



**Programme Review Report
Programme Reviews - 2018**

LLB Degree

The Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Open University of Sri Lanka

17th to 20th September 2018



Prof. Naazima Kamardeen

Dr. Jayasundara Samarakoon

Mr. Kumaravadival Guruparan

Quality Assurance Council

University Grants Commission

Table of Contents

Section 1 – Brief introduction to the programme	3
1.1 Open University of Sri Lanka	3
1.2 Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences	3
1.3 The Bachelor of Laws Degree Programme.....	4
Section 2 – Review team’s observation on the Self-Evaluation Report (SER)	7
Section 3 – A brief description of the Review Process.....	8
Section 4 – Overview of the Faculty’s approach to Quality and Standards.....	9
Section 5 – Judgement on the Six Criteria of Programme Review	11
Criteria 1: Programme Management	11
Criteria 2: Programme Design and Development.....	12
Criteria 3: Course Design and Development.....	13
Criteria 4: Learning Infrastructure and Resources and Learner Support.....	14
Criteria 5: Learner Assessment and Evaluation	14
Criteria 6: Innovative Initiatives and Good Practices.....	15
Section 6 - Grading of Overall performance of the Programme.....	16
Section 7 - Commendation and Recommendation.....	17
Section 8 – Summary	18
Annexure A: Agenda of Site Visit.	19

Section 1 – Brief introduction to the programme

1.1 Open University of Sri Lanka

The Open University of Sri Lanka (OUSL) was established in 1980 under the Universities Act No. 16 of 1978 and the Open University Ordinance No. 01 of 1990 as amended by No 12 of 1996. It has the same legal and academic status as any other national university and thus comes under the purview of the authority of the University Grants Commission.

The distinctive feature of OUSL is that it is the only recognized tertiary educational institution in Sri Lanka that offers students the opportunities for pursuing higher studies through the Open and Distance Learning (ODL) methodology.

The Open University has five (05) academic faculties, nine (09) regional centers and nineteen (19) study centers across the country. The Central Campus premises of OUSL is located at Nawala, Nugegoda. The five faculties are; the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Faculty of Engineering Technology, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Natural Sciences and Faculty of Health Sciences.

One of the main objectives in forming OUSL is to provide tertiary level educational opportunities to employed adult citizens of the country. Hence, OUSL offers foundation programmes for those who do not have any formal educational qualifications. Thus OUSL provides a readily accessible and progressive ladder of opportunities to students to obtain higher education. The study programmes cater to the national educational and training needs. On successful completion of studies at OUSL, students are able to obtain qualifications such as a certificate, advanced certificate, diploma, first degree or post-graduate qualification. The OUSL is a member of the Asian Association of Open Universities and Association of Commonwealth Universities.

1.2 Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

The Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS) is the largest academic faculty in the OUSL in terms of student population size, graduate output, income generation and more importantly, academic discipline-wise. HSS has four academic departments viz.

- (a) Department of Legal Studies,
- (b) Department of Language Studies,
- (c) Department of Management Studies and
- (d) Department of Social Studies.

The Department of Legal Studies (DLS) is one of the largest academic departments of HSS faculty in terms of student population, graduate output, income generation etc. DLS commenced her activities in 1984/1985 academic year. It is also the only higher education institution in Sri Lanka that offers Bachelor's Degree in Law (LL.B) using ODL methodology. DLS launched her first-ever postgraduate programme viz. LL.M in 2013.

1.3 The Bachelor of Laws Degree Programme

The Bachelor of Laws programme is structured across four levels, and conforms to Level 6 of the SLQF (Sri Lanka Quality Framework). The specific objectives and the co-related academic activities to achieve those objectives have been designed in consultation with the industry (Bench and Bar). The specific objectives of the LL.B degree programme are as follows:

- Guide and assist students to acquire knowledge in core areas in law with the necessary academic orientation in ODL environment (e.g. 17 courses dealing with substantive aspects of theory in law supported by printed module for each course)
- Develop skills of intellectual reasoning, investigation and critical analysis (e.g. via compulsory project on Jurisprudence)
- Create an understanding of law in action and of the role of law in contemporary society (e.g. via compulsory project on Environmental Law)
- Cultivate the ability to analyze complex facts relating to modern issues and to apply law to contemporary realities (e.g. via Tutor Marked Assignments (TMA), Continuous Assessment Tests (CAT) and final examinations)
- Help students to develop advocacy skills, presentation and writing skills (e.g. Viva Vorce/ Oral Presentation on Land Law)
- Develop skills in legal research adopting multi-disciplinary approach (e.g. via course on Research Methodology, Dissertation, Project Reports).

Table 2. Details of academic staff

Se/ No	Designation	Service	Salary Code	DLS approved Cadres	Exiting Cadres	Vacancies		
01	Professor	Academic	U-AC 5	1	0	1		
02	Professor	Academic	U-AC 5	20	1	3		
03	Associate Professor	Academic	U-AC 4		0			
04	Senior Lect. Gr. I/ Senior Lect. Gr. II/ Lecturer/ Lecturer (Prob.)	Academic	U-AC 3		1 4 2 9			
05	Lecturer*	Academic	U-AC 3		1		1	0
06	Temporary Lecturer						0	
07	Lecturer on Contract				4*			

Table 3 details of non – academic staff

Category	No. of Approved Cadres	No. of Existing Cadres
Senior Staff Assistant	01	01
Clark (Grade III)	01	01
Labour (Grade III)	01	01
Office Assistant (On Contract)	01	01
Project Assistant (On Contract)	07	03

Student Statistics: Distribution of students by gender and levels of study:

Level	Female	Male	Total
Level III	608	1134	1742
Level IV	589	774	1363
Level V	286	385	672
Level VI	382	440	822
Grand Total	1865	2733	4598

Student Statistics: Distribution of students by medium

Sinhala	Tamil	English	Total
3275	723	600	4598

Section 2 – Review team’s observation on the Self-Evaluation Report (SER)

The Self-Evaluation Report (SER) of the Open University was based on standards designed separately for distance learning institutions, and comprised of 6 criteria. The SER was well organized and provided much of the information required to conduct a successful programme review. It was also found that a team of writers compiled the SER and opportunities were given to the faculty to provide their inputs. Documentary and other evidence made available to substantiate the claims made in the SER were also well organized and comprehensive. Furthermore, the SWOT analysis included in the SER is comprehensive and covers most of the important aspects directly and indirectly related to the LLB degree programme. The reviewers are extremely satisfied with the manner in which the SER was compiled, as well as on the information contained in it. The review visit was organized very efficiently, with the Dean, HSS and the director of the QA Cell being in constant communication with the review team. Organization of the site visit and the provision of information and evidence should be commended.

Section 3 – A brief description of the Review Process

The review process comprises various steps such as familiarization with the process of review, individual desk evaluation, review team's discussion on individual evaluation, site visit and drafting the review report. Familiarization of the review process was conducted by the UGC where procedures, possible issues and terms of references relating to reviews were discussed and clarified. At the same time, a hard copy of the Self Evaluation Report (SER) was provided to the reviewers. The review team consisted of three members. Individual members carried out a desk evaluation of the SER based on the evidence listed in the document. Later, the entire team was given the opportunity to compare and discuss individual evaluations.

The four-day site visit was well planned and organized. During this visit, the team had discussions with Vice- Chancellor, Dean, and Head of the Law Department, academic staff, support staff and students. Facilities such as lecture rooms, laboratories, cafeterias, wash rooms, university medical centre, physical education unit, career guidance unit and staff development unit were observed. The agenda of the review team is given in Annex A.

All the documentary evidence listed in the SER was examined. In order to verify certain processes and practices, additional information was requested by reviewers. All additional information requested was promptly provided. The reviewers are very impressed and happy with the way the review was conducted, the manner in which the evidence was organized and the members of the team were treated. The team would like to commend the faculty, IQAC and especially the staff members who were assigned to support the team.

Based on evidence examined, facilities observed and, discussion held with relevant stakeholders, marks were given for standards listed under the six criteria. The review was concluded with a wrap-up meeting. During this meeting the reviewers explained their observations and findings, and also had a very productive discussion about improving the quality of the programme.

A summary report with key findings of the review was initially sent to the QAC of UGC. This document is the final report submitted to the QAC.

