Σχόλια του Τμήματος Νομικής επί της Έκθεσης της Διεθνούς Επιτροπής για το Προπτυχιακό Πρόγραμμα Σπουδών (LLB) του Τμήματος Νομικής

Λευκωσία, 18 Αυγούστου 2018

Το Τμήμα Νομικής επιθυμεί να ευχαριστήσει τόσο τη διεθνή επιτροπή όσο και τον ΔΙΠΑΕ για τις ενέργειές τους για την πιστοποίηση των προγραμμάτων σπουδών του Τμήματος. Το Τμήμα είναι ευγνώμον για την ευκαιρία που μας δόθηκε να παρουσιάσουμε τα προγράμματα σπουδών, καθώς και για την εξαιρετική και εποικοδομητική συνεργασία με τη διεθνή επιτροπή. Το Τμήμα ευχαριστεί την επιτροπή για τα πολύ καλά σχόλια για το έργο του Τμήματος και για τη θετική εισήγηση που κάνει για την πιστοποίηση των προγραμμάτων του.

Η παρούσα απάντηση του Τμήματος αφορά το προπτυχιακό πρόγραμμα σπουδών. Όπως προκύπτει από τις αναλυτικές απαντήσεις και σχόλια του Τμήματος στις παρατηρήσεις της Επιτροπής, το Τμήμα αποδέχεται και υιοθετεί τις πλείστες παρατηρήσεις της επιτροπής και έχει ήδη προβεί στις απαραίτητες ενέργειες για την υλοποίησή τους. Οι μόνες παρατηρήσεις της επιτροπής που δεν έχουν υλοποιηθεί αφορούν πολιτικές του Πανεπιστημίου από τις οποίες το Τμήμα δεν μπορεί να διαφοροποιηθεί, καθώς και αδυναμία ανταπόκρισης λόγω περιορισμένων πόρων, όπως αναλυτικά επεξηγείται πιο κάτω.

Ευελπιστούμε στη συνέχιση της αγαστής συνεργασίας με τον ΔΙΠΑΕ και τη διεθνή επιτροπή και είμαστε στη διάθεσή σας για οποιεσδήποτε διευκρινίσεις.

Με τιμή,

Αριστοτέλης Κωνσταντινίδης
Αναπληρωτής Καθηγητής Διεθνούς Δικαίου και Δικαίου Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων
Πρόεδρος Τμήματος Νομικής Πανεπιστημίου Κύπρου

1. Effectiveness of Teaching Work – Available Resources

1.1 Organization of teaching work

(Point 1.1.1) The Committee observed the extensive reliance on English language materials with English not being an admission criterion. Taking into account the specificities of the Cypriot legal system the Committee recommends that English language competence at the admission stage or first year of study be encouraged.

According to applicable legislation, the University of Cyprus and the Department of Law have no say in the admission criteria, which is a matter falling within the exclusive competence of the Ministry of Education. The Department recalls that the Language Center of the University offers the course 'English for Law', which is specifically designed for students of the Law Department and is a compulsory first semester course. In addition, the Department is constantly increasing the elective modules offered in English. There are currently 2-3 such modules per semester. Moreover, the Department offers a Moot Court module as an elective course for the participation of student teams in the Philip C. Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition in Washington DC each year, and organizes the participation of teams of (more than a dozen) students in at least two Model United Nations competitions (one in Cyprus and one in Rome) each year that involve small group teaching and student-led presentations in English. If we also add the number of students that take part in the Erasmus program in Universities with programs in English, more than half of the Department's students take advantage of opportunities that considerably improve their writing and oral communication skills in English. Lastly, the Language Center has undertaken a University wide overhaul of language teaching to the effect that students will not be able to graduate unless they have reached the level of proficient user in English and independent user in a second language.

(Page 21, Note (a)) The Committee notes that there is currently no plan to significantly expand the student intake, which does not sit comfortably with the vision of the University as a whole and its international outlook.

The current student intake of approximately 50 students is high compared to other departments of the University of Cyprus (and among the highest considering the number of staff). If we add the number of projected LLM and PhD students (25 and 12 respectively), the total number of students is commensurate to the size of the Department. The Department may consider

requesting a modest increase in student intake in the mid-term, apace with a similar increase in its academic (and administrative) staff.

