STATUS OF LEGAL EDUCATION IN BANGLADESH: THE CASE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LAW OF JAGANNATH UNIVERSITY

Dr Sarkar Ali Akkas[*] Md. Asaduzzaman Saadi[**] and Md. Shahidul Islam[***]

Abstract

To be recognised as an excellence of knowledge creating and education imparting institution, a university in general, and its different departments and institutes in particular, has to fulfill some basic requirements. To this end, the Department of Law of Jagannath University also has to satisfy some conditions. The Self-Assessment Committee of the Department of Law, under the auspices of the HEQEP and supervision of the UGC of Bangladesh, has conducted a self-assessment study on some QAs areas using the questionnaire survey on five specific stakeholders. This paper, through an analysis of the data so collected, finds that the Department of Law has some strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. The strengths and opportunities, among others, include a well-written vision, mission and objectives of the programme, a curriculum and employee friendly Service Rules. The weaknesses and threats, inter alia, include extreme want of physical structure both for academic and residential purposes, lack of student involvement both in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities. Therefore, this research offers some recommendations to overcome the weaknesses and withstand the threats. With these deliberations, the research draws its conclusion.

1. Introduction

Every institution, irrespective of its nature, has some strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats which can be learnt through its self-assessment study. The self-assessment study of an academic institution or a programme offering entity (POE) on the quality assurance areas (QA) like governance, curriculum design and review process, physical facilities, quality of students, progress and achievement, teaching-learning and assessment etc. provides a real picture on the present status of the POE. This helps to determine the future steps to be taken in order to achieve the objectives of the establishment of the POE. Self-assessment study of a POE is such a systematic process that evaluates the various aspects of a POE including its major QAs. A diagnosis of the various aspects of a POE through its self-assessment study called Self-Assessment Report (SAR) underpins its strength, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. Moreover, visit by the External Peer Review (EPR) Team of the different aspects of the POE and review of the SAR followed by the External Peer Review Report (EPRR) adds more information about the present status of the POE. The combined information about the present status of the POE resulting from the SAR and EPRR help the POE to chalk out its future plan to achieve its

[*]Professor, Department of Law, Jagannath University, Dhaka.
[**] Associate Professor, Department of Law, Jagannath University, Dhaka.
[***]Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Jagannath University, Dhaka.

vision and mission. This is a global trend. Accordingly, the University Grants Commission of Bangladesh (UGC) in collaboration with the Higher Education Quality Enhancement Project (HEQEP) has initiated the self-assessment study of the POE of the universities in Bangladesh. As part of it, the Department of Law of Jagannath University, through its SAC, has conducted a study on the present status of the QAs of the Department applying questionnaire survey methodology upon the said stakeholders. On the basis of the feedback from the said stakeholders, the SAC has prepared the Self Assessment Report (SAR) which underpins the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) of the POE. Thereafter, the Institutional Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) of Jagannath University invites the External Peer Review Team (EPR Team) and examines the QAs of the Department of Law from 25 to 27 February 2018. After visiting the Department and examining its different aspects including the SAR, the EPR Team submits External Peer Review Report (EPRR) identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the Department. The EPRR includes some recommendations to overcome the weaknesses of the Department. The SAC considers both the SAR and EPRR and sorts out the areas need to be improved for the purpose of achieving the very objectives of the POE. Towards that end, the SAC prepares its Post Self-Assessment Improvement Plan (PSAIP) for the period from 2018-2021.

This article forms part of the SAR submitted to the IQAC of Jagannath University on 24 July 2018. In this study, total number of respondents is 193 among whom existing students are 112, alumni are 40, faculty members are 11, non-teaching staff are 11 and employers are 20.

2. Status of Legal Education in Bangladesh

The authors of this article consider the status of legal education through the Department of Law of Jagannath University as an embodiment of the status of legal education in Bangladesh.

3. Overview of JnU and the Department of Law

Jagannath University came into existence in 2005 under the authority of the *Jagannath University Ain 2005* in the campus of its predecessor Jagannath College. However, Jagannath College has a long history to its credit which traces back to 1858 when it was first established as Dhaka Brahma School founded by DinnathSen, Probhaticharan Roy, AnathbandhuMallik and BrajasundarKaitra. Later Kishorilal Chowdhury, the Zaminder of Bilaidi took over the school in 1872 and renamed it Jagannath School after the name of his father Jagannathlal Chowdhury. It was upgraded to a second grade college and first grade college in the year 1884 and 1907 respectively. In 1910, Raja Manmath Roy Chowdhury, the Zaminder of Santosh, Tangail affiliated the

Pramath-Manmath College of Tangail with Jagannath College. In 1968, the College was taken over by the government. In 1975, Jagannath College opened honours and masters programmes.

The Department of Law is one of the two Departments of the Faculty of Law of Jagannath University. This Department initially started its journey under the Faculty of Arts. However, with the inauguration of the Faculty of Law under the *Thirty-Ninth Syndicate*, the Department came under it. The University offers MPhil and PhD Programmes from 2012-203 academic session under different departments including the Department of Law.

The Department of Law started its journey offering LLB (Honours) Programme with 30 students which gradually increased to 80. The Department opened a one year LLM (General) Programme from 2011-2012 for the students obtaining LLB (Honours) Programme from the Department of Law of Jagannath University. From 2013-2014, it starts offering one year LLM (Evening) for those having four years LLB (Honours) degree. So currently run programmes of the Department are: a four year LLB (Honours)**,** a one year LLM (General) Programme, one year LLM (Evening) Programme, MPhil Programme and PhD Programme. The Department has a bunch of brilliant teachers which can be viewed from the following table:

Position	Total Number	With PhD	Having one Post Graduate Degree from Abroad	Presently Pursuing for MS/MPhil/ PhD
Professor	01	01	01	Not applicable
Associate Professor	01	00	00	PhD
Assistant Professor	09	02	03	02 (PhD)
Lecturer	04	00	00	00
Total	**15**	**03**	**04**	**03**

Table 1: List of teachers of the Department of Law, JnU

4. Status of the Department of Law of Jagannath University: The SