



**Program Review Report
Program Reviews - 2018
LL.B (Honors)
Faculty of Law
University of Colombo
14th to 18th October 2018**



**Prof. H.M. Nawarathna Banda (Chair)
Prof. Vigith Jayamanna
Mr. K. Guruparan**

**Quality Assurance Council
University Grants Commission**

Contents

Section 1	Brief Introduction to the Programme	2
Section 2	Review Team’s Observations on the SER	4
Section 3	A brief description of the Review Process	6
Section 4	Overview of the Faculty’s Approach to Quality and Standards	7
Section 5	Judgment on the eight criteria of programme Review	8
	5.1: Criterion 1- Programme Management	8
	5.2: Criterion 2- Human and Physical Resources	8
	5.3: Criterion 3- Programme Design and Development	9
	5.4: Criterion 4- Course/Module Design and Development	10
	5.5: Criterion 5-Teaching and Learning	11
	5.6 Criterion 6- Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression	11
	5.7: Criterion 7- Student Assessment and Awards	12
	5.8: Criterion 8- Innovative and Healthy Practices	13
Section 6	Grading of Overall Performance of the Programme	14
Section 7	Commendations and Recommendation	18
Section 8	Summary	24
Appendices		26

SECTION 1: Brief Introduction to the Program

The Degree program in Law was introduced in 1947 primarily because of dissatisfaction with the quality of legal education available at the time. The original intention was that all aspiring lawyers should first obtain a Law Degree and thereafter proceed to the Ceylon Law College for practical training. This was subsequently rejected. Professor T Nadaraja (Foundation Professor of Law and Dean of the Faculty had described the events leading to the establishment of the Faculty of Law as follows:

“The next stage in the evolution of legal education in Ceylon was initiated in 1923 by Chief Justice Sir Anton Bertram, who pointed out grave defects in the education provided, at training given by part-time teachers at the College and to have had in mind the broader objectives which university teachers are expected to follow, and the wider horizons they can open up to students in the environment of a University. His suggestion, which the Council for Legal Education accepted in 1924, was that the major part of the instruction of law students be transferred to a Faculty of Law at the proposed University of Ceylon, leaving the Law College to provide a postgraduate course of instruction in what were termed practical subjects, like Procedures, Evidence and Conveyancing. But eleven years later the Council went back on its earlier decision and decided that, whether the proposed Faculty of Law came into existence or not, the Law College should continue to provide a complete course of study and training for prospective lawyers.”

Thus, while the Law College continued to provide access to the profession, the Faculty was able to provide students selected through the university admissions process with a different orientation. This was consistent with the vision of Chief Justice Bertram and the broader outlook that university education must necessarily contain. There are, therefore, two streams through which one can enter the profession. The stream which flows from the university system prepares students differently, with an emphasis on an analytical, jurisprudential perspective. It has made and continues to make a unique and indispensable contribution to the Sri Lanka legal community, legal scholarship and other areas of public life.

The LL. B curriculum consists of four years of teaching and learning activities. Under the program, a student studies nineteen law subjects within a span of four academic years. The four academic years are called the Bachelor of Laws Degree Year 1, Year II, Year III and Year IV. The minimum period for which an undergraduate should be a registered as an undergraduate student is four years. However, in practice, students complete the LL. B degree in a span of 3 years and 9 months and obtain their results transcript in hand in order to register for the professional bar exam that is called Attorney’s Final which is conducted by the Sri Lanka Law College. Undergraduates admitted to the LL. B program are required to complete the course before the end of 10 years from the date of their first registration.

Revision of the current curriculum has been completed and will be implemented for the academic year 2018/2019.

SECTION 2: Review Team's Observation on the Self-Evaluation Report (SER)

The Faculty of Law, University of Colombo is Sri Lanka's premier seat of legal education and has a long pedigree in providing high quality legal education. The self-evaluation report, our evaluation of the evidence and interaction with various stakeholders over the last three days confirms the high-level quality of teaching, learning and assessment at the Faculty.

However, we feel that the Faculty can do better in some areas, particularly in the area of bringing its course design, where demonstration is required that it complies with the standards that are universal, to the state university system. We also think that the Faculty can be proactive, given its competent staff and diverse alumni to diversify its learning and teaching strategies.

There are three departments at the Faculty of Law but not any more development. There are not enough academic and non-academic staff, so they have over load of work and that affects the quality of the degree. Infrastructure facilities are inadequate. Classrooms are not properly ventilated. Some modern technology is used, but FM microphones are not used for teaching large classes. Therefore, interaction with students is not very good. Students have to do two assignments and are not required to do a presentation, so they are unable to develop their soft skills. The curriculum does not include field trips, a research methodology paper or a final year dissertation. These are negative aspects of the LL. B degree.

