

# BAR STANDARDS BOARD

REGULATING BARRISTERS

## Bar Professional Training Course City Law School Report of Visit held on 20 January 2016

<b>Name of Institution</b>	<b>Date of Visit/Meeting</b>
City Law School, City University London	20 January 2016

<b>Title of Course/award</b>	<b>Nature/status of the course</b>
Bar Professional Training Course	Accredited Full-time BPTC and Part-time BPTC

<b>Numbers/modes approved</b>	<b>Dates of course</b>
Approved for: 420 FT for the academic year 2015/16 60 PT for the academic year 2015/16 345 FT enrolled and 24 PT enrolled	September 2015 to July 2016

Panel Members	Role and area of primary responsibility
Dr Victoria Stec	Head of Training Supervision, BSB
Ms Hayley Gault	Senior Training Supervision Officer, BSB
Prof. Maria Tighe	Legal Academic
Ms Rebecca Foulkes	Barrister
Ms Joanne Lewthwaite	BPTC Course Director at Manchester Metropolitan University

Provider Team	Role and area of primary responsibility
Professor Stuart Sime	FT Course Leader, BPTC
Mr Marcus Soanes	PT Course Leader, BPTC
Ms Lisa Laurenti	Tutor
Professor Nigel Duncan	BPTC LLM Director
Ms Snigdha Nag	Tutor
Mr Paul McKeown	Tutor
Ms Caitriona Hegarty	Deputy PT Course Leader, BPTC
Ms Nikki Walsh	Tutor
Mr Nigel Waddington	Tutor
Professor Carl Stychin	Dean, City Law School
Professor Peter Hungerford-Welch	Assistant Dean, Professional Programmes

## **Rationale for the visit**

This visit was held as part of the BSB's annual programme of visits to BPTC Providers to monitor the quality and standards of the course and to determine whether the course is being delivered in accordance with the Course Specification Requirements and Guidance.

The Panel was provided in advance with key documentation including the Law School's most recent Annual Reflective Review, copies of the last years' External Examiner reports and the last BSB monitoring report, and other relevant information. During the visit, the Panel had the opportunity to meet with management, teaching staff and students. Members of the Panel also had the opportunity to observe some teaching in Civil and Criminal Advocacy, Criminal Evidence and Civil Litigation.

All of the above informed the Panel's conclusions contained in this report.

## **Context: The HEI/Provider**

City University of London was established in 1894 as the Northampton Institute and obtained University status in 1966. City Law School (formerly the Inns of Court School of Law) delivered the Bar Vocational Course from 1989 to 2009, with the course forming part of a suite of related law programmes. The BVC was replaced from 2010 with the Bar Professional Training Course. In 2016, City University will become one of the self-governing colleges of the University of London.

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

The panel found that the Bar Professional Training Course at City Law School was being delivered in accordance with the stated aims, philosophy and standards of the course. Areas for improvement or enhancement, and aspects of good practice are identified in the report.

The management team was invited to indicate what impact joining the University of London was likely to have. The team said that the decision was a strategic one which had been mooted several decades ago, and that now the timing was right in terms of City University's development as an institution. The team described the move as a validation of a lot of hard work being put into raising the level of performance of the university. The team reassured the panel that because City will remain self-governing, there will be no impact on the overall rules and regulations already in place. There will be an annual quality report submitted to the University of London. Benefits of the move will include increasing City's recognition nationally and internationally, and enhancing collaboration with other University of London colleges.

There are proposals in the pipeline regarding City Law School possibly moving to a new, purpose-built campus. The management team said that the project was still very much in the early stages – nothing would be happening before 2019 – so little is known at the moment. However, they explained that there continues to be a lot of discussion about needs from the estate, and the specific needs of the BPTC and the wider Law School are being taken into consideration as part of this. Teaching staff confirmed that they had been included in discussions about the future and management emphasised that this would continue.

## **2. Quality management systems**

The panel heard that the teaching team was sent all of the external examiners' reports from last year as well as the report from last year's BSB annual monitoring visit. These informed the teaching staff workshops which took place in September 2015 before term started. The management team described the documents as one of the central sources of quality management information for the course.

The report from the previous annual monitoring visit, which is available online via the BSB's website, was also proactively shared with students.

The Panel saw the minutes of Staff-Student Liaison Committee (SSLC); there are three meetings per academic year, one per term for the full-time cohort. For the part-time SSLC there are four virtual meetings. The minutes for the SSLC clearly illustrated the concerns students had raised and the actions table indicated the extent to which matters had been resolved.

