assessment and progression is delivered to students, taking account of the fact that repetition in different forms may be appropriate. (*Paragraph C.3.3*)

Action: The Head of Department

Recommendation 3:

The Panel recommends that the School takes urgent steps to discover how far student expectation of assessment feedback differs both from what it provides and is capable of providing, and that it devises appropriate means of bridging the gap between expectation and reality. (*Paragraph C.3.5*)

Action: The Head of Department

Recommendation 4:

The Panel recommends that the School revisits the 2004-05 External Examiner reports in respect of Civil Law, etc. and European Law, and submits its response to the Senate Office as a matter of urgency. (*Paragraph C.3.6*)

Action: The Head of Department

Recommendation 5:

The Panel recommends that the School gives consideration to ways in which the practice of limiting admission to popular Honours classes might be discontinued. (*Paragraph C.4.3*)

Action: The Head of Department

Recommendation 6:

The Panel recommends that the School seek to determine the extent to which a sense of detachment from the academic community prevails and, informed by the outcome, consider what action might be appropriate to reduce perceived levels of isolation. (*Paragraph C.4.4*)

Action: The Head of Department

Recommendation 7:

The Panel recommends that the School give consideration to establishing a Learning and Teaching Committee with responsibility for reviewing the delivery of the curriculum as a whole. (*Paragraph C.4.6*)

Action: The Head of Department

Recommendation 8:

The Panel recognised that applicants should compete for places on a level playing field but recommends that the School continues its exploration of the relatively small numbers of students from ethnic minorities on the LLB programme, and consider, as appropriate, how it might encourage more applications from ethnic minorities. (*Paragraph C.5.3*)

Action: The Head of Department

Recommendation 9:

The Panel recommends that the International and Postgraduate Service should be advised that MLL students from overseas had indicated that they would have appreciated more assistance settling into Glasgow and that, whether independently or in conjunction with the School of Law, it might consider whether it would be practicable to offer further support, or whether more might be done to advise overseas students of the support that is already available on request. (*Paragraph C.5.5*)

Action: The Director of the International and Postgraduate Service

Recommendation 10:

The Panel recommends that support for postgraduate students published on the School's website should be brought up to the same standard as that provided for undergraduates. (*Paragraph C.5.6*)

Action: The Head of Department

Recommendation 11:

The Panel recommends that the review of the adviser system being undertaken in the Faculty of Law, Business and Social Sciences should include a survey of student opinion on the matter, and that the results of that consultation should be taken into account. (*Paragraph C.5.8*)

Action: The Dean of the Faculty of Law, Business and Social Sciences

Recommendation 12:

The Panel recommends that the School consider how formal communications with students' representatives might be improved. (*Paragraph C.5.9*)

Action: The Head of Department

Recommendation 13:

The Panel recommends that the School should consider how students might be made more aware of its expectations of them, and how they might be assisted to acquire the necessary skills. (*Paragraph C.5.11*)

Action: The Head of Department

Recommendation 14:

The Panel recommends that the School should play a more proactive role than at present in determining whether teaching - delivered other than by members of School staff - is of appropriate quality. (*Paragraph C.6.4*)

Action: The Head of Department

Recommendation 15:

The Panel recommends that the School should explore its concerns about the level of IT support with the Dean of the Faculty. (*Paragraph C.6.6*)

Action: The Head of Department and the Dean of the Faculty of Law, Business and Social Sciences

Recommendation 16:

The Panel recommends that a statement of the deficiencies of the teaching accommodation it uses should be made available to the Director of Estates and Buildings. (*Paragraph C.6.6*)

Action: The Head of Department

Recommendation 17:

The Panel recommends that staff in the School be reminded again of the importance of adhering in a timely manner to quality assurance requirements notably in respect of the prompt completion of Annual Course Monitoring Reports. (*Paragraph E*)

Action: The Head of Department

Prepared by: Janet Fleming, Senate Office

Last modified on: Wednesday, 10 May 2006