It is believed by some that the Sinhala and Tamil medium graduates are produced for the local courts and English medium graduates are produced for high courts in Sri Lanka. Some were of the view that those from rural areas of Sri Lanka do not have enough ability to follow the English medium degree, but this is discrimination of students who are selected for the Sri Lanka University system and those students are the spirit of the country. Documents related to the SER were available, but some documents were missing, and arrangement of the documents was not in a good condition. The academic, non-academic, students, alumni and other people with whom we had discussions to get information, supported us. Changing their attitudes was somewhat difficult.

Releasing results has taken more than three months and this has affected student performance. There is no fallback option which has negatively affected students who wish to migrate or go away within the period of study. There is no credit transfer system. Therefore, there are no opportunities to study other subjects in or outside the country, which is also not good for the quality of the degree. When students want to do additional activities, they do not have a place to arrange them and they do so outside classrooms and in open places. So, during rainy seasons, they are unable to arrange extracurricular activities. Providing an auditorium is the best way to solve this problem. There is no changing room for non-academic staff. Every

non-academic should be provided with computer knowledge which would benefit the Faculty and provide a service from technical officers.

SECTION 3: A Brief Overview of the Review Process

The review process consisted of three stages: (a) Desk evaluation of the Self-Evaluation Report prepared by the Faculty of Law, University of Colombo (b) Site visit of the review team to the Faculty and (c) debriefing with the relevant stakeholders, of the findings and their feedback.

All three reviewers conducted desk evaluation independently and the findings were discussed prior to the site visit. The site visit proceeded as per the agenda annexed hereto this report. The visit covered three days and a wide spectrum of issues arising from the Self-Evaluation Report which the team was fairly satisfied with, was reviewed the debriefing was deliberative and was useful in the preparation of this report.

We have no doubt whatsoever that the Faculty took the review process seriously and this was reflected in the programme that they had put together for our visit. The logistics and breadth of the programme were more than satisfactory.

SECTION 4: Overview of the Faculty's approach to Quality and Standards

It was observed during the review visit that the Faculty is moving in the right direction towards enhancing the quality of the legal education, even though the progress needs to be stepped up. The University maintains an Internal Quality Assurance Unit (IQAU) under able directorship and adequate resources. Further, the Faculty of Law operates an Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC), under the guidance of the IQAU. Both IQAU and IQAC are doing a commendable job with a view to ensuring the quality of the LL. B degree programme. Both IQAU and IQAC are working according to the Internal Quality Assurance Manual (2013) of the UGC and the Internal Quality Assurance Circular of 2015. Both bodies appear to be conducting regular meetings in order to uphold the quality of the existing study programmes. The Faculty is fully committed towards the quality enhancement of its study programmes even though the review team is not satisfied with the progress of some of the activities e.g. the progress of curriculum revision.

It was observed that the Faculty has a very strong organizational structure which is adequate for effective quality management and execution of its core functions. Its management procedures are in compliance with national and institutional goals and objectives. Student participation is ensured at the Faculty Board and a detailed student handbook was made available. The academic calendar is communicated and followed, and the website is up-to-date, ICT platforms have been put in place and used by the students.

The review team is of the opinion that the Faculty has a great potential to update/upgrade its existing study programmes, by incorporating the SLQF guidelines into the existing curriculum. Further, the review team recommends that the various standards given under the 8 quality criteria of the Manual for Review of Undergraduate Study Programmes of Sri Lankan Universities and Higher Education Institutions (2015) be adopted by the Faculty of Law, University of Colombo. There was no adequate evidence that the study programme has incorporated, fallback options, lateral entry/exit points, verification of marks/grades, repeat examinations etc. Therefore, a comprehensive revision of the existing LL. B curriculum by incorporating all the guidelines of the SLQF (2015) is highly recommended by the review team. Further, the review team suggests that a few workshops on curriculum development be held for the benefit of staff members with the participation of suitable resource persons from the UGC.

Section 5: Judgement on the Eight Criteria of Programme Review

This section outlines the major strengths and weaknesses of the LLB programme offered by the Faculty of Law, University of Colombo

Criterion 1 – Programme Management

Strengths

1. The Faculty has a very strong organizational structure which is adequate for effective management and execution of its core functions
2. Management Procedures are in compliance with national and institutional SoPs
3. Student participation is provided for at the Faculty Board and a detailed student handbook made available
4. Academic calendar is communicated and followed
5. Website is up-to date, ICT platforms have been put in place and are in use
6. IQAC is functional and has a system in place to deliver QA
7. Active and inclusive Curriculum Development Committee
8. Student welfare services – hostels, cultural and aesthetic activities, sports facilities and safety are all of a high standard. Support for differently abled students seems adequate
9. Zero tolerance policy to ragging
10. Strong examination By-laws which are strictly followed