(Point 1.1.3.4) Uniformity is required with regard to the criteria for admission to the dissertation module

Any student wishing to take the dissertation module can do so on condition of a 7.5 GPA. Each professor can supervise a maximum of 5 students per academic year. Each professor previously had the discretion to supervise a smaller number but not less than 3; the Department has decided to drop that discretion. Each professor previously also had the discretion to establish additional admission criteria; the Department has decided to drop that discretion as well. In case more than 5 students wish to write a thesis under the supervision of the same professor (this has never happened so far), the selection will be made exclusively based on the students' GPA.

(Point 1.1.3.5) Anonymous assessment, double marking and use of external examiners;

The Department is in principle in favour of both anonymous assessment and external marking. However, for the time being there seem to be insurmountable obstacles to introducing any of the two. In relation to anonymous assessment, the University of Cyprus does not apply such a policy in any Department, nor is any Department individually enforcing such a practice. The reasons are logistic, given that students are identified only via their ID or name and the legal responsibility for marking (including submission in the electronic platform) belongs exclusively to the academic staff teaching the module. Therefore, blind marking would become obvious at the time of submitting marks, while the Secretariat is prohibited under the Law governing the University to have any involvement.

In terms of external examiners, in the case of the University of Cyprus there is no applicable precedent for reasons relating to: cost, lack of Greek speaking external assessors familiar with the Cypriot context of law, extremely tight marking deadlines. External assessors from within the Department is an option that is also excluded because there is often lack of expertise on the matters, given the small number of academic staff at the moment.

Any changes regarding blind marking and external marking will necessitate legislative amendment or at best amendment of the secondary law (regulations) and cannot be

implemented unless there is a University wide decision on the matter and the executive and legislature of the Republic endorses it.

(Point 1.1.3.5) Clear specification of the marking criteria within bands.

The Department follows the compulsory numerical grading system of the University of Cyprus that is numerical and ranges from 0 to10, with increments of 0.5. The minimum passing grade is 5.0. The Grade Point Average (GPA) is calculated on the basis of the average grades for all courses. The final GPA is recorded on the degree according to the following scheme:

-"Excellent with Distinction" (9.5 - 10)

-"Excellent" (8.5 - 9.45)

-"Very Good" (6.5- 8.49)

-"Good" (5.5-6.49)

-"Satisfactory" (5.0 - 5.49).

In terms of marking criteria for every form of assessment for the Law Department, the following principles will apply within the preceding bands and those are now included in the LLB student Handbook:

General Assessment principles: range of knowledge, direct engagement with the question, quality of argument and analysis, organization and presentation. For the first three, emphasis is being placed on use of applicable case law, primary and secondary law and academic analyses. Additional and specific requirements applicable to individual modules are included in the syllabuses.

It is clarified that for classification in any of the marking bands, an assessed piece of work does not have to fulfil all the criteria listed for that band; each member of staff is guided by the marking principles as regards the predominant character of the assessed piece of work. Therefore, the principles are guiding for the examiners and instructive for students with room for academic evaluation and for compensating weaknesses in one area with evidence of strong presence in others.

"Excellent with Distinction" (9.5 - 10) & "Excellent" (8.5 - 9.45)

A comprehensively argued and insightful response to the question, based on broad reading that goes well beyond sources that were part of compulsory reading. Includes a wide range of

examples (case law, primary secondary law, academic writings) to support the argument and provides clear references to relevant literature. The student discusses various points of view relevant to the issues, critically evaluates them and distinguishes between different ideas and arguments. The student also can offer personal and original argumentation relevant to the debate on the issue, while at the same time documenting in-depth understanding of fine points and distinctions. The work is very well written, very well researched, with very few technical errors and a consistent sense of style. The writing style is direct and with strong evidence of perfect command of the language. A mark in this range recognizes intellectual and thoughtful engagement with the subject, a very strong grounding in the topic, and the presentation of a coherent argument with an awareness of nuance and complexity, although not all these elements need be equally strong.

10

Outstanding work in all aspects that is thoroughly independent, original and insightful; writing that has attained the highest professional standards in the discipline.

9.5

Exceptional insight, weight and sophistication. Highly accurate work, analytically rigorous, written with a sense of style.

9

Evidence of critical and innovative thought. Evidence of a capacity to pursue independent lines of enquiry.

8.5

Shows a clear awareness of the salient points and an ability to discuss them analytically and incisively. Evidence of undoubted quality in the use of secondary sources or evidence, but not sustained across the entire range. Although generally fluent, work in this category may contain occasional stylistic or technical errors.