## **3. Staffing and staff development**

The panel was able to meet with several of the tutors from a variety of subjects on the BPTC course.

The teaching staff explained that the workshops in September prior to the start of the course described in section 2 above enabled staff to commence the year better informed about quality assurance mechanisms and the priorities for improvements and enhancements during the year. They also had a workshop led by an external consultant on dealing with a diverse student body.

Several of the teaching staff remain in practice and tutors undertake a wide range of professional and academic development activities in addition to teaching on the BPTC, including in-house and external training, court observations, and academic writing and research. Two tutors are also doing an MA in Academic Practice at City.

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

The panel asked both the management and teaching teams about whether there was anything that could be done differently to address the concerns raised by some part-time students with External Examiners about a perceived mismatch in the first and second years of the course. Students thought that the first year consisted primarily of knowledge subjects and witness handling, and the second year was much tougher. The teaching team explained that part-time students are taught Criminal subjects in year one and Civil subjects in year two of the course.

Staff had discussed moving one civil subject into the third term of year two but had not yet reached a consensus; one tutor pointed out that doing so would create a major time lag between the teaching of the subject and the assessment. The teaching team pointed out that as the Professional Ethics centralised assessment was taken in year one as well as the Criminal Litigation centralised assessment, it was by no means an easy year, though they acknowledged that there might be a

sense of there being more written work to do in the second year. One tutor suggested that there is also an inevitable fatigue for part-time students, who are balancing the course with other commitments, whilst attending BPTC classes in the evenings. The team said they had looked at different permutations of when to cover knowledge subjects, but had concluded that the current model was best.

The team stated that part-time students receive the same materials and teaching as full-time students, but in some instances in a different format. Part-time students do not, from this year, do a full mock trial in Civil, although it is planned to reintroduce this in future years. They do, however, do a full mock criminal trial.

The panel invited the staff to talk about the relatively low pass rates for part-time students compared to full-time students. The teaching staff explained that there is a trend nationally for part-time students to perform less well, and the reasons are myriad and complex to address. Where a student's grades identify them as being at risk of failure, this is reported to their personal tutor to enable suitable support to be given.

## **5. Admissions and student profile**

The management team was invited to discuss the BSB's Key Statistics Report as it related to City Law School. They said that that student recruitment had been stable over the years but that there has been a change in the profile of students' prior attainment. In recent years, the priority has been to enhance the prior attainment at the point of admission. The number of students with 2:2s has reduced from 36% of the cohort to 14% over a ten-year period. There were no students with 2:2s who achieved an Outstanding grade on the BPTC until last year when two students with 2:2s achieved this. The management team remarked that there is a strong correlation between prior attainment and achievement on the BPTC and as such it was only fair to increase prior attainment; students with lower prior qualifications tend to struggle and the university does not wish to take a student's money unless they have a good chance of passing the BPTC.

The City cohort is diverse in that it has around 50% international students. There is also a band of students with 2:2 undergraduate degrees. Its admissions policy seeks to avoid entirely denying places to students with 2:2s because it would deny potentially able students the opportunity, but that they tended to admit students who were at the top end of the 2:2 band, and these tended to fulfil their potential well. The management team said that they care very strongly about widening access and that great effort is put into ensuring no unconscious bias takes place during the recruitment process as part of their commitment to equality and diversity. Each year a number of very highly qualified students tend to do particularly well. 56 students in 2014-15 achieved an Outstanding grade, which the management team described as a healthy number compared to national performance.

The panel heard that the process for awarding scholarships was formerly devolved down to the programme level. However, due to concerns about variability across the school - though management emphasised there were no such concerns with the BPTC programme - a new approach had been introduced which means that scholarships are decided at a school level. The criteria are in line with university policy, which is on the basis of academic excellence, but academic achievement is considered alongside the students' background and any challenges they may have faced are taken into account.

The management team acknowledged that there were reducing numbers of part-time students, and

that performance of part-time students gave some cause for concern, but this was in line with national trends. Consideration had been given to the possibility of delivering the part-time route at different times, but a daytime model was not viable due to resources needed for the fulltime students, and a weekend option was not attractive from a marketing perspective as it was offered by other providers. The team had considered introducing more online interaction but this had been unpopular with students. In spite of the challenges, the management team emphasised that from a school perspective, the part-time course is meeting targets and that City does fill a valuable niche in the market for those who wish to study in the evening.

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

Panel members observed two civil advocacy classes, one criminal advocacy class, one opinion writing class and one class in drafting. The Hampel method was not employed in any of the advocacy sessions due to the specific aims of those sessions and their learning outcomes; this was explained at the beginning of the class. The teaching team emphasised that this was atypical and that generally the Hampel method would be employed and that all students would experience this from the beginning of the course. However, when the panel met with students, three out of four of them said that they were unable to identify unambiguous use of the Hampel method in their time on the course except in individual advocacy training. One of the students said they were familiar with the method from experience at their Inn of Court but had never experienced it at City. It must be noted that the panel was only able to meet with four students out of a cohort of 345 full-time students, and that three of these students were from the same teaching group so it may be that their experience is not representative of the entire cohort. The panel **recommends** that careful thought be given to how to ensure and quality assure consistency in advocacy teaching and feedback. Mechanisms for doing so may include introducing a programme of peer review of teaching or using team teaching activities (**Recommendation 1**).

The management team explained that students are introduced to the Hampel method in introductory lectures at the beginning of the course. The use of the method is prescribed in tutor's notes for advocacy sessions throughout the course, though some modification of the method is permitted, particularly early on in the course when students lack confidence and strict adherence to the method may exacerbate this. The panel observed that students might benefit from being reminded of the basics of the Hampel method later on in the year to ensure they are clear on what it is.

The classes that the panel observed were pitched at the appropriate level for the course. The aims and objectives of the classes were clear and students generally understood the purpose of the session. Tutors in the advocacy sessions were approachable, knowledgeable and dynamic and students in all classes seemed to be well-prepared and engaged. Students were invited to give feedback to their peers, and gave good quality constructive feedback.

The teaching team said there are SAQ tests and written tasks in class to monitor performance in knowledge subjects which helped identify students at risk of failure and/or in need of additional support. Poor performance would also be observed in class. Each student's grade is passed onto their personal tutor so that this can be discussed in personal tutor sessions along with coping strategies, etc.

In opinion writing, students submit an opinion which the tutor will annotate with their comments. The tutor then records on a standard feedback sheet what the grade would be and gives a small list of what needs to be done to improve. There is then a class dealing with generic problems. Students can

be offered extra time if needed.

The students whom the panel met expressed a lot of uncertainty about whether they were prepared for the centrally-set examinations. The students said stress levels were increasing as the examinations drew near, particularly because they were so closely grouped together. They were unhappy that they had no examinations before Christmas but now had three major examinations to sit in four weeks. They said they were finding that they had no time to revise on top of all the day-to-day work they were doing for the course. However, the panel heard that students who had approached tutors for help with things like examination technique and organising notes had found the module tutor and personal tutor very helpful. The students also felt they were given plenty of opportunities to practise; they said that they were getting unseen SAQs in class which would be marked the following week. They felt that it was useful for their technique to do practice questions like this and then see the mark scheme to get a sense of what is required in answering the question.

The students reported feeling frustrated at the extent of the syllabus and sometimes had difficulty seeing its practical application. They did not feel confident that their grades would reflect the amount of work done in preparation.

The students were concerned that feedback for skills subjects was sometimes not specific enough or given early enough to enable them to develop individual skills or to prevent them from making the same mistakes twice. They also wished that they could get grades in subjects like opinion writing each time so that they could gauge what level they were operating at and get a sense of improvement or progression.

The students expressed some unhappiness with advocacy training. They said that they wanted to receive the notes taken by tutors during their performance in addition to oral feedback so they could use this for their personal development. They thought that it would be more useful to have longer individual advocacy training sessions as they felt that the sessions were useful in putting theory together with practice but they questioned the use of having such short sessions and felt it was odd that the tutors meeting with them individually did not feed back to their usual advocacy tutors.

In spite of all the challenges of the course, the students that the panel met said that they were glad that they had chosen City and that they believed the hard work necessary to complete the course reflected the hard work that would be required in practice as a barrister.

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

The teaching staff told the panel that mock examinations for centrally-assessed subjects had been moved closer to the live assessments after taking on board comments from students; mock exams are now two weeks before the live assessments. Generic feedback on the short answer questions (SAQs) is then discussed in a Large Group Session (LGS), with common pitfalls and mistakes relayed to the students.

There are timed 'mini-mocks' and SAQs available online, which give students the opportunity to test themselves throughout the year. In skills subjects, feedback is given formally; in knowledge subjects, feedback on SAQs is available on Moodle with commentary. Teaching staff said that the time needed to provide feedback is considerable but that they considered it a worthwhile investment.