Weaknesses

1. While there is a University Corporate Plan, which also includes the plan of the Faculty, the Faculty does not have its own separate action plan
2. Performance appraisal system not put in place

Criterion 2 – Human & Physical Resources

Strengths

1. Highly qualified, dedicated and committed staff
2. Well-resourced staff development center that provides high quality staff development programmes
3. Well-resourced library with a wide variety of services available

4. ICT facilities adequate

Weaknesses

1. Infrastructure facilities need upgrading. (We have taken note of the comprehensive proposal for a new building)
2. Some of the lecture halls (particularly the New Law Theatre) are very poorly ventilated.
3. Individual staff rooms are small and inadequate
4. Little evidence of specialized clinical training facilities

Criterion 3 – Programme Design and Development

Strengths

1. The entire Faculty Board functions as the Curriculum Development Committee providing for maximum possible inclusivity. On the other hand, the over-inclusivity may be one of the reasons why it took so long for the Faculty to revise its curriculum.
2. Programme approval process is clear and adhered to.
3. External stakeholder participation provided for
4. Programme is logically structured, consists of a coherent set of courses while allowing flexibility in student choices
5. Learning strategies for self-directed learning, creative and critical thinking, and lifelong learning in place.
6. Academic standards of the programme appropriate to the level and nature of the award.

Weaknesses

1. External stakeholder participation not broad enough, particularly given the extremely diverse alumni of the Faculty that can be easily tapped into.
2. Full compliance with SLQF standards not reflected in the existing curriculum and in the newly developed curriculum
3. The SLQF standards prefer the adoption of a semester based course unit system with the Grade Point Average system of evaluation, for a more objective and organized means of assessment, teaching and learning. The Faculty has not adopted the system.
4. Inadequate evidence of supplementary vocational/ professional/ semi-professional courses to enrich generic skills of students
5. Inadequate evidence for work based placement / industrial training / internship

Criterion 4 – Course design and development

Strengths

1. Course design and development has participation of external experts
2. Courses reflect knowledge and current development in the relevant field
3. Student centered teaching provided for, enabling students to be actively engaged in their own learning
4. Course design and development integrates appropriate learning strategies for the development of self-directed learning, collaborative learning, creative and critical thinking, lifelong learning
5. Courses are scheduled and offered in a manner that allows students to complete them within the intended period of time
6. Course content has adequate breadth, depth, rigor and balance.
7. Appropriate media and technology are used

Weaknesses

1. Compliance with SLQF credit definition not adequately demonstrated
2. Constructive alignment can be better articulated and demonstrated
3. Inadequate evidence for the credit value and corresponding notional working hours being broken down into different types of learning such as direct contact hours, self-learning time, assignments, assessments, field studies, clinical work, industrial placement etc.
4. The ideal number of credits per course unit as per SLQF standards are four. The Faculty has preferred large credit courses which may be a burden on the student and also affect the accuracy of the assessment system.
5. The Faculty does not have any non-credit, auxiliary / elective courses that facilitate inter-faculty/ inter-disciplinary learning.
6. The Faculty may consider introducing a research project in the final year and a dedicated research methodology course in the third of Final year.
7. The Faculty has not adopted a system of credit transfer

Criterion 5 – Teaching and Learning

Strengths

1. Teaching & Learning based on Faculty's mission and curriculum requirements
2. Course specifications and timetable made available to students before the commencement of the course
3. The Faculty encourages blended learning. Teachers integrate into their teaching, current scholarly work and current knowledge in the public domain
4. Teaching & Learning accessible to differently abled students
5. Teachers encourage study groups. Teacher centered and student-centered teaching-learning methodologies are used.

Weaknesses

1. The Faculty's decision of 'no awards' inhibit identifying teaching excellence and promotion and adoption of good practices
2. Opportunity for students to engage in research as part of Teaching & Learning, not available beyond the confines of take home essay type in course assessments

Criterion 6 – Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression

Strengths

1. The Faculty adopts a student friendly, administrative, academic and technical support system
2. Guides the students to optimally use the available student support services
3. Training in the use of ICT, use of library is available
4. Use of library and information resources integrated into the learning process
5. Promotes active academic and social interactions between academic staff and students
6. Co-curricular activities supported, evidence of CGU being used is available
7. Student grievances are promptly addressed.

Weaknesses

1. Not enough evidence for the Faculty offering specialized learning resources such as clinical facilities etc.

2. Modern technology beyond use of multimedia, such as smart boards etc. may be considered particularly in a large group teaching setting
3. Evidence suggests that the alumni association can be better utilized for career guidance, internships, placements

Criterion 7 – Students Assessments and Awards

Strengths

1. Clear relation between assessment tasks and programme outcomes
2. Procedures for designing, approving, monitoring and reviewing assessment strategies are clearly available
3. Clear policy in relation to appointment of internal/external examiners
4. Conflict of interest issues taken seriously
5. Well-defined marking scheme use of blind second marking
6. Strict enforcement of examination laws and regulations

Weaknesses

1. Conflicting evidence on whether exam results are released on time. The evidence points to the fact that final year results are released by the end of four years from registration. But students point to delay in release of results in between academic years
2. The Faculty has no avenue for students to request re-scrutiny
3. Depriving a student of any Class for failure even in one course unit, seems disproportionate.

Criterion 8 – Innovative and Healthy Practices

Strengths

1. The Faculty is the leader of pioneering legal research and is involved in national legal reform and policy efforts at a very high level
2. Has strong links with national governmental and non-governmental agencies and industries

Weaknesses

1. Evidence of research, community and industry engagement available, but the Faculty has the capacity to foster, promote and encourage more research, community and industry engagement.
2. The Faculty can and should implement a sophisticated rewards system to encourage academics for research and outreach activities
3. The study programme does not include an undergraduate research project
4. The study programme has very little evidence of an 'industrial attachment' being integrated to the teaching and learning strategy
5. No lateral entry or lateral exit points.

SECTION 6: Grading of Overall Performance of the Program

The Faculty By -laws are outdated. There is no Faculty Action Plan, so it is not possible to follow up the work done by the Faculty. There is no development plan also, so they don't know what their future is. The arrangement of documents was not in a good condition, so it was very complicated to find relevant documents. They have explained a great deal of things done but not supported by documents. Individual timetable for lecturers was not seen. Within the Department no appreciable system for appraising e academic staff. Old curricula not adopted to the SLQF and the new curriculum also is not fully adopted to the SLQF.

There are not enough academic and non-academic staff. Most of academic staff have completed their post-graduate degrees locally. So, lack of foreign exposure that could explain not changing attitudes. The SER was not properly checked by senior people so there were many errors. The human resources profile is not compatible with the needs of the Faculty and comparable with national and international norms.

There are 60 computers but not enough for a thousand students. The curriculum does not include soft skills and neither does the new curriculum. The English requirement is also not included in the curriculum and students have to do assignments and they do not participate in English classes properly. No global trends included in the curriculum. They have not used any specialist for curriculum development. The LMS is used, but not heavily, for student centered learning. No ILOs for the existing degree. There is a very good software for differently abled students but those are not provided by the Faculty.

Although the alumni would like to change the curriculum in keeping with the changing world, constraints from the bureaucracy does not allow it. There is no mentoring program within the Faculty, but the alumni have the capacity to provide it but they are not utilized by the Faculty. The alumni are of the view that the Faculty should convert all the degrees into the English medium as soon as possible. Several new subject areas have emerged, but the Faculty has not considered them yet. The Faculty should link with the corporate sector with a view to produce quality graduates for the job market. The Learning environment in the Faculty is not at the expected condition. Students do not use power point to do their presentations, which would affect their skills development.

The Faculty comprises of a fairly adequate administrative structure which enables the implementation of its core functions. Quality assurance is a paramount component of the Faculty, and it ensures that the IQAC is on par with the guide lines provided. Curriculum revisions are made with the assistance of a Curriculum Revision Committee. In the process of formulating and revising the study program, the Faculty frequently utilizes both the SLQF and SBS documents. Further, Outcome Based Education and Student-Centered Learning are also executed in academic development and planning. So, the program management criterion is ranked in first place.

The Department ensures a student-friendly conducive and caring environment to provide opportunities to solve students' problems. The Department gets feedback regarding the learning support via monthly discussions with student representatives and the Head and decisions are taken to resolve the issues. A Faculty appointed team organizes an orientation program for newly enrolled students, to make them aware of the examination rules and regulations, university library, physical education, and available student support services in the Faculty/Department. Further, at the enrolment, students are provided with the Code of Student Conduct, Declaration by candidate, and prohibition of ragging. A zero ragging policy is enforced. So, the learning environment, student support and progression criterion is ranked in second place.

The Faculty has adopted a participatory approach inclusive of all academics, external stakeholders at the main stages of program design. A Curriculum Committee has been formed with representatives of external stakeholders. LL. B Honours Degree includes five subjects in the first year, all of which are compulsory. Five compulsory subjects are offered in the Second year. In the Third year at least one semi-elective and one or more elective subject/s to make a minimum of 5 and maximum of 6 subjects, must be selected. Revision of the curriculum was started in 2010 but is not completed yet. The new syllabi are not compliant with the SLQF. No global trends are included in the syllabi. The service of specialists has not been obtained to develop the curricula. There are no employability rates included in SER. So, the programme design and development criterion is ranked in third place.