"Very Good" (6.5- 8.49)

The answer is focused on the question, is complete vis-à-vis essential arguments, is well argued and supported by a solid understanding of the subject. Makes good use of the applicable reading that covers exhaustively and goes beyond compulsory reading sources (case law, primary and secondary law, academic writings) and into additional recommended reading. Illustrates wide scope of knowledge with elements of independent thought. The answer compares different

arguments and evaluates them in a critical manner, with occasional yet not complete individual argumentation. The work is well written, well researched, with few technical errors and a consistent sense of style encompassing clear structure and use of a range of sources to support the argument. The writing style is often direct and with considerable evidence of perfect command of the language.

8.0

Well written, with few technical errors. A direct answer to the question, showing an awareness of different arguments and interpretations, and developing a coherent and well-structured discussion.

7.5

A mark in this range will demonstrate a good overall level of competence but will show some weakness in terms of breadth of knowledge, depth, precision, clarity, or style. The answer may neglect some areas of the question, or show some weakness in the prose, or the range of reading.

7.0

A relevant response to the question showing a reasonable level of general competency and knowledge according to most criteria, but with weakness in some areas. Some use of relevant examples and some appreciation of different arguments and interpretations

6.5

Demonstrates knowledge of some issues relevant to the question, but with significant gaps in coverage, some inaccuracies and little attempt to evaluate the status or significance of information. May indicate an insufficiently developed argument with one or more key points neglected, over- reliance on a few items of reading, weaknesses in the prose, and inadequate referencing.

"Good" (5.5-6.49)

A relevant answer to the question, showing a solid but limited engagement with the subject. Attempts to present an argument, but may lack sustained focus, have a limited developed argument or tend towards the assertion of essentially derivative ideas. More descriptive than analytical, without the kind of critical reflection characteristic of answers in higher mark bands. Shows some understanding of strands in historiography where this is relevant. Provides a

reasonably structured account but with some signs of confusion; may contain errors of fact or interpretation. The writing lacks fluency and may be inelegant in places.

6.0

A relevant response to the question showing a reasonable level of general competency and knowledge according to most criteria, but with weakness in some areas. Some use of relevant examples and some appreciation of different arguments and interpretations.

5.5

A weakly relevant response to the question showing a reasonable level of competency and knowledge according to most criteria, but with weakness in some areas. Some use of relevant examples and some appreciation of different arguments and interpretations.

"Satisfactory" (5.0 - 5.49)

A merely partial response to the question, which makes little sustained attempt to develop a coherent answer to the question or only does so in a random manner. An inadequately developed argument, based on very limited reading. The evidence may be misremembered, vague or insufficient to constitute a serious response, containing errors of fact or interpretation. Some evidence of structure, but it is likely to be confused or unclear.

"Fail" (0-4.49)

Signs of some knowledge but at an elementary level and/or displays little or no real understanding of the question. Ranges from being in the most part confused and poorly expressed to lack of a coherent argument. The answer relies on a very limited amount of descriptive material, without any critical reflection of its significance. Contains significant grammatical and spelling errors.

4.5-4.0

Rough response to the question set. Shows limited knowledge of relevant material. A mark in this range may reflect: failure to address the question set; insignificant or no argument. Contains certain relevant information, is often erroneous in matters of fact and interpretation, and poorly organized. Poorly written with numerous grammatical and spelling errors.

3.5-3.0

Bare response to the question set. Shows very limited knowledge of relevant material. A mark in this range may reflect: total failure to address the question set; insignificant or no argument.

Contains little relevant information, is predominantly erroneous in matters of fact and interpretation, and very poorly organized. Very poorly written with numerous grammatical and spelling errors.

2.5-2.0

No meaningful response to the question. Contains no relevant information. Some attempt at analysis, but misconceived and/or incoherent, and has a weak structure.

1.5-1.0

No serious attempt to carry out the task assigned. No attempt at analysis. No structure at all. No understanding or knowledge of the topic. Only partial response.

0

Indicates work either not submitted or unworthy of marking.

(Point 1.1.3.5; 1.1.6) Common template for a feedback form which specifies areas of improvement and acknowledges good performance; adoption of individual feedback forms; Provision of general feedback to the cohort.

The Department has welcomed and implemented the Committee's recommendation by drafting a feedback form for written papers, which is included in the LLB student Handbook.