Mock examinations are booked through the school office and held under examination conditions. In their meeting with students, the panel heard that some students opt not to do the mock examinations if they feel they have not revised enough by the date of the mock, but they can do it online at a later date (albeit not under examination conditions). The panel was concerned to learn that mock examinations are not compulsory and that students may miss out on the benefit of doing mocks under examination conditions. The panel therefore **recommends** that the team give further thought to how mock examinations might more closely replicate the conditions of the actual examination (**Recommendation 2**).

In opinion writing and drafting, students are given an extra set of papers which they can do themselves as a revision task. Students are also given sample answers for SAQs in centrally-assessed subjects. These are broken down so students can see where marks have been scored. In Civil Litigation, students mark their own work to put them in the examiner's shoes. The teaching team described role-playing as an assessor as "a really powerful tool" for students to understand what is required of them in the assessment. They will be given drafts submitted by past students on a recent assessment they have done themselves, and will also be given the assessment criteria.

The students that the panel met felt that the conditions for assessments in opinion writing were at odds with the reality of practice where using a computer and having access to key texts would be more realistic.

The teaching staff said that an 'Ethics club' had been set up last year which runs drop-in sessions to familiarise students with how the Code works, and which was also delivered on a Saturday to ensure part-time students could attend if they wished to do so.

The panel learned that the university does not have a 'fit to sit' policy. The management team stated that introducing such a policy had been discussed and a wide range of views considered. It was found that although there was body of support, there were drawbacks, and the primary concern for the management team was the issue of stress placed on students. The management team explained that students must make a decision before the exam whether or not to proceed, and that this can create further anxiety for students who are already in a potentially stressful situation. It was also pointed out that there may still be applications for appeal and that such a policy does not reduce the overall number of extenuating circumstances applications.

## **8. Student support and quality of student experience**

The panel learned that every student has a personal tutor who also teaches them one subject so they have regular contact. Students can go to their tutor on an ad hoc basis with any problems but there are meetings scheduled once a term to discuss progress as well as any issues that may have come up. Teaching staff said many students make use of the personal tutor system, including the more able students. Tutors also hold sessions for part-time students. Teaching staff said that while part-time students may have many things to balance with their studies, such as work and family commitments, there is no pronounced difference between the stress levels of full- and part-time students. The concerns about student stress raised in last year's Annual Monitoring Report had been discussed in the pre-session workshops for staff in September 2015.

Students have access to a student counselling service at Northampton Square, where there is a daily

lunchtime drop-in session which is confidential. The teaching team said that the learning success team, who offer support with things like study skills and time management, are flagged to students at their Freshers' Fair and that additional support sessions are available as assessments draw nearer. These sessions cover topics such as dealing with stress, and revision skills. Students are also given an FAQ document at the beginning of every year.

The teaching team said that preparing students for how to deal with stress was part of a more complex shift from being an undergraduate to being a professional; students must be prepared for a shift in focus and must recognise how much more work they have to do. The teaching staff said students do receive support from the beginning of the course. However, the panel **recommends** ensuring that students' expectations are adequately managed from the outset to prepare them for the workload and demands of the course (**Recommendation 3**).

The students described the cohort as diverse, especially in comparison to their undergraduate experience. They felt it was good to be able to study alongside international students and students from a range of backgrounds as they felt it reflected what practice would be like, though they noted that a lot of their international peers did not plan to practise at the Bar in England and Wales. The panel learned that tutors took a variety of approaches to encouraging quieter students to speak and were sensitive to instances where participation was more hesitant due to cultural differences.

The students said that it was very difficult to balance and prioritise time given the demands of the course. They had seen instances where tutors had challenged students' lack of preparedness in a firm but fair way, but students were expected to take responsibility for their own learning and preparation. The students said that the suggested time given by tutors for length of tasks was sometimes inaccurate for them personally; they also told the panel that they wished that it was clearer what would be formally assessed and what was just 'background information' so they could prioritise their time better.

The students were impressed with the series of introductory lectures held in their first week which gave them an idea of what to expect from the course. However, they described the course as a "shock to the system" and that they felt they probably were not managing to do everything. The students gave different account of what preparation they did prior to beginning the course – some received a pack of information and others did not, and some were told particular areas from their undergraduate degree to revise while others were not. The panel **recommends** that students receive consistent pre-enrolment information, for example in an electronic format available on the university's website (**Recommendation 4**).