The Faculty promised to ensure the quality of teaching and learning, with hope of improving the quality of the learning experience of students, and to achieve the ILOs which are based on the mission of the Faculty and the curriculum requirements. Lecturers are given their individual timetables and the Faculty timetable is displayed on the notice boards and web before commencing the semester. Students are provided with study guides with ILOs, content, and prescribed readings at the beginning of the course. The assessment process and learning outcomes are aligned with study guide and closely monitored. No personal timetable can be seen to students. They use the LMS but not heavily. Although modern technology used. FM microphones etc. are not being used for lectures. The heavy load of assignments is a big burden for students. There are English classes, but attendance is poor due to heavy load of work. Six credits for a subject is also a big burden. So, the teaching and learning criterion is ranked in fourth place.

The Faculty adopts assessment strategies of student learning as an integral part of program design by constructing well established ILOs pertaining to the program objectives. The name of the degree is not compliant with the SLQF and assessment strategies are specifically aligned with the descriptors of the SLQF and SBS. The Faculty practices formative and summative assessments in order to evaluate student performance, and these strategies are approved by the Faculty Board and the Senate. The release of results has taken more than three months. The semester and GPA system are not used. Assessment heavily depend on

assignments and no presentations are included in the curricula. There is no student awarding system. So is the student assessment and awards criterion is ranked in fifth place.

The Faculty adopts a participatory approach for course design and development through the Curriculum Development Committee which comprises of subject lecturers, external subject experts. Each lecturer prepares course unit/s and takes responsibilities of it. The courses are designed to meet the program objectives and outcomes through introducing new courses on par with contemporary knowledge and competency requirements. The courses do not comply with the SLQF and SBS. There are no ILOs for the existing curriculum. Course design does not specify the credit value and the work load is through 45 direct contact hours. Allocation of four months for a full-time internship/dissertation is not seen. So, the course/module design and development criterion is ranked in sixth place.

Delivery, design and development of academic programs are carried out by qualified and competent staff. The Faculty efficiently manages available human resources despite a heavy work load. The Faculty assures the availability of satisfactory and qualified staff, through doctoral degrees, obtaining of research grants, and encouraging scientific communications locally and internationally. The newly recruited staff are encouraged to follow an induction program and personal development of the staff is continuously upgraded through workshops and adequate training on Outcome Based Education and Student-Centered Learning. There is not enough academic and non-academic staff. Majority have done local post-graduate degrees. So, there is a lack of foreign exposure. The SER was not properly checked by senior academics. The human resource profile is not compatible with international level. Appraisal documents were not available and monitoring or remedial action has not been taken. New technology is not being used and an old overhead projector is still being used. Student feedback has been obtained but is not used for changing the existing environment. No evidence of providing training on use of the LMS. Skills development paper is not integrated into the curriculum. So, the human and physical resources criterion is ranked in seventh place.

Innovative and healthy practices are vital aspects of the Faculty. The Faculty has established and operates an ICT-based platform to facilitate multi-mode teaching and learning. Lecture halls utilize ICT-based platform such as the LMS in order to communicate and share teaching materials with students. Some multimedia equipment is out of order. They do not use the LMS heavily. There is no good award system for academic staff. There is no research methodology paper and dissertation for the final year students. There is no system of credit transfer, no fallback option and external examiners are not used. So, the Innovative and healthy practices criterion is also ranked in seventh place.

After summing up of all the documents and details provided, the Degree programme in Law offered by the Faculty of Law, University of Colombo, has been granted an 'A' grade.

Criteria Performance

SN	Criteria	Weighted Minimum Score	Actual Criteria Wise Score
1	Program Management	75	124.07
2	Human and Physical Resources	50	88.89
3	Program Design and Development	75	122.92
4	Course/ Module Design and Development	75	126.32
5	Teaching and Learning	75	139.47
6	Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression	50	88.89
7	Student Assessment and Awards	75	135.29
8	Innovative and Healthy Practices	25	38.10
	Total on a thousand scale	1000	863.95
	%		86%

Grade: A

SECTION 7: Commendations and Recommendations

Having carefully gone through all the documentary evidence and having examined all the other resources, the review team is of the opinion that, there are many practices/areas that can be highly commended. However, there are certain standards that need to be improved over time. Accordingly, the review team would like to highlight the following commendations and recommendations for the Faculty of Law, University of Colombo.

