

**BAR  
STANDARDS  
BOARD**

REGULATING BARRISTERS

**Bar Professional Training Course  
Nottingham Law School, Nottingham Trent University  
Report of visit held on 5 March 2015**

<b>Name of Institution</b>	<b>Date of Visit/Meeting</b>
Nottingham Law School	5 March 2015

<b>Title of Course/award</b>	<b>Nature/status of course</b>
Bar Professional Training Course	Accredited BPTC

<b>Numbers/modes approved</b>	<b>Dates of course</b>
Approved for: 120 full-time (86 enrolled)	September 2014 to July 2015

<b>Panel Members</b>	<b>Role and area of primary responsibility</b>
Dr Victoria Stec	Temporary Education Manager, BSB (Chair)
Professor Andrew Sanders	Head of the Birmingham Law School, Birmingham University; Chair of Education and Training Committee, BSB
Mr Benjamin Wood	Barrister; Member of Bar Professional Training Course Sub-Committee, BSB
Ms Jacqueline Cheltenham	Head of BPTC, University of Law; Provider representative

<b>Provider Team attending the event</b>	<b>Role and area of primary responsibility</b>
Mr Ian Fox	Course Leader: BPTC
Professor Janine Griffiths-Baker	Dean of the Law School
Ms Andrea Nicholson	Academic Team Leader
Mr Rob Manning	Tutor: Criminal
Mr Ian Taylor	Tutor: Criminal
Ms Rachel Rowley	Tutor: Civil
Ms Kathryn Taylor	Tutor: Civil
Ms Andrea Piggott	Tutor: Civil, Drafting
Mr Simon Parsons	Tutor: Criminal

<b>Rationale for the visit</b>
The visit was held as part of the Bar Standards Board's annual programme of visits to providers of the Bar Professional Training Course to monitor the quality and standards of the course and to determine whether the course is being delivered in accordance with the requirements of the BSB's Bar Professional Training Course Handbook.

The panel was provided in advance with key documentation, including the provider's Annual Reflective Review 2013-14, copies of External Examiner reports for the relevant year, the most recent BSB visit report and other relevant information.

During the visit the panel saw teaching rooms and social spaces, and toured both University and Law School learning resources areas. The panel met, separately, with management, course team and students. Members of the panel also observed two classes. The report reflects the findings of the panel and is informed by both the documentation and the visit.

### Context: the Provider

Nottingham Trent was granted University status in 1992. Nottingham Law School is part of the College of Business, Law and Social Sciences within the University. The Law School is a full-service Law School offering a full range of undergraduate, postgraduate and professional programmes. The Law School delivered the Bar Vocational Course from 1997 to 2010, and since then has delivered the Bar Professional Training Course. It ran the Bar Professional Training Course in collaboration with Kaplan Law School (both operating as separate providers, with Kaplan running the Nottingham course at its site in London) between 2010 and 2014, when Kaplan ceased to offer the BPTC.

### 1. Adherence to course aims, philosophy and standards

Adherence to course aims and philosophy seemed sound and standards secure.

The management team was invited to describe what was felt to be most distinctive about the BPTC at Nottingham Law School. A key point of distinctiveness was given as the use of core briefs, which provides a unique learning experience of the entire litigation process from start to finish, rather than a number of disparate training exercises. The initiative of providing iPads was believed by the team to be innovative and gave students a useful tool for organising their materials. It was also noted that Nottingham was the only provider outside London to offer training and pro bono opportunities with the Free Representation Unit (FRU). The management team regarded as a further distinctive feature the fact careers advice was available to intending students from the point of offer, not just from the point of acceptance.

### 2. Quality management systems

Staff reported that all assessments had to be written by the end of September at the start of each academic year, and this deadline was inflexible within the University. They found this challenging, especially in the event of changes in the law that might need to be taken into account. Assessments are expected to be seen by External Examiners and finalised in December. All Outstanding, all fails and all borderline papers are double-marked. The panel had nevertheless noted some External Examiner comments about a lack of apparent formalised process for the writing and approval of assessments. The panel **recommended** that a formalised timetable be clearly set out and disseminated for the internal and external steps necessary in the creation and approval of assessments. (**Recommendation 1**)

It was noted that the fact that the BSB's BPTC Handbook for the year is often not available until shortly before the course starts is unhelpful, as was the fact that it was perceived that major changes, such as the perceived adjustment of the English Language requirement, are sometimes imposed without consultation. The panel noted these concerns and will feed back to the relevant BSB groups.