As to generic feedback, although the University does not have a policy and/or guidance regarding feedback on student performance in each module, the Law Department applies the following internal policy, which is now included in the LLB student Handbook:

After final marks for each module are being made available to continuing students, the convener for each module sets a date in the first week of the next semester devoted to providing feedback to students for modules concluded. Each student makes an appointment and/or uses the open door policy of the Department, either on that specific date or during advertised office hours in the first two weeks of the semester. In that meeting, the convener goes through the papers (mid-term and final exam) with the student. After week three of the semester the papers are recycled in accordance with University rules on data retention.

For students that are no longer registered to the University, a day for feedback meetings is set by the convener of each module in the week following release of marks and in any case before

the graduation list is verified. In that meeting, the convener goes through the papers (mid-term and final exam) with the student.

(Point 1.1.3.5) Past examination papers should be made available to students as this is normal international practice

The University does not have a policy and/or guidance regarding availability of past examination papers to students. There are clear guidelines at University level classifying exam papers as intellectual property of the members of staff, thus it is not possible to impose such an obligation without the prior consent of the member of staff concerned. Nonetheless, the Law Department has decided to apply the following internal policy, on a voluntary basis:

In the syllabus for each module, the convener is strongly encouraged to include the past final exam paper for the previous year that the module was offered and/or a sample exam paper reflecting exam practice to be applied in the year to which the syllabus applies. The syllabuses are required to be submitted to the Secretariat of the Department and the Chairperson is responsible to verify that such compliance has taken place. All syllabuses for all years are kept with the Secretariat.

(Point 1.1.3.5) Mentoring of new staff to ensure they mark consistently

For each newly appointed member of staff an academic mentor is appointed by the Board of the Department, as is the case for external/visiting lecturers, who is tasked with guiding the new colleague in terms of marking and also reviewing teaching quality. The mentor reports at the end of the semester to the Board of the Department after he/she has observed teaching in at least two occasions.

(Point 1.1.3.6; 1.1.5) Production of a student handbook

The Department has eagerly welcomed the Committee's recommendation and has already prepared an LLB student Handbook that brings together all procedures and information necessary for the understanding of the educational process. The Handbook is attached.

(Point 1.1.4.2) Adoption of an automatic ordering protocol of new editions of core textbooks by the library

The Department has communicated the Committee's recommendation to the Library and the Library has promised to find ways to act upon the Committee's recommendation. In addition, the Department's Library, Research Infrastructure, New Technologies and Internet Committee has been instructed to remind colleagues of the need to check for and order new editions of recommended core textbooks ahead of each academic year (this will be an agenda item to be included in the spring meeting of the Department's Board).

(Point 1.1.11) Plagiarism detection software must be used as a matter of course.

The Department has asked the Library to appoint a member of the Library staff as contact person for inquiries relating to the plagiarism detection software available at the University, and arrange a meeting with all members of academic staff as well as with PhD and LLM students of the Department to better acquaint them with such software. The meeting will take place in September.

(Point 1.1.12) Departmental procedure on appeals and escalation.

In the event of complaint for misconduct by a member of the academic staff, the aggrieved student may first raise a complaint with her/his academic advisor who will make best efforts to resolve the matter within a week. If the matter is urgent or relates to conduct of the academic advisor, or the academic advisor is unable to resolve the matter, or the aggrieved student is not satisfied with the settlement of the matter by the academic advisor, the student may file a complaint with the Department's Committee on Academic Affairs and Student Issues, documenting in detail the issue and requesting a specific solution.

The Committee must respond to the complaint within a month of receiving it, documenting its findings and decision. The decision is addressed to the Chair of the Department and to affected parties. The Chair is responsible for implementing the decision.

The decision of the Committee can recommend:

a. Reconciliation measures
b. Period of probation for the student
c. Reprimand of the member of academic staff

d. Initiation of disciplinary procedures for any party involved
e. Change of academic advisor or thesis supervisor, if possible.

If the complaint involves a member of the Committee, that member does not take part in the process and is substituted by the Chairperson of the Department, and if that is not possible by a member of staff appointed by the Board of the Department.

1.2 Teaching

(Point 1.2.3) There is currently no provision for any formative assessment.

The University regulations do not provide for any formative assessment. Any formative assessment that is being made compulsory needs to form part of the formal assessment, according to the applicable regulations. Additionally, owing to resource restraints, the Department cannot offer tutorials at the time. The Department will consider introducing both tutorials and formative assessment as soon as there is a considerable increase in the academic staff, including in teaching assistants, which are also currently lacking. Moreover, the objective of offering to both the student and the convener the opportunity to reflect on the learning process and the assessment is met by requiring at least two types of assessment taking place at different times (eg. mid-term and final, with the latter not weighing less than 60%).