7.1. Criterion 1 – Programme management

Commendations

1. The Faculty has a very strong organizational structure which is adequate for effective management and execution of its core functions.
2. Management Procedures are in compliance with national and institutional SoPs.
3. Student participation is provided for at the Faculty Board and a detailed student handbook is made available.
4. The academic calendar is communicated and followed.
5. The Website is up-to date, ICT platforms have been put in place and are in use by the students.
6. IQAC is functional and has a system in place to deliver QA.
7. Active and inclusive Curriculum Development Committee.
8. Student welfare services – hostels, cultural and aesthetic activities, sports facilities, safety are all of a high standard. Support for differently abled students seems adequate.
9. Zero tolerance policy on ragging
10. Strong examination By-laws which are strictly followed

Recommendations

1. Faculty Action/Corporate Plan needs to be developed every five years and incorporated into the University Corporate Plan.
2. Performance-based appraisal system for the academic and non-academic staff needs to be established.

7.2. Criterion 2. Physical and Human Resources

Commendations

1. Highly qualified, dedicated and committed staff.
2. Well-resourced Staff Development Centre (SDC) that conducts high quality staff development programmes.
3. Well-resourced library with a wide variety of services.
4. Adequate ICT facilities for the staff.

Recommendations

1. The Faculty is severely under-staffed at the moment. Academic and non-academic cadres need to be increased according to the student number.
2. Infrastructure facilities need upgrading. We have taken note of the comprehensive proposal for a new building.
3. Some of the lecture halls (particularly the New Law Theatres) are very poorly ventilated. Proper ventilation needs to be ensured.
4. Individual staff rooms are small and inadequate. The proper rooms with adequate facilities need to be included in the new building proposal.
5. Specialized clinical training facilities need to be established.

7.3. Criterion 3. Programme Design and Development

Commendations

1. The entire Faculty Board functions as the Curriculum Development Committee providing maximum possible inclusivity.
2. Programme approval process is clear and adhered to.
3. External stakeholder participation is obtained for the curriculum development process.
4. Programme is logically structured and consists of a coherent set of courses, while allowing flexibility in student choices.
5. Learning strategies for self-directed learning, creative and critical thinking, life-long learning are in place.
6. Academic standards of the programme are appropriate to the level and nature of the award.

Recommendations

1. External stakeholder participation in the curriculum development process needs to be ensured, especially the extremely diverse alumni of the Faculty should actively take part in the process.
2. Full compliance with SLQF standards in the existing curriculum as well as the newly developed curriculum needs to be ensured.
3. The adoption of the semester-based course unit system with Grade Point Average (GPA) for a more objective and organized means of assessment, teaching and learning, is highly recommended. The Faculty has not adopted the system yet though the UGC requires that all the state universities adopt the system.
4. Adequate supplementary vocational/ professional/ semi-professional courses to enrich generic skills of students need to be included.
5. Work-based placement/industrial training/internship programmes need to be included in the new curriculum.

7.4. Criterion 4. Course Design and Development

Commendations

1. Course design and development has the participation of external experts.
2. Courses reflect knowledge and current development in the relevant field.
3. Student-centered teaching/learning is provided, thus enabling students to be actively engaged in their own learning activities.
4. Course design and development integrates appropriate learning strategies for the development of self-directed learning, collaborative learning, creative and critical thinking, life-long learning.
5. Courses are scheduled and offered in a manner that allows students to complete them within the intended/stipulated period of time.
6. Course content has adequate breadth, depth, rigour and balance.
7. Appropriate media and technology are used.

Recommendations

1. Compliance with the SLQF credit definition needs to be demonstrated.
2. Constructive alignment with SLQF/SBS needs to be articulated and demonstrated.

3. The credit value and corresponding notional working hours need to be broken down into different types of learning such as direct contact hours, self-learning time, assignments, assessments, field studies, clinical work, industrial placement etc.
4. The ideal number of credits per course as per the SLQF standards is between two and four. The Faculty has preferred large credit courses e.g. 6-credit courses which may be a burden on the student and also affect the accuracy of the assessment system. This needs to be corrected.
5. The Faculty does not have any non-credit, auxiliary/elective courses that facilitate interfaculty/inter-disciplinary learning. This should be corrected.
6. The Faculty needs to consider introducing a research project in the final year and a dedicated research methodology course in the third or final year.
7. The Faculty has not adopted a system of credit transfer. Adoption of a credit transfer system is highly recommended.

7.5. Criterion 5. Teaching and Learning

Commendations

1. Teaching and learning are based on Faculty's mission and curriculum requirements.
2. Course specifications and timetable are made available to students before the commencement of the course.
3. Faculty encourages blended learning and teachers integrate into their teaching, current scholarly work and current knowledge in the public domain.
4. Teaching and learning methods are accessible to differently abled students, e.g. blind students.
5. Teachers encourage study groups and teacher-centered and student-centered teaching learning methodologies are used.