The students were very happy with the amount of pro bono opportunities available to them. They said that they receive three to four emails a week with different opportunities and they felt the opportunities themselves were good, giving them practical experience which they could apply to the course. They said that the university provides good opportunities to make links with the profession, for example breakfasts with local Chambers, though some students felt that the provisions for this at their Inns were better. The students mentioned that often they received very little notice for some events – frequently less than 24 hours' notice.

Several of the students said that they had used the university's pupillage advisory service before joining the course and found it useful. Indeed, some of the students gave the pupillage advisory service as one of the main reasons they opted to go to City. Other reasons included the course fees being lower than at other London providers and the strong reputation. They also said that student life



on the BPTC was quite different to undergraduate life, and that there was not the same level of social events so that new arrivals in London could find it difficult to integrate. The students said that there were few opportunities to meet new people socially, especially for postgraduate students.

The students said that the administration of the course was generally very good and that they found administration staff and processes very easy to deal with. They liked that fact that the reception desk was manned from 8am to 6pm and that they could direct any queries to them. However, concerns were raised about the interaction with central university service with regard to additional support for students with disabilities. The panel heard that there had been difficulty with arranging support such as special exam arrangements and equipment. The management team acknowledged that there had been some difficulty with communication, accountability and responsibility between the school, Disability Office and the university.

### **9. Learning resources (Library and IT)**

The BSB monitoring panel in 2015 had toured facilities and as there had been no major changes it was not thought necessary to conduct a tour on this visit. The students whom the panel met did not raise any concerns with the provision of library and IT facilities.

### **10. Equality and diversity**

Students have one legal and ethics-based lecture dealing with discrimination as part of the course, and this deals with issues of diversity. Staff explained that the student body itself is diverse which means that students are acutely aware of diversity. The teaching team said that in preparing case papers and other course materials they make an effort to ensure that different races, backgrounds and genders are included. The management team emphasised that great effort is put into ensuring that no unconscious bias occurs at the point of recruitment, and that there are a number of measures to help students who might be disadvantaged in some way, for example through the personal tutor system. Management described the university's system for widening participation as "robust", although there was of course no compromise on expectations in terms of academic attainment which had to be of sufficient quality to enable students to have a chance to succeed on the course and at the Bar.

A number of the staff workshops in September covered dealing with a diverse student body. Tutors said that external consultants had offered guidance on how to ensure that international students' needs are met and that they feel comfortable. There are sessions dealing with living in London and other cultural matters offered to students before the course starts but staff acknowledged that students whose visas were delayed may miss out on these sessions. The teaching team said that they were very conscious of the fact that the BPTC can be a large shift for any student, especially students used to a more didactic learning culture as the interactive elements can be very different from their undergraduate experience. Tutors have to develop students' confidence in how to articulate their views in class by giving firm but constructive feedback and taking time outside of the classroom to talk to shy or reticent students. There are also individual advocacy training sessions which are one-on-one and which reticent students may find easier.

The teaching team said that the cohort is deliberately split into smaller groups which incorporate a range of backgrounds to ensure diversity; this is done by the Admissions Tutor and Timetabling Officer.

As stated above, the panel was concerned to hear that students with disabilities were having trouble gaining the support and assistance that they needed. The management team said that the matter was under review and that it was an issue they were aware of, and which had been escalated within the central university. The team said students with disabilities had achieved highly in the past, but at times this may have been without the level of support that they should have received, despite the good intentions of the Disability Office. As a university as a whole, there are issues in communication between the central disability office and the schools, and a lack of clear lines of accountability and responsibility. The panel **recommends** that these issues are resolved as they are clearly impacting on the students (**Recommendation 5**).

### Observations

#### Observation 1

It was difficult for the panel to draw any firm conclusions from the meeting with students due the group being so small and unrepresentative of the whole cohort; all of the students were full-time white UK-domiciled students and several had very high prior academic achievement. It was very unfortunate that out of 72 students invited to attend the meeting with the panel, only 4 were able to do so. The BSB would very much appreciate the Law School making efforts to ensure that the panel is able to meet with a more representative sample of students on a future occasion.

### Good practice, distinguishing features

The Panel wished to commend City Law School on the following:

1. The number and variety of pro bono opportunities available to students and the effective pupillage advisory service.
2. The fact that recommendations from previous monitoring visit informed the staff development programme and were proactively shared with students.

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

Continuing approval (with recommendations) for the period September 2016 to July 2017.

