

**Σχόλια του Τμήματος Νομικής επί της Έκθεσης της Διεθνούς Επιτροπής για το
Μεταπτυχιακό Πρόγραμμα Σπουδών (LLM) του Τμήματος Νομικής**

Λευκωσία, 18 Αυγούστου 2018

Το Τμήμα Νομικής επιθυμεί να ευχαριστήσει τόσο τη διεθνή επιτροπή όσο και τον ΔΠΙΑΕ 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 μεταπτυχιακό 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 αγωγής συνεργασίας με τον ΔΠΙΑΕ 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 1.1.3.4) We would like to see more detailed specification of word limits, and the credit-weighting between essays and exams

The Law Department has introduced the following policy that is now included in the LLM 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.

In relation to credit-weighting between different assessment methods, all course outlines, which are included in the LLM student Handbook, provide for detailed weighting of each type of assessment.

(Point 1.1.3.5) Need for anonymous assessment; need for 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) Need for clear signposting of the marking criteria (the LLM programme presentation included an excellent list, which could easily be turned into a template for a feedback form).

The Department follows the compulsory numerical grading system of the University of Cyprus that is numerical and ranges from 0 to 10, 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 LLM 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.

(Points 1.1.3.6, 1.1.5) The production of an LLM student handbook would be very advisable. A handbook would bring together all of the procedures and information necessary for the understanding of the educational process (academic calendar; module descriptions; teaching arrangements; assessment requirements; dissertation information; points of contact, complaints procedure etc).

The Department has eagerly welcomed the Committee's recommendation and has already prepared an LLM 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) We would encourage the Library and the Department to adopt a new protocol with automatic ordering of new editions of core textbooks.

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 1.1.6) The Committee feels that the Department needs a clear and uniform policy on feedback; the adoption of individual feedback forms and the 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 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 LLM 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 1.1.8) The Department needs a clear mechanism for monitoring attendance and the consequences of non-attendance. It is important that such mechanisms are put in place early on in the life of the course.

The Department has decided to monitor attendance in a uniform way by having attendance sheets signed by students in each class. Unjustified absence from 3 (out of 14) lectures shall entail an automatic deduction of 0.5 point. Unjustified absence from 4 (out of 14) lectures shall entail an automatic deduction of 1.0 point. Unjustified absence from 5 or more (out of 14) lectures shall have as consequence that the student fails the module.

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 LLM student Handbook.

(Point 1.1.11) Plagiarism detection software must be used as a matter of course. It should not be down to the individual marker to identify and deal with plagiarism.

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) It is essential to include information on department procedure on complaints appeals and escalation (e.g. through the PG Programme Panel).

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 Committee of Postgraduate Studies 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.

(Page 20, Note (b)) The countries of origin of the majority of students - The programme is ideally placed to attract students from the wider region, and would encourage the Department to be more ambitious in opening the programme to international students. Therefore, it would invite the Department to reflect on the possibility of offering either the whole or part of the programme also in English, including allowing students to write their dissertation in English. The feasibility study the Department presented to us makes clear that the Department aspires to attract international students, so it is natural for the programme's content and mode of delivery to be adjusted to that end.

The Department had long and thorough discussion on the possibility of offering the whole or part of the programme also in English. It has ultimately decided to partly endorse the Committee's recommendation and allow students to write (and present) their dissertation in English if they so wish (provided, of course, they are fluent in English). The relevant rules read as follows:

11. Οι φοιτητές θα κάνουν προφορική παρουσίαση της εργασίας στην ελληνική ή αγγλική γλώσσα [...].

12. Γλώσσα συγγραφής είναι η Ελληνική ή η Αγγλική (με τη σύμφωνη γνώμη του επιβλέποντος και εφόσον ο φοιτητής έχει άριστη γνώση της αγγλικής γλώσσας).

The Department has decided not to offer the LLM programme in English at this stage, for the following reasons: The Department's perception is that the LLM will be particularly appealing to lawyers/jurists from Cyprus (and Greece) who wish to further their studies on the streams offered and who might find a programme in English less attractive. The Department considers that this pool is probably larger than the pool of prospective students from the wider (Middle East) region who have a large number of options, especially since the focus of the Department's LLM is on EU law (two of the three streams and part of the third). Building on the experience of the current LLM, the Department does intend to offer an LLM in English in the mid-term once more colleagues are hired (the University has allocated four new positions to the Department for 2018 and 2019) as well as a second member of administrative staff. The aim is to offer joint Master programmes with other Departments of the University (Department of Political Science, Department of Economics etc).

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) It would be good practice to have standardized length in the coursework. The Committee heard the Department's argument about allowing a range of lengths, but it was not convinced that this is pedagogically useful.

The Department has addressed this concern by introducing a word limits policy (see point 1.1.3.4)

(Point 1.2.5) We encourage the Department to adopt practices that allow for active student participation, e.g. in-class presentations, mooting.

Mooting is not applicable at the LLM level. When it comes to other means of active student participation, in addition to applying the Socratic method, there will be in-class presentations of reaction papers, case notes or research papers in almost all modules.

(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.

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) The arrangements concerning the assessment of written work need to be clearly set out and standardized. In particular, students need to know the length of each essay component, which ought to be consistent across courses. In addition, we would strongly encourage the Department to consider making provision for second-marking and external oversight of exam papers and exam marking for quality assurance purposes. We understand that this process is not widely used in the University, but we feel that it reflects best international practice.

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

With respect to standardization of coursework assessment, see above (point 1.1.3.4).