Recommendations

1. The Faculty's decision of 'no awards' inhibit identifying teaching excellence and promotion and adoption of good practices. Establishment of a staff award system is highly recommended.
2. Opportunity for students to engage in research as part of the teaching and learning activities is not available beyond some take-home essay type assignments. Adoption of a variety of assessment methods is recommended.

7.6. Criterion 6 – Learning environment, student support and progression

Commendations

1. The Faculty adopts a student friendly, administrative, academic and technical support system.
2. The Faculty guides the students to optimally use the available student support services.
3. Training in the use of ICT, use and library is commendable.
4. Use of library and information resources is integrated into the learning process.
5. The Faculty promotes active academic and social interactions between academic staff and students.
6. Co-curricular activities are supported. The evidence of the CGU being used by students is impressive.
7. Student grievances are promptly addressed.

Recommendations

1. Not enough evidence for the Faculty offering specialized learning resources such as clinical facilities etc. These facilities need to be improved.
2. The use of modern technology beyond use of multimedia such as smart boards etc should be considered particularly in a large group teaching/learning setting.
3. The alumni association should be better utilized for career guidance, internships, and placements.

7.7. Criterion 7 – Student Assessments and Awards

Commendations

1. Clear relation between assessment tasks and programme outcomes was observed.
2. Procedures for designing, approving, monitoring and reviewing assessment strategies are clearly available.
3. Clear policy in relation to appointment of internal/external examiners.
4. Conflict of interest issues taken care of promptly and seriously.

5. Well-defined marking scheme and use of blind second marking are highly commendable practices.
6. Strict enforcement of examination laws and regulations was observed.

Recommendations

1. Conflicting evidence on whether exam results are released on time. The evidence points to the fact that final year results are released by the end of four years from registration. But students point to delay in release of results in between academic years. Corrective measures for this are recommended.
2. Faculty has no avenue for students to request re-scrutiny. A proper system for this needs to be established as per the UGC guidelines.
3. Depriving a student of any Class for failure even in one course unit seems inappropriate. Existing By-laws need to be revised to rectify this.

7.8 Criterion 8. Innovative and Healthy Practices

Commendations

1. The Faculty is the leader of pioneering legal research and education and the Faculty is involved in national legal reform and policy efforts at a commendably high level.
2. The Faculty has strong links with national governmental and non-governmental agencies and industries.

Recommendations

1. There is evidence of research, community and industry engagement but the Faculty has the greater potential/capacity to foster, promote and encourage more research, community and industry engagement. Therefore, more research, out-reach and community development activities are recommended with the participation of its high profile alumni.
2. The Faculty should implement a sophisticated rewards system to encourage academics for research and outreach activities.
3. An undergraduate research project needs to be included in the new curriculum.
4. More industrial attachment needs to be integrated to the teaching and learning strategies of the academic programmes.
5. Lateral entry and exit points need to be introduced to the new curriculum.

SECTION 8: Summary

The Programme Review (PR) Team consisting of Prof Nawarathna Banda-Chair (University of Kelaniya), Prof Vijith Jayamanne (University of Ruhuna) and Mr K. Guruparan (University of Jaffna) visited the Faculty of Law, University of Colombo and conducted the programme review from 15th to 18th October 2018. Having been established in 1947 first as the Department of Law under the Faculty of Arts, the Faculty of Law currently consists of three Departments of study, namely, Department of Commercial Law, Department of Private and Comparative Law and the Department of Public and International Law.

Currently, the Faculty offers the degree of LL. B in three languages and appears to be doing satisfactorily in the Sri Lankan state university sector. The review team thoroughly examined all the documentary evidence pertaining to the 8 criteria as per the guidelines given in the UGC Manual for Review of Undergraduate Programmes of Sri Lankan Universities and Higher Education Institutions. The Faculty has been functioning as the premium national institute that offers legal education to the students in the country. Accordingly, the Faculty has produced over 5000 legal professionals who are currently holding high-ranking positions across the country in the legal/judicial sector.

The Self Evaluation Report (SER) has been well written, even though the review team observed a few occasional mistakes. Out of the eight criteria, the Faculty obtained high marks for certain criteria while they showed inadequate evidence to prove that they fully adopted the UGC guidelines specified in the UGC manual. Accordingly, the Faculty appears to have satisfactorily adopted and showed adequate evidence for the Criterion 1 (Programme Management), Criterion 3 (Human and Physical Resources), Criterion 5 (Teaching and Learning), Criterion 6 (Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression) and Criterion 7 (Student Assessment and Awards). However, the Faculty is yet to fully adopt UGC guidelines for Criterion 2 (Programme Design and Development), Criterion 4 (Course Module Design and Development) and Criterion 8 (Innovative and Healthy Practices). It was observed that the existing LL. B programme is not fully aligned with the SLQF guidelines. Further, a Subject Bench Mark Statement (SBS) does not appear to have been developed for law education in Sri Lanka. The existing curriculum appears to have been developed a long time ago according to the British education/evaluation system. Accordingly, the Faculty appears to be holding year-end examinations and marks are calculated and given as an average from 100. It was observed that adequate courses on research methodology, scientific and technical writing, soft skill development etc. have not been incorporated in the curriculum. Further, there is no research and in-service training components in the existing curriculum.