Section 4 – Overview of the Faculty’s approach to Quality and Standards

The Faculty has established Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) and works in liaison with the University Internal Quality Assurance Unit (IQAU) in accordance with the Quality Assurance Manual (2013) of the UGC and the IQA circular of 2015. The Department of Legal Studies which offers the degree programme is well aware of the value and importance of quality and standards of the degree programmes. Their approach is demonstrated in the meticulous attention paid to the SER submission and the compilation of evidence. Both the report and the evidence compiled by the department are exemplary. Each item in the report has been paid due attention and was substantiated with justification and evidence. The display of the evidence collected in six cupboards, one for each criterion, using various colors and a box-file for each standard, was arranged with a precision of a library. The SER, the evidence collection and attention of the Faculty on the site visit show clear evidence of a high level of attention to the quality and standards.

The approach of the Faculty is also reflected in the evidence provided. Most of the standards have been met inadequately and barely adequately. This paradox of the above mentioned approach and the adequacy of evidence is embedded in the discourse on the quality and standards. There is a discussion that the given standards are not all that relevant to the program’s nature. This approach is inherited from the dominant discourse on such programmes in Sri Lanka as well as other countries. Accordingly, the ultimate objective of the program is to produce graduates well-versed in legal theory and practice. Therefore, the programme content cannot be modified considering objectives other than the above. This approach limits the boundaries for law education demand of the country. Proof for the above statement is embedded in the SWOT analysis: mismatch of huge demand for the programme with high workload of staff, loss of professional recognition, and insufficiency of academic staff due to lack of qualified persons to be hired on contracts. Accordingly, there is a vacuum of qualified staff which should be filled by the programs of the Department aiming at producing high quality staff which would be providing the service to the program and other national and global needs.

Faculty discourse on quality and standards has also contributed to the mismatch of the exemplary approach mentioned above and the low performance. Much of the evidence provided in the report does not meet the requirements of standards provided in the manual. For example, the graduate profile of the programme provided in Annexure 3 has no relationship to the attributes of graduates. The programme objectives presented in page 3 of the report states that they are designed in consultation with Bench and Bar. It would have been more effective if wider stakeholder participation had been engaged, such as private and state agencies who have employed legal officers and to cater the need for academics in law.

Meeting the competitive challenges facing by any institution in the 21st century, it is essential to redesign the programme management and programme design considering the challenges of globalization, technology and sustainability. Accordingly, faculty action plans, academic calendar and updated study material etc., should be reconsidered to match with the demonstrated approach in the report and evidence collection which would complete the initiated changes in the Faculty's approach.

Section 5 – Judgement on the Six Criteria of Programme Review

Criteria 1: Programme Management

❖ Strengths:

1. The faculty organizational structure is adequate for effective management and execution of its core functions with respect to programme management
2. The department has subcommittees and ad hoc committees to coordinate at implementation of all functions of programme management
3. The Department makes available a hand book to all prospective students
4. Study programme prospectus is available
5. Website is up-to-date
6. The DLS ensures confidentiality of the permanent records
7. Department uses ICT platform for key functions
8. Student code of conduct is available and monitored
9. Duty lists of staff are available and monitored
10. Establishment of IQAU and IQAC is evident
11. Programme approval policy is available
12. Approved by-laws on student discipline and examinations available
13. Administrative staff is qualified
14. Staff responsibilities are clearly spelled out
15. Financial procedure is transparent
16. There is provision for financial assistance for students

❖ Weaknesses:

1. Research cooperation with national and international organizations was not established
2. No provisions made for research in design of courses and other disciplinary research
3. Faculty action plan has not been prepared
4. Participatory approach has not been adequately adapted in its governance and management.
5. Faculty academic calendar does not enable learners complete the programme on time

Criteria 2: Programme Design and Development

❖ Strengths:

1. The academic standards have been recently aligned with the SLQF, and will be operational soon. This will ensure that there is constructive alignment of Teaching, Learning and Assessment, and that learning outcomes are clearly defined.
2. The faculty has given clear instructions to students about exemptions and other policies that facilitate their mobility and recognise prior learning and experience. Flexible entry points are available to a great extent.
3. The programme has a good mix of core and elective subjects.
4. The programme sensitises students to issues of gender equity, social justice, ethical values and environmental sustainability.
5. Programme design reflects the integration of appropriate learning strategies for the development of learning that is self-directed, creative, and life-long.
6. There is evidence of gathering feedback from students about the programme.
7. Course specifications are available to students.