(Point 1.2.4) Adoption of a clear and uniform policy and implementation of the assessment of class participation.

The Department has decided to discontinue the practice of some members of academic staff to give credits to students for (active) class participation.

(Point 1.2.5) Alternative forms of delivery that encourage active student participation (small group teaching, student-led presentation etc)

Owing to resource restraints, the Department cannot offer tutorials for the time being. The Department will consider introducing both tutorials and formative assessment as soon as there is a considerable increase in the academic staff, including in teaching assistants, which are also currently lacking. Moreover, the Department offers a Moot Court module as an elective course for the participation of student teams in the Philip C. Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition in Washington DC each spring, and also organizes the participation of teams of

(more than a dozen) students in at least two Model United Nations competitions (one in Cyprus and one in Rome) each year that involve such recommended small group teaching and student-led presentations in English.

(Point 1.2.6) We encourage the use of the discussion forum function on the blackboard platform.

The Committee's recommendation was brought to the attention of all members of academic staff of the Department who are committing to making good use of the function.

(Point 1.1.8) Lack of a clear mechanism for monitoring attendance and the consequences of non-attendance

The Department has decided to monitor attendance in a uniform way by having attendance sheets signed by students in each class. Unjustified absence from 4-5 lectures shall entail an automatic deduction of 0.5 point. Unjustified absence from 6-10 lectures shall entail an automatic deduction of 1.0 point. Unjustified absence from 11-15 lectures shall entail an automatic deduction of 2.0 points. Unjustified absence from 16-20 lectures shall entail an automatic deduction of 3.0 points. Unjustified absence from 21 or more lectures shall entail an automatic deduction of 3.5 points.

Absence is considered unjustified when it is not due to serious personal or professional reasons or health reasons. Students invoking such reasons must provide evidence as soon as possible. This information is included in the LLB student Handbook.

2. Programme of Study and Higher Education Qualifications

2.1 Purpose and Objectives and learning outcomes of the Program of Study

(Point 2.1.4) Standardisation of written work assessment

The Law Department has introduced the following policy that is now included in the LLB student Handbook:

As a universal rule, all coursework will carry a word limit, that may vary depending on the module. For each module where a coursework assessment is set, the convener includes either in the syllabus or in the coursework questions communicated to the students a clear word limit

(e.g. 2500, 3000 words). Footnotes, table of contents and bibliography are always excluded in the word limit. Assessed essays should be word processed.

Whatever the word limit, it must be approached as the strictly applicable space in which to answer the questions set. Each student clearly declares the word count for each coursework in the cover of the answer. Failure to do so triggers a deduction of 0.5. Inaccurate declaration triggers a deduction of 0.5 and could result in disciplinary proceedings in accordance with the University's Regulations under the cheating provisions.

Failure to comply with the word limits will result in the imposition of penalties as follows:

1-9% over the specified word limit, a penalty of 0.5 mark;

10%-20% over the specified word limit, a penalty of 1.0 mark;

More than 21% over the published word limit, the work will be awarded a mark of zero.

The preceding penalties apply also to dissertations.

(Point 2.1.4) Second marking, external examination oversight

With respect to second-marking and external oversight, see above (point 1.1.3.5).

(Point 2.1.6) Teaching in smaller tutorial groups/seminars

Owing to resource restraints, the Department cannot offer tutorials at the time. The Department will consider introducing tutorials as soon as there is a considerable increase in the academic staff, including in teaching assistants, which are currently lacking. Moreover, the Department offers a Moot Court module as an elective course for the participation of student teams in the Philip C. Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition in Washington DC each spring, and also organizes the participation of teams of (more than a dozen) students in at least two Model United Nations competitions (one in Cyprus and one in Rome) each year that involve such recommended small group teaching and student-led presentations in English.