The Faculty has been working on development of a new curriculum since 2009. The entire Faculty Board has been functioning as the Curriculum Development Committee (CDC). The CDC appears to have met on a regular basis and prepared a new curriculum encompassing new subjects. Further, the CDC appears to have had many stake holder meetings. However, the new curriculum also is not fully aligned with the SLQF guidelines. The review team highly recommends that the semester-based course unit system with GPA be adopted by the Faculty. Currently, the Faculty offers the LL. B degree in three languages. This appears to have limited the potential of LL. B degree holders in the Sinhala and Tamil stream to be competitive in the international job market. Furthermore, the Faculty appears to be severely under-staffed and, thus, does not maintain the required student staff ratio of 10 to 1.

Moreover, the non-academic staff cadres also need to be increased according to the student number. Even though there is a strong alumni community, the Alumni Associations does not appear to be functioning to its full potential. The Quality Assurance Unit of the University of Colombo and the Internal Quality Assurance Cell of the Faculty of Law appear to be fully functional with a dedicated staff. Further, the University Medical Center as well as the Sports Center appears to be doing a commendable job for the university community. The Faculty is running a fully-fledged Staff Development Center (SDC), well resourced Library, IT Center, Staff/Student welfare Center, Legal Aid Unit, Center for Study of Human Rights (CSHR), even though the physical and human resources are not adequate in most of the centers. The learning/teaching environment needs to be improved with the procurement of state-of-the art teaching/learning tools/aids. Having considered all the evidences provided by the Faculty and having discussed among review team members, it was decided to give “ A ” grade to the existing LL.B programme of the University of Colombo. The review team highly recommend that the Faculty adopts all the recommendations put forward in the Final PR report over a time span of 5 years.

Appendix I

University of Colombo - Faculty of Law
LLB (Honors)

	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4	Criterion 5	Criterion 6	Criterion 7	Criterion 8
Standard 1	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2
Standard 2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3
Standard 3	3	3	3	1	2	3	3	3
Standard 4	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3
Standard 5	3	2	1	2	3	3	3	2
Standard 6	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1
Standard 7	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Standard 8	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	2
Standard 9	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3
Standard 10	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	1
Standard 11	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3
Standard 12	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3
Standard 13	2		3	3	3	3	3	2
Standard 14	1		2	3	3	3	3	1

Standard 15	3		1	2	3	3	2	
Standard 16	1		2	2	3	2	2	
Standard 17	1		2	3	3	1	2	

Standard 18	0		3	3	3	3			
Standard 19	2		2	3	1	3			
Standard 20	3		3			3			
Standard 21	3		3			1			
Standard 22	3		3			2			
Standard 23	3		2			3			
Standard 24	3		3			3			
Standard 25	3								
Standard 26	2								
Standard 27	3								
Total	67	32	59	48	53	64	46	32	
Maximum Score	81	36	72	57	57	72	51	42	
Actual criterion wise score	124.07	88.89	122.92	126.32	139.47	88.89	135.29	38.10	86.395
Weighted minimum score	75	50	75	75	75	50	75	25	

Weighted in thousand scale	150	100	150	150	150	100	150	50
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Appendix II

Criteria Performance

SN	Criteria	Weighted Minimum Score	Actual Criteria Wise Score
1	Program Management	75	124.07
2	Human and Physical Resources	50	88.89
3	Program Design and Development	75	122.92
4	Course/ Module Design and Development	75	126.32
5	Teaching and Learning	75	139.47
6	Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression	50	88.89
7	Student Assessment and Awards	75	135.29
8	Innovative and Healthy Practices	25	38.10
	Total on a thousand scale	1000	863.95
	%		86%

Grade: A

Appendix III

RANKS ACCORDING TO MARKS THEY HAVE EARNED

SN	Criteria	Rank
1	Programme Management	1
2	Human and Physical Resources	7
3	Programme Design and Development	3
4	Course/ Module Design and Development	6
5	Teaching and Learning	4
6	Learning Environment, Student Support and Progression	2
7	Student Assessment and Awards	5
8	Innovative and Healthy Practices	7