The panel was concerned to learn that some teaching staff appeared never to see External Examiner reports or be invited to contribute to responses. This also meant that they were never apprised of the many complimentary comments about their teaching made in the reports. The staff with whom the panel met also appeared to be unaware of the existence (or content) of the Annual Reflective Review

or the student performance statistics underpinning the Review, and had not been involved in its production, although management advised that tutors had been directed to a copy of the Annual Reflective Review and had contributed individually to the sections on staffing and staff development. The panel **recommended** that management ensure that teaching staff, in conjunction with the Course Leader, are fully involved in quality assurance processes such as responding to External Examiners' reports and drafting of the Annual Reflective Review. **(Recommendation 2)** The panel further **recommended** that teaching staff (not just module leaders) are made aware of pass rate data and have the opportunity to discuss with course management. **(Recommendation 3)**

The panel learned that the forum for the student voice was the Law School Forum; there was also a course forum although this had not taken place in the preceding year. The panel was concerned to note that in the forum reports that it had seen that there were few matters of relevance to BPTC students, and that BPTC students appeared not to attend every meeting. The panel was of the view that it was vital to the health of the course to have a forum that facilitated and provoked thought about how the course was going, as well as a general forum for airing minor and more substantial concerns. It therefore **recommended** that a BPTC-specific student/staff liaison group should become a permanent feature with standing agenda items to assist in monitoring the health of the course. **(Recommendation 4)**

### 3. Staffing and staff development

The Annual Reflective Review had alluded to the fact that 2013-14 had been a difficult year from the point of view of staffing with multiple staff absences due to maternity/paternity and sickness absence. This had placed a great strain on the course team, and it was thought that some staff had had been required to teach outside their areas of specialism (although management later indicated that no tutor had taught outside their areas of specialism in 2013-14).

Staff were clear that they were employed by the University and not by the Law School, and were expected to teach across the spectrum including on the LLB and GDL, and supervising students on placements. A standard model was used to determine teaching loads across the University. Teaching staff never knew until September what their teaching load would look like and how much cross-course teaching they would be doing. They felt that no allowance was made for additional workload such as needing to rewrite materials in response to a change in the law. For example small group sessions could take 2-3 hours each to rewrite. The management team noted that module leaders receive a module leader allowance and all teaching carries a weighting (multiplier), which is designed to cover teaching-related duties, including updating. They also confirmed that for the purposes of calculating the Student Staff Ratio (SSR), time spent by staff on other programmes was not counted towards the BPTC workload. Likewise, staff from other programmes who contributed very small amounts of teaching on the BPTC were not counted towards the SSR. There are currently 7.2 full-time equivalent staff on the BPTC. The combination of factors that had resulted in the staffing difficulties in the previous year were said no longer to be in play, and a more normal workload has been re-established.

The teaching team noted that there did not appear to be a formalised induction process. Although new staff had found immediate colleagues very supportive, expectations of them had been high from the outset. Formal support had been through the allocation of a mentor and a three-monthly review with the line manager. There is a University system for peer observation for all staff, which is an effective means of sharing best practice. Staff are also observed by their line manager, who conducts their appraisals. The management team noted that during the Induction phase, the line manager would have primary responsibility for a tutor's University Induction, while the Course Leader's role was as mentor to any new staff whose subject was Civil; other mentors would be found should their specialism be Crime. There is no specific BPTC Induction. There is good peer support across tutors who share rooms and can easily communicate informally.

Staff were aware that there was nominally a 200 hour allowance for staff development activities, but that in practice there was no real structure for staff development and in some instances there had been a sense of active discouragement when staff had wished to undertake practice-related

activities. Some had used annual leave in order to return to practice, even when they had not used their 200 hour allowance. The panel was concerned that staff seemed to be expected to be at their desks 5 days a week, whether or not this was the most productive use of their time, which appeared to reflect a University-wide, and therefore perhaps inflexible 'systems mentality'. The panel gained the impression that there was an underlying 'them and us' mentality between the teaching staff and the rest of the University because, although there was obviously a harmonious and close knit teaching team, they did not feel trusted as professionals to use their time to the best advantage of students and the course, and did not feel encouraged to think creatively about new developments. This was thought to contribute to low morale and staff turnover. The management team indicated that staff would be encouraged to spend time in court if they wished to. Friday was a non-teaching day. When pressed to explain more about how staff were supported to use the notional 200-hour allowance, the management team indicated that this could be used towards attendance on a variety of developmental activities, including Higher Education Academy Fellowship. There was some discretion for line managers around how time spent in practice could be counted towards the 200 hours. After examinations were over, it was possible for tutors to spend some time in practice, but the line manager would need to be kept informed and tutors would need to be contactable. Their duty was as a tutor first and foremost. The panel **recommended** that the management team should actively promote and enable staff to engage with practice, and ensure that this is seen as a core part of a tutor's role that feeds into their teaching, and is not wholly or mainly an activity to be undertaken during annual leave. **(Recommendation 5)**