2.2 Structure and Content of the Program of Study

(Point 2.2.6) Dissertation module

The Department has amended the rules on LLB theses/dissertations (addressing all relevant concerns of the Committee), which are included in the LLB student Handbook and read in relevant part:

8. Η διπλωματική εργασία έχει ανώτατο όριο 13,000 λέξεις. Στο όριο λέξεων δεν περιλαμβάνονται οι υποσημειώσεις, ο πίνακας περιεχομένων, η βιβλιογραφία ή τυχόν παραρτήματα. Σε περίπτωση υπέρβασης του ορίου μέχρι 1300 λέξεις επιβάλλεται αυτόματη μείωση 0.5 βαθμού. Σε περίπτωση υπέρβασης του ορίου από 1301 μέχρι 2600 λέξεις επιβάλλεται αυτόματη μείωση 1.0 βαθμού. Σε περίπτωση υπέρβασης του ορίου περισσότερο από 2600 λέξεις η εργασία βαθμολογείται με βαθμό 0.
13. Η προφορική παρουσίαση και η προφορική εξέταση αντιστοιχούν στο 30% του βαθμού. Το 70% του βαθμού αντιστοιχεί στο γραπτό κείμενο. Ο βαθμός για το γραπτό κείμενο τίθεται από την επιτροπή εξέτασης πριν την έναρξη της προφορικής διαδικασίας και γνωστοποιείται στο συντονιστή ή, αν δεν έχει οριστεί συντονιστής, στον Πρόεδρο του Τμήματος.

(Point 2.2.8) Regular review of the programme's modules both compulsory and electives, based on the market needs and close contact with the profession.

In addition to maintaining good relationship and close links with the Bar Associations of Cyprus, the Department has decided to appoint Dr Costas Paraskeva, Assistant Professor of Public Law, as its liaison person with the Pancypriot Bar Association and the Legal Council to consult on a regular basis on matters of mutual concern.

In addition, the Department is mindful of the scope for further development of its LLB programme and intends to offer the modules of Environmental Law, Energy Law, Labour Law as well as Trusts as electives in the academic years 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 to be taught either by the new staff or by adjunct/visiting lecturers.

(Point 2.3.2.3) Although there is provision for input by students, the committee was not clear that there were adequate processes for follow-up.

The Board of the Department includes three elected student representatives. The Department has asked its students to make active use of this route to provide us with feedback by including the following information in the LLB student Handbook:

«Υπάρχουν εκλεγμένοι εκπρόσωποι των φοιτητών οι οποίοι συμμετέχουν στο Συμβούλιο του Τμήματος. Γενικά ζητήματα σπουδών μπορούν και πρέπει να τίθενται υπόψη του Συμβουλίου του Τμήματος μέσω αυτής της οδού. Ζητούμε από τους φοιτητές μας να παρέχουν την απαραίτητη ανατροφοδότηση που θα βοηθήσει το Τμήμα να διασφαλίσει την ομαλή λειτουργία του και τη διαρκή βελτίωση της ποιότητας των προγραμμάτων σπουδών που παρέχει».

(Points 2.3.1) Proper written and transparent policy for quality assurance

The Department has introduced a number of written policies that define clear competencies and procedures with a view to enhancing quality assurance of its LLB program.

(Points 2.4.7) Current student evaluation forms are seen only by the president. We recommend the creation of a committee for that purpose.

The Department has decided that evaluation forms will also be seen by the vice president of the Department. The president and vice president will make joint efforts to address any serious issues noted by students in their evaluations.

(Points 2.6.2) Employability study

The Department has decided to keep track record of its alumni and create a database that will include, *inter alia*, information about their employment.

Conclusions and Suggestions of the External Evaluation Committee

(Pages 14-15) There are a number of aspects in which the Department lacks clear procedures and policies. We understand that, due to the small number of faculty and the aforementioned resource constraints, a number of issues can be handled informally. However, having clear formal procedures and communicating those procedures effectively to students and faculty is very important and will become even more so as the Department grows. In particular, we feel that the Department needs to focus on adopting clear written policies regarding:

- *Providing consistent and effective feedback to students;*
- *Having uniform guidelines on assessment;*
- *Utilising available plagiarism-detection methods;*
- *Specifying in greater detail the supervision process and detailed requirements for UG dissertations;*
- *Providing for student participation in the evaluation and review of the programme (not simply at course level), and closing the feedback loop.*

The Department has considered and thoroughly discussed all recommendations of the Committee and has endorsed and acted upon most of them, as shown in the detailed answers

above. Most importantly, the Department has drafted an LLB student Handbook with all available information and policies, which are now clear and written. The recommendations that were not endorsed relate to institutional and/or resource constraints that the Department cannot currently overcome because they require University level action or more resources that the Department currently does not possess.