❖ Weaknesses:

1. Needs analysis, employer surveys would help the DLS to better determine learner needs and viability of the programme. This was evidenced by not only the documents, but the conflict between learners interviewed, whose primary objective was to follow a conventional mode of learning, which includes sitting for the attorneys exam within 4-5 years (indicating a desire to practice law) and the views of the staff, who believed that those students were a minority, and that the majority of students wished to have a more ODL -style, slower paced programme and gain an academic qualification relating to legal studies.
2. The DLS should actively solicit a wider stakeholder participation in the planning, design, development, monitoring and review of the programme.
3. Course development committees should have a greater representation of the wider stakeholder community, including experts from outside the institution. In the evidence presented, some names of experts were given, but only a few seemed to have participated in the workshops.
4. The DLS should design a graduate profile that states clearly what attributes it expects a law graduate to possess upon graduation.

5. Appropriate learning outcomes for field placements should be in place and communicated to those external organisations.
6. Revision of curriculum should be an ongoing process, with upgrading of teaching materials taking place regularly.

Criteria 3: Course Design and Development

❖ Strengths:

1. The faculty has a strong policy framework for course design and development. This should be utilised at the optimal level.
2. The DLS has strong mechanisms for course adoption and adaptation, which are capable of incorporating the latest advances and trends in course design and development.
3. SLQF has been adopted, and will be operationalized soon.
4. Learner-centred teaching strategies are adopted.
5. Course profiles are available and communicated to learners.
6. Approved formats and templates are used in course design.
7. Staff members are trained instructional design and development, and are also trained in OBE and student-centred learning strategies and methodologies.
8. A variety of teaching and learning methods are employed.

❖ Weaknesses:

1. Course design would benefit from some comparison with international standards, especially those pertaining to assessment design. At present, evaluation of assessment appears to cast a heavy burden on the academic staff, leaving them with little time to engage in research or the upgrading of the learning material.
2. The course curriculum does not reflect the knowledge and current developments in the relevant subject areas. This is because the learning material has not been updated to the level that the DLS itself expects in its work norms.
3. At present, courses do not reflect constructive alignment.
4. Experts have not been productively utilised in course design and development.
5. A copyright policy is needed.
6. While printing and dispatch facilities are excellent, the unavailability of soft copies and the presence of outdated learning material make the available resources

redundant. Learning material currently being printed is poor, both in terms of quality and readability.

Criteria 4: Learning Infrastructure and Resources and Learner Support

❖ Strengths:

1. Administrative staff members are accessible to learners.
2. A wide range of technologies is available for learners.
3. Appropriate training is provided to staff for counselling.

❖ Weaknesses:

1. Learner – tutor ratio is inadequate.
2. Learner support systems appear to be inadequate, with the course material not being updated and given to students at the beginning of the course. While it may be possible that updates are given at the Day Schools, this is not a substitute for the learning material given, as Day Schools are not compulsory. Given that the ODL methodology emphasises on learner support through the provision of learning materials, that these materials have not been updated in a long time for a majority of the courses is a major cause for concern.
3. The Faculty does not sufficiently monitor learner retention, progression, completion and graduation rates in the context of necessary learner support services and does not take remedial measures.

Criteria 5: Learner Assessment and Evaluation

❖ Strengths:

1. The Faculty has a strong rules-based framework for assessment and evaluation. The procedural manual on CATs, Final Examinations *et al* provides comprehensive guidance on matters in relation to assessment and evaluation.
2. The DLS has an impressive record of releasing exam results in a timely manner as prescribed by the relevant rules and regulation.
3. Written evidence bears witness to the fact that the DLS follows the exam manual in almost all areas of concern such as adhering to rules relation to appointment of examiners, rules relating to moderation of exam papers, the use of independent, external examiners, use of detailed marking schemes, guidelines,
4. Progression within and between courses are clearly explained and available. The programme includes formative and summative assessments.

❖ **Weaknesses:**

1. A disproportionate amount of time is spent on assessment and evaluation by academic staff. The heavy burden placed on academic staff in assessment and evaluation tasks has put a heavy strain on time available to produce course materials and the discharge of other essential functions of academics (such as research and knowledge dissemination). While it appears that the academic staff are diligent about their assessment functions, the pressure of releasing results within a very short time frame for a very large student population is bound to have an adverse impact on the quality of assessment and on the academic staff's ability to do justice to his/her other functions.
2. Not enough evidence that assessment regulations are periodically revisited.
3. No evidence for monitoring of graduate course completion and retention rates

Criteria 6: Innovative Initiatives and Good Practices

❖ **Strengths:**

1. The availability of ICT based platforms to facilitate multi-mode teaching delivery and learning is a major strength.
2. Mechanisms, support and reward system available for undertaking research, innovation and community engagement.
3. Students take part in co-curricular activities and participation is encouraged by the DLS/Faculty.