The view of staff was that management systems worked in a horizontal sense but not vertically. The Course Leader has no line management responsibilities for teaching staff and although staff spoke very positively indeed of his approach and contribution, the panel gained the impression that the management structure left him without appropriate authority. There was a lack of opportunity for staff to meet as a BPTC team, and their identity as a team suffered as a result. Teaching staff are line managed by Academic Team Leaders, who are senior staff but who do not teach on the BPTC. The Academic Team Leaders manage tutors individually as people, but not as a BPTC team.

It was evident that the goodwill and enthusiasm of staff for the course was undiminished in spite of recent difficulties and frustrations expressed, and it was also evident that serious thought needed to be given to rethinking the management structure of the course team. The management team confirmed that the Course Leader had a remit for the structure and the content of the course, but did not have a responsibility for the people teaching it. This was in line with Course Leaders across the University, although it was possible that that might change. It was acknowledged that this could lead to a sense of powerlessness for the Course Leader. The panel **recommended** that the best practice management structure should involve the Course Leader in direct line management of the course team and that the University reconsider this for the BPTC. **(Recommendation 6)**

The panel asked where the locus of ownership was for the Bar course. The Course Leader confirmed that he felt it was with him, and he was willing to step into the breach when there were difficulties such as had occurred with staff absences in the preceding year. The management team acknowledged that there had been lapses in communication as had occurred when an error in the Conference exam had failed to be brought to the Course Leader's notice initially, as the module leader had taken responsibility for dealing with it. The panel **recommended** that any issues affecting assessment should be reported immediately to the Course Leader and a log kept of incidents, causes and actions taken, to help ensure that they do not happen again. **(Recommendation 7)**

#### **4. Curriculum content and structure**

The panel asked about how the rewriting of the Professional Ethics course to bring it in line with the new Code had been facilitated. Module Leaders were on academic contracts with notional hours that would include any rewriting and updating of materials. Although this was not a trivial rewrite, it was not a complete rewrite either. It was noted that there was no course team meeting to discuss the revisions. The Course Leader indicated that he would always be happy to run a team meeting if asked for one, or if he felt that one should happen. He paid tribute to the fact that the staff team was reliable and stable, and that the course benefited greatly from their goodwill. The panel

**recommended** that the Course Leader should institute (or where these already exist, ensure that adequate time within working hours is allowed for) regular team meetings, including at the start and end of the course, at both module and course level, to promote a course team ethos, to foster best practice and to facilitate course development. (**Recommendation 8**)

## 5. Admissions and student profile

The management team noted that historically the student profile had been strong and this continued into the current cohort, in which around 82% of students had a 2:1 or better. Around 50% of the current cohort is comprised of International students. The management team reported that it was no longer very easy to see a correlation between the level of qualification on entry and performance in final examinations as centralised assessment had made that harder to see with some well qualified students performing unexpectedly badly.

## 6. Teaching and Learning (knowledge and skills areas)

The panel learned that the BPTC now has priority usage of the mock courtrooms although there are some on-going concerns caused by a lack of sophistication in the timetabling system that can cause tutors to be timetabled inefficiently in terms of the number of times they need to switch rooms. This was under discussion.

The panel was given to understand that classes of six do not rotate, and there is no rotation of tutors either, although management confirmed that there is rotation of students and tutors for a Case Management Conference. All students had the experience of working in the mock courtroom, in Advocacy and Civil Litigation classes. Even where there was no problem with uneven abilities, students were of the view that student- and tutor-rotation would be useful. Having a good rapport within a group of students might mean that they felt comfortable interacting in class, but it also meant that they got to know their peers very well, and knew how to exploit their weaknesses. In one instance where rotation had come about through unavoidable circumstances, this had been found a very helpful learning experience. The panel **recommended** that consideration be given to rotating Advocacy groups and tutors. (**Recommendation 9**)

## 7. Standards and assessment strategy and methods (including progression data)

The students had the strong feeling that there was inconsistency across tutors. In particular, there were concerns that teaching of Conference was not consistent; it was reported anecdotally that one group had been taught differently causing them to fail a formative assessment under the Red Light rule. When this had been raised, students did not feel that their concerns had been taken seriously and there was no on-going dialogue. Students further reported that they had been invited to meet External Examiners, but they never heard any more about any of the issues they raised and were not aware of External Examiners' reports (although it should be noted that there would not have been any for 2014-15 yet). The issue of the student voice is addressed in Recommendation 4 above.