2.2 Structure and Content of the Program of Study

(Point 2.2.6) The Committee has two concerns, that can be easily met:

With regard to NOM 500, the course outline (which was inadvertently omitted from the application) needs to specify in more detail: the number of supervision meetings, the kind of feedback students may expect following each supervision; the process of supervision; and the role and weighting of the oral presentation. In addition, the Committee feels strongly that the word limit should be much narrower than 20-25,000 words; that standard practice is to specify only an upper limit; and that, should the Department want to set a minimum too, any latitude in the range should be quite narrow, not more than 1-2,000 words.

The Department has endorsed the Committee's recommendation and has set an upper limit of 18,000 words. It has also drafted rules on LLM theses (addressing all relevant concerns of the Committee), which read in relevant part:

«Κάθε φοιτητής οφείλει να έχει, με δική του πρωτοβουλία, τουλάχιστον δύο και όχι περισσότερες από τέσσερις καταγεγραμμένες συναντήσεις με το επιβλέπον μέλος ΔΕΠ κατά το τρίτο εξάμηνο. Με το πέρας κάθε συνάντησης, ο φοιτητής θα στέλνει εντός δύο ημερών με ηλεκτρονικό μήνυμα στο επιβλέπον μέλος ΔΕΠ ένα σύντομο πρακτικό της συνάντησης με τα θέματα που συζητήθηκαν και η/ο επιβλέπουσα/ων θα το εγκρίνει, αφού κάνει τις αλλαγές που κρίνει απαραίτητες».

«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 στον Πρόεδρο και τα μέλη της Επιτροπής Μεταπτυχιακών Σπουδών».

All this information and the rules on LLM theses are included in the LLM student Handbook.

(Point 2.2.6) The Committee understands the rationale behind the inclusion of Constitutional Principles as a compulsory course for both streams. However, we would invite the Department to consider the following: (a) including a more sustained focus on public international law & human rights; (b) revising the title of the course to incorporate reference to global governance (or simplifying it to Foundations of Public Law); (c) making clear to students that the course examines the interaction among different legal orders, and the principles underlying that interaction (with regard to research methods training, see section 3 below).

The Department has decided to drop the 'Constitutional Principles' module and replace it with a new compulsory module 'Fundamental Principles of EU Law' (see description and outline in Annex), which is relevant to both existing LLM streams ('Criminal Justice and Human

Rights’, ‘European Business Law’) as well as to a third stream (‘European Public Law’), which the Department has also decided to introduce. The new compulsory course will be taught by Dr Ioanna Hadjiyianni (see CV in annex), the new colleague that the Department is about to hire (please note that since the hiring process is not yet completed, in case she is ultimately not hired, the Department intends to appoint her as visiting lecturer). The three other courses for the European Public Law Stream will be chosen from the following four: European Public Law (new module taught by Constantinos Kombos, see description and outline in Annex), EU Environmental Law (new module taught by our new colleague, Ioanna Hadjiyianni, see description and outline in Annex), Law of the European Convention on Human Rights (also available for the ‘Criminal Justice and Human Rights’ stream), and Gender and Human Rights (also available for the ‘Criminal Justice and Human Rights’ stream).

2.3 Quality Assurance of the Program of Study

(Point 2.3.2.3) There is no provision for input by students

The Department has restructured the PG Studies Committee to also include one representative of the LLM students and one representative of the PhD students.

We have asked LLM students to make active use of this route to provide us with feedback by including the following information in the LLM student Handbook:

“Υπάρχουν εκλεγμένοι εκπρόσωποι των μεταπτυχιακών φοιτητών οι οποίοι συμμετέχουν στην Επιτροπή Μεταπτυχιακών Σπουδών του Τμήματος. Γενικά ζητήματα σπουδών μπορούν και πρέπει να τίθενται υπόψη μας 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.»

2.4 Management of the Program of Study

(Point 2.4.7) It would be advisable to include student representatives in the PG Management Committee, and for the Department to close the feedback loop by communicating the ways in which it has responded to student feedback.

See above point 2.3.2.3.

3. Research Work and Synergies with Teaching

3.1 Research – Teaching Synergies

(Point 3.1.9) It is important that the Department create either a research skills course, or a semester-length non-credit bearing research skills training programme for LLM students.

This will help satisfy the Department's stated learning aims.

The Department considers that a research skills course is not common practice at the LLM level. The Department has brought the matter to the attention of the Graduate School and the University's Centre for Teaching and Learning with a view to introducing a research skills training programme for LLM students or, if that is not possible, for Master students of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Education at large. The Department will strongly urge LLM students to attend any courses and seminars offered by the University's Centre for Teaching and Learning on research skills and Library services and will procure research skills seminars for its LLM students for the academic year 2019-2020 (the deadline for such seminars for the upcoming academic year passed in early July).

Conclusions and Suggestions of the External Evaluation Committee

(Pages 14-15)

Department-focused: 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, as the Department and the student cohort grow, having clear formal procedures and communicating those procedures effectively to students and faculty will become very important. In particular, we feel that the Department needs to focus on adopting clear written policies regarding:

Providing feedback to students.

Having uniform guidelines on assessment.

Utilising available plagiarism-detection methods.

Specifying in greater detail the supervision process and requirements for PG dissertations.

Reviewing the role of the English language in the delivery of the programme, with a view to increasing that role.

Providing for student participation in the evaluation and review of the programme, and closing the feedback loop.

Providing student training on research methods.

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 LLM student Handbook with all available information and policies. 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.