❖ **Weaknesses:**

1. Very little evidence for research and development, innovations and industry engagement being recognised as part of the function of academics in practice.
2. Evidence relating to use of knowledge base to respond to societal needs and community issues not broad based.
3. Little or no evidence of DLS promoting thematic research on national issues.
4. Very little evidence of DLS establishing links with international, national and non-governmental agencies to build the reputation of the institution, to promote staff and student exchange.
5. No mechanism for students who do not complete the programme to exit at a lower level.

Section 6 - Grading of Overall performance of the Programme

Criterion No.	Assessment Criteria	Total Stds.	Max raw score	Raw score	Weighted Actual score
1	Programme management	40	120	87	109
2	Programme Design and Development	24	72	42	88
3	Course Design and Development	25	75	42	112
4	Learning Infrastructure & Resources and Learner Support	20	60	36	180
5	Learner Assessment and Evaluation	21	63	54	129
6	Innovative Initiatives and Good Practices	14	42	32	38
	Total (out of one thousand)				655
	Total (percentage)				66 %

The LLB programme offered by the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of the Open University of Sri Lanka has been reviewed through a review process including desk evaluation and site visit. Overall performance of the programme was reviewed through six criteria consisting of 142 standards related to the criteria. All criteria have gained more than the minimum weighted score requirement. The total mark received for all six criteria rounded is 66%, resulting in a C grade. Accordingly, the programme meets the standard requirements at a satisfactory level of accomplishment of quality expected of a programme of study and requires improvement in a few aspects.

Section 7 - Commendation and Recommendation

To avoid repetition we commend the OUSL for its strengths identified via each criterion above. The weaknesses that we have identified have inbuilt into them recommendations of how those weaknesses can be remedied. One general point of commendation and recommendation follows:

Commendation:

OUSL is the only state institution providing access to an academic law degree for those who do not enter the traditional universities through the very competitive GCE Advanced Level exams. This is very valuable as a measure of equity and equality of opportunity and one which the legal profession must value.

Despite being an ODL programme the standard of evaluation is no lesser than any of the traditional universities. The graduates of the LL.B at OUSL we found are required to demonstrate the minimum necessary knowledge required for an LL.B awarded by any other state university in Sri Lanka.

Recommendation:

The OUSL and the Department in specific must look carefully at the reasons why one of their main methods of ODL delivery, the preparation of course materials has not been reviewed over the past so many years within and beyond the period under review. The reason is partly owing to the fact that the academic staff spend most of their time in exam and administrative work. In conversations with different stakeholders we found that despite adopting an entirely different teaching methodology, i.e. ODL, the system (teaching staff, academic, nonacademic) resembles almost entirely the systems that traditional universities have put in place.

Section 8 – Summary

The programme review of the LLB Degree of the Open University of Sri Lanka was successfully completed by the team during four months including a site visit from 17th to 20th September 2018. Based on the site visit schedule, the team met the Programme Management Teams such as Director IQAU, Dean of the Faculty, Academic staff members and the administrative staff members. Furthermore the team evaluated documentary evidence and visited various Resource Centres.

The Team met with students and discussed about their study programmes, welfare facilities and extra- curricular activities. Furthermore the team visited the Staff Development Centre, the NODES, the Hostel, interacted with the regional centres via video conferencing, visited the Press, Health Center, Counselling Unit of the CRC, CETME and the Library. The team was very impressed by the coordination between these centres, which takes place smoothly and efficiently in order to support the teaching and learning activities of the DLS.

On the final day the team met the academic staff and discussed the strengths and weaknesses in briefly. The team hopes that through this report the Open University of Sri Lanka will update its LLB degree to a programme of excellence.

The review process of the programme was completed successfully fulfilling the requirements of each step satisfactorily. Careful and step by step evaluation has given a “C” (Satisfactory) grade for the programme. Therefore, there are only a few steps to be taken to improve the programme to reach a higher grade. The faculty possesses the required mechanism and strength for further improvement of the programme and to establish a system for assurance of continuous improvement. Recommendations provided in section 7 will help in this venture.

Annexure A: Agenda of Site Visit.