Students expressed their anxiety over centrally assessed areas, in particular the fact that the examinations are closed book, which they did not feel was reflective of real life practice. There were also serious concerns about the scheduling of examinations on consecutive days in the current year. The students also felt that it would be helpful to have more than one mock paper provided by the central assessments examining team for Professional Ethics, as this is the only sample paper. There was also some concern that there was too much emphasis on how to pass the examinations and that this risked bringing about a disconnect between knowledge and its practical application. The Bar Course Aptitude Test was not believed to achieve what it set out to do, and students were of the opinion that it either needed to be tougher or to have a shorter time limit. The panel noted these concerns and comments, and will feed these back to the relevant BSB groups.

## 8. Student support and quality of student experience

The panel was pleased to have the opportunity to meet with six students. Two had taken a GDL at Nottingham Law School while the others had studied for undergraduate degrees at other UK universities. Their reasons for choosing Nottingham for their BPTC included its perceived high success rate for pupillage amongst graduates, the lower cost, the opportunity to live at home, the reputation of its tutors as practitioners, and the fact that they wished to practise outside London.

The students felt that the course had generally lived up to their expectations, although their individual experiences had varied. While some had peer groups with comparable levels of ability, this was not true of all. In the worst instance, one student felt that their peers were consistently underprepared and insufficiently engaged, and that there were problems with English Language ability in the group. It was understood that three students had been required to withdraw as a result of failing to meet the required IELTS standard of 7.5.

It was reported that attendance was generally poor in the week of assessments. This had been borne out by the experience of the panel on teaching observations where poor attendance had led to two groups having to be merged. This was believed to be because there was a ReDOC assessment the following day. This had plainly been anticipated by the management team as there had been an e-mail to all students warning them that they must attend, but this had evidently not had any effect, and students felt that the Attendance Rule was not well enforced generally. There were also some problems with passive attendance where students were unprepared and who elected to just 'wing it' in class, particularly in Advocacy sessions. Tutors did try to address this by directing questions at the individuals who were not prepared but this was not always successful. Some able students said that they were undeterred by this, as they would complete their own preparation regardless, and were happy to contribute more to sessions where the balance of abilities was unequal. The management team sought to assure the panel that passive as well as actual attendance was closely monitored and that students could be marked absent for lack of preparedness. Tutors would certainly be expected to use directed questioning to establish levels of preparedness. The management team indicated that the issue had not been raised by the teaching team or by any of the 8 External Examiners who had visited in the current year. The panel **recommended** that management and course team should ensure not only that the requirement for students to be fully prepared and actively to participate (or else they are marked as 'absent', even if physically present) is rigorously enforced, but also that students recognise its enforcement. (**Recommendation 10**)

The students reported that they would feel able to take any difficulties to their personal tutors. They also spoke warmly of the Course Leader, describing him as 'competent and brilliant', and perceived him as a good problem solver. Students assumed that their tutors were line managed by the Course Leader, but they did feel that there was some lack of communication, for instance when the Course Leader had initially been unaware that an actor had failed to turn up to take part in an assessment. Students also found their tutors very approachable, and would sometimes turn to them rather than their personal tutor, for instance, if their query related to a career aspiration that was not their personal tutor's specialism.

The perception of students was that the BPTC was somewhat isolated within the University and even from other law courses. For instance, there was perceived to be no interaction with the LPC and no joint events. The management team later advised that this was not the case as there had been a drinks reception for GDL/LPC/BPTC students at the start of the academic year, and a number of joint events including Guest Lectures. Students also perceived that there was no longer a termly course committee covering all professional courses, but management advised that the cross-course School Forum continues to meet termly. Whilst it should be noted that the group of students the panel met with was possibly too small to be a fully representative sample, the mismatch between students' perceptions and reality suggest there may be scope for improved lines of communication.