### Recommendations

#### Recommendation 1

The panel recommends that careful thought be given to how to ensure and quality assure consistency in advocacy teaching and feedback. Mechanisms

	for doing so may include introducing a programme of peer review of teaching or using team teaching activities.
Recommendation 2	Give further thought to how mock examinations might more closely replicate the conditions of the actual examination.
Recommendation 3	Ensure that students' expectations are adequately managed from the outset to prepare them for the workload and demands of the course.
Recommendation 4	Ensure that students receive consistent pre-enrolment information, for example in an electronic format available on the university's website.
Recommendation 5	As a university as a whole, there are issues in communication between the central disability office and the schools, and a lack of clear lines of accountability and responsibility. We recommend these issues are resolved as they are clearly impacting on the students.

## Response by the Provider (maximum one page)

**Recommendation 1 (Advocacy):** We conducted a thorough review of how we use the Hampel method in Advocacy classes following the Monitoring Visit in 2016. It confirmed that feedback given to students in advocacy is predominantly in the Hampel style, with students being introduced to the method during Induction Week in their first advocacy large group. Although staff and students rarely refer to the Hampel method by name, nonetheless its 6 elements are used in advocacy small group sessions throughout the year. In accordance with guidance in the BPTC Course Specification and Guidance, it is used with suitable modifications to ensure that students receive encouragement on facets of their performances that are done well. Where appropriate more than one point is covered with students who are able to develop in the skill in more than one way at a time. However, in recognition of the Hampel coaching method in these cases care is taken not to overload students. The review also confirmed that a small number of advocacy sessions are designed to offer students experience of conducting sustained advocacy, e.g. trials, which means that feedback may be offered using a modified coaching method.

There will be further staff training in the use of the Hampel method as part of the School's training schedule over the coming months. Staff receive peer feedback on all aspects of their teaching as part of the School's established teaching observation system. One of the areas specifically identified in the documentation supporting these teaching observations is the use of the Hampel method in advocacy classes.

Core ideas underpinning the Hampel method are that feedback must include identification of a significant problem in a performance, an explanation of why it is a problem, and advice on how to put it right. These ideas are central to all the feedback given on the BPTC, not just in advocacy, but also in all the other skills. City University is committed to providing high quality feedback to students across all its programmes, and on the BPTC the staff are committed to providing effective Hampel style feedback as a means of ensuring students fulfil their potential as they develop their skills as advocates.

**Recommendation 2 (Mock Examinations):** In response to comments and suggestions from students, in 2015-16 we moved the Mock examinations supporting the centrally set assessments to dates closer to the final exams than had been the case in previous years. At this point in the year it is too early to evaluate whether that has been a success, but it will be reviewed when the results from the assessments in 2015-16 are known. In 2016-17 there will be a new system for the centrally set assessments, with CEB-set mocks taking place again earlier in the year. The Ethics mock paper will be released to providers in the week commencing 19 December, and the Civil and Crime mock papers in the week commencing 9 January. CLS will take a decision when they are released to its students informed by its teaching grid and experience of the timing for the release of mocks.

All the skills assessments have formal feedback exercises based on previous exam papers, which are marked against the same assessment criteria as the final exams, and to exam standard. The current system was designed in consultation with students from previous years, and works well.

Taking personal responsibility for your own work is one of the intended outcomes of the BPTC. While there are always different ways of doing things, the current system allows students to plan their own revision and preparation for assessments.

**Recommendation 3 (Awareness of Workload and Demands of the Course):** Detailed information on the demands of the course, the number of classes, and the amount of preparation required is given to students in written form as part of their pre-registration documentation. This is reviewed annually, and will be reconsidered in the light of this recommendation.

**Recommendation 4 (Pre-registration Information):** All students are sent the same pre-registration information. To date we have done this by post which relies on students giving us their correct contact details. There are occasions when students do not inform us when they move address after university etc. This year we intend to send this information by email, which should address this problem as CLS is in regular email correspondence with offerees. The City University's web design team have enhanced the applicant pages for the website, and we intend to include all the information which goes in the pre-registration pack on these pages too.

**Recommendation 5 (Central Disability Service):** Typically around 40 students on the BPTC will have special arrangements each year. Some will be for in-course support, others are for special arrangements for assessments. Decisions on these arrangements are made centrally by the Learning Success team (which includes the Disability team, Dyslexia Support Unit and Mental Health team) to ensure consistency and fairness across the university. Most arrangements are put in place in good time. There are occasions when there are late applications by the students, or late diagnosis of the issue, and some isolated instances of delays in communication of a student's needs to us. The School is working actively with Learning Success to ensure the system works as smoothly as possible.