Day 1 – Monday, 17th September 2018			
Time	Activity	Participants with Review Team	Venue
8.00 – 8.30 am	Meeting with IQAU Director – Professor H.T.R. Jayasooriya	Dean, HoD, Chair/IQAC	IQAU Office, 1 st floor, Senate House (Building No 15)
8.30 – 9.00 am	Meeting with Vice-Chancellor & Deputy Vice-Chancellor	VC, DVC, Dean, HoD, Dir/IQAU	VC Office, Senate House (Building No. 15)
9.00 – 10.00am	Meeting with Dean of the Faculty of HSS		Dean's office, Ground floor (Building No.14)
	Tea break		
10.00 – 10.30	Presentation by Head of Legal Studies dept.	HoD of Legal Studies	HOD's Room - DLS, 2 nd floor (Building No 14)
10.30 – 12.30 pm	Meeting with Head and Academic Staff of Dept. of Legal Studies (DLS)	HoD & All academic staff of Dept. of Legal Studies (DLS)	
12.30 – 1.30 pm	Lunch		DSL Lunch Room - 2 nd floor (Building No 14)
1.30 – 4.00 pm	Observing documentary evidence		Conference Room - DLS, 2 nd floor (Building No 14)
	Tea Break		
Day 2 – Tuesday, 18th September 2018			
8.00 – 8.45 am	Meeting with Non – academic staff of Dept. of Legal Studies	All Non – academic staff of DLS	HOD's Room - DLS, 2 nd floor (Building No 14)
8.45 – 9.45 am	Meeting with Assistant Registrar (AR) and the staff of the Dean's Office	AR (HSS), All staff of the AR's office	Dean's Office, Ground floor

	Tea Break		(Building No.14)
10.00 – 11.00 am	Discussion with Assistant Directors (ADs) of Regional Centers (Video Conferencing)	ADs	NAC Room, Colombo Regional Center (CRC Building No 1)
11.00 – 1.30 pm	Observing facilities relevant to programme at Colombo Regional Center (CRC), Dispatch, Press, Health Center, Counselling Unit of CRC, NODES, Lecture Halls, Career Guidance Unit		Building No. 1, 4a,4,7
1.30 – 2.15 pm	Lunch		DLS Lunch Room - 2 nd floor (Building No 14)
2.15 – 2.45 pm	Meeting with Director of Staff Development Center (SDC)	Dir. SDC	SDC, 2 nd floor (Building No 18)
2.45 – 4.00 pm	Observing documentary evidence		Conference Room - DLS, 2 nd floor (Building No 14)
	Tea Break		
Day 3 – Wednesday, 19th September 2018			
8.00 – 9.30 am	Observing documentary evidence		Conference Room - DLS, 2 nd floor (Building No 14)
	Tea Break		
9.30 – 10.30 am	Meeting with Administrative and Operations Team	DVC, Registrar, Bursar, Dir/RES, Dir/IT, Dir/Operations, Dir/Welfare, SAR/Examinations, SAR/ Student Affairs and Deputy Registrar	Senate Room, Senate House (Building No 15)

10.45 – 11.30am	Meeting and observing facilities relevant to programme – CETMe		CETMe (Building No 12)
11.30 – 12.00 pm	Visiting Library & Temporary Residential Facilities (Hostel)		Library (Building No 13) & Hostel (Building No 24)
12.00 – 12.30 pm	Meeting with Head of Language Studies Dept.		Conference Room - DLS, 2 nd floor (Building No 14)
12.30 – 1.30 pm	Lunch		DLS Lunch Room 2 nd floor (Building No 14)-
1.30 – 2.30 pm	Observing documentary evidence		Conference Room - DLS, 2 nd floor (Building No 14)
2.30 – 4.00 pm	Meeting with students		HSS Faculty Board Room, Ground floor (Building No.14)
	Tea Break		
Day 4 – Thursday, 20th September 2018			
8.00 – 10.30 am	Observing documentary evidence		Conference Room - DLS, 2 nd floor (Building No 14)
	Tea Break		
10.30- 12.30 pm	Debriefing	Dir/IQAU, Dean/HSS, Chairperson QAC/HSS, Head & Staff of Legal Studies Dept.	Faculty Board Room, HSS, Ground Floor (Building No.14)
12.30 – 1.30 pm	Lunch and departure of the team		Guest House – OUSL

			(Building No 20)
--	--	--	---------------------