Students did not have a strong awareness of their tutors' practitioner experience and neither did they feel that the programme of guest lectures provided as much as it might; there had been an instance where practitioners had been scheduled to run a workshop but in the event had been unavailable. The workshop had then been run by the Course Leader and a colleague. Students felt that their main

contact with the Bar was through the Inns. They would welcome more exposure to how Chambers and courts work, and more contact with those who are in tune with how to write good pupillage applications. The management team indicated that there was a range of guest lecture events that also provided opportunities for networking, and that enthusiastic attendance by BPTC students at these events was guaranteed. As the group of students that the panel met was rather small, no conclusions could be drawn from the mismatch between these views except that there was clearly some scope to improve students' sense of connection with the profession.

Students reported good Pro Bono opportunities (including the FRU, in particular, where about a third of students enrol). Although this was not compulsory, it was easy to take up opportunities to do Pro Bono work. The panel had the opportunity to view the new Legal Advice Centre, which is a bright airy building with conference rooms and workspaces. Staff are allocated hours within their workload for supervising students giving legal advice.

Overall, the students felt that their teachers were doing a good job, and some of them were superb. They had nominated one tutor for an outstanding teacher award.

Although much of the session had been focused on negative aspects, it should be noted that some of these were the experiences of only one or sometimes two students in the group and when asked whether they would recommend Nottingham Law School as a BPTC provider, the students replied unanimously that they would.

## 9. Learning resources (Library and IT)

The University library is situated across the road opposite the BPTC teaching areas. The building is designed with bookable collaborative meeting rooms around the outside and a central open space for the stacks and workspaces. It contains a separate Postgraduate library through which a designated BPTC space is reached. This space comprises two separate areas, one with PCs and one without, but all workspaces have electrical sockets.

Students are issued with iPads at the start of the course. As well as using these devices for accessing and organising electronic resources, they can be used to record performances in class. Electronic resources can be organised through an App called Binder, which gives students a choice of how they wish to save and organise their materials. Students are given the White Book and Archbold in hard copy. A pilot is currently running with course representatives being given these texts electronically as well. There are, however, no plans to go over to electronic only provision of texts.

Students reported mixed feelings about the provision of iPads. All already had laptops or tablet devices before the course started (or would have acquired one if they had not already known that one would be provided). The iPad was useful for recording performances digitally in class, and for playing these back; this was thought to be greatly preferable to using DVDs, as laptops did not always have a disk drive to play them, albeit that the memory capacity of the iPads supplied was insufficient to store all of the students' performances and the 'camera angle' of the iPads was less good than a permanently mounted camera. When using an e-bundle, it was necessary either to have two devices or to use the iPad with a paper bundle. The panel also gained the strong impression that students were not given the paper resources that they sometimes needed, the briefs for the observed advocacy class being a case in point. The students with whom the panel met were of the view that they would prefer either to be given money, printing credits, or paper resources than an iPad. The panel **recommended** that the iPad policy and students' printing burden be reconsidered.

**(Recommendation 11)**

Whilst it was recognised that the use of iPads was useful for informal recordings, it was important to ensure that good quality recordings were also available for classes and assessments, and it was noted that External Examiner comments indicated that this was not always the case. It was therefore **recommended** that consideration be given to the use of permanently mounted cameras and appropriately located microphones for better quality recording of skills classes and assessments.

**(Recommendation 12)**

**10. Equality and diversity**

No equality and diversity issues were raised or noted.

**Additional comments**

None

**Good practice, distinguishing features**

The panel wished to commend:

1. The enthusiasm of the tutors.
2. The dedication and commitment of the Course Leader.
3. The high quality facilities and good working conditions.
4. The good Pro Bono opportunities.
5. The strong links with local Chambers, which should continue to be nurtured by the University.

**Conclusions: recommendation on accreditation/approval/continuing approval**

The panel recommends continuing approval with recommendations.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations must be addressed:

Recommendation 1	Clearly set out and disseminate a formalised timetable for the internal and external steps necessary in the creation and approval of assessments.
Recommendation 2	Ensure that teaching staff, in conjunction with the Course Leader, are fully involved in quality assurance processes such as responding to External Examiners' reports and drafting of the Annual Reflective Review.
Recommendation 3	Ensure that teaching staff (not just module leaders) are aware of pass rate data and have the opportunity to discuss this with course management.
Recommendation 4	A BPTC-specific student/staff liaison group should become a permanent feature with standing agenda items to assist in monitoring the health of the course.
Recommendation 5	Actively promote and enable staff to engage with practice, and ensure that this is seen as a core part of a tutor's role that feeds into their teaching, and is not wholly or mainly an activity to be undertaken during annual leave.
Recommendation 6	The best practice management structure should involve the BPTC Course Leader in direct line management of the course team: the panel recommends that the University reconsider this.
Recommendation 7	Any issues affecting assessment should be reported immediately to the Course Leader and a log kept of incidents, causes and actions taken, to help ensure that they do not happen again.
Recommendation 8	The Course Leader should institute (or where these already exist, ensure that adequate time within working hours is allowed for) regular team meetings, including at the start and end of the course, at both module and course level, to promote a course team ethos, to foster best practice and to facilitate course development.
Recommendation 9	Consider rotating advocacy groups and tutors.
Recommendation 10	Ensure not only that the requirement for students to be fully prepared and actively to participate (or else they are marked as 'absent', even if physically present) is rigorously enforced, but also that students recognise its

	enforcement.
Recommendation 11	Reconsider the iPad policy and students' printing burden.
Recommendation 12	Give consideration to the use of permanently mounted cameras and appropriately located microphones for better quality recording of skills classes and assessments.

<b>Observations</b>	
If any observations are made, to bring to the attention of the BSB, please detail below:	
Observation 1	Given the seriousness of the panel's concerns regarding the management structure, the BSB is strongly urged to ensure that the next monitoring visit takes place early in the next academic year, ideally at the end of October, and certainly before Christmas. Should the University have altered its management structure by then, it will give the panel chance to see how this is working; should the present structure remain in place, the panel will wish to assure itself that adequate measures have been implemented in line with the recommendations above to ensure coherent and robust management of the course.

**Response by the Provider (maximum one page)**

We note the Panel's comments and are pleased that the Panel commended, amongst other things, the enthusiasm of the tutors, the high quality of our facilities and the good Pro Bono opportunities available. We continue to nurture our links with local Chambers and the wider Bar, students having received, since the Panel's visit, talks from Alastair Hodge, Shaun Smith QC and, as Guest of Honour at our Annual Dinner, the Leader of the Midland Circuit, Richard Atkins QC.

Since the Panel's visit, in order to clarify and further embed the management structure and processes, we have produced a detailed Course and Module Management Plan (which we are happy to provide). We believe this strengthens existing lines of communication and provides robust mechanisms to address the principal recommendations made by the Panel (or otherwise evidences the mechanisms that were already in place). These include the attendance of the Head of Postgraduate Professional Programmes at BPTC staff meetings, the organisation of a Course & Module Review Day (21 July) to consider, for example, student progression data and External Examiner reports, the production of staff development plans to include engagement with practice, and the production of detailed assessment schedules which will be provided to External Examiners. Although staff are aware of assessment timelines, a Staff Assessment Handbook is being produced for the academic year 2015-16 clearly setting out a formalised timetable for the internal and external steps necessary for the creation and approval of assessments.

The Panel will be aware that we had reinstated a formal BPTC staff/student liaison group (Course Committee) for the academic year 2014-15, a number of the representatives attending the Panel's meeting with students. We have received 10 External Examiner visits which have included meetings with students and have also conducted our annual BPTC student survey. In the circumstances we are confident that we have captured the students' perception of the health of the Course.

We have looked across the responsibilities of BPTC tutors in respect of the wider Law School. Of 9 tutors only 2 taught on the LLB in 2014-15; of those, 1 had been recently appointed in circumstances where BPTC teaching was already covered, the other was involved with the delivery of only 1 module (mooting). No BPTC tutor taught on the GDL.

The Course and Module Management Plan, mentioned above, expressly requires that assessment issues are reported to the Course Leader and, likewise, restates the need to enforce the attendance requirement in accordance with the BPTC Handbook. Although already detailed in our Student Assessment Handbook and raised on Induction, we will devote more time in the Assessments Lecture to reminding students of their obligations.

We will consider rotating students in respect of Advocacy classes. All tutors are provided with DVD cameras and have been reminded to use them for recording oral skills classes.

In reviewing the provision of iPads, we included a question in our annual student survey (whether students would prefer additional print credits instead of an iPad). Of those who responded, approximately 2/3 were in favour of the provision of iPads. We note the comment about students' printing burden; however, we believe that our course fee is extremely competitive and more than offsets the print costs that a student may choose to incur. As a University we are committed to a Green agenda and sustainability.

We look forward to the next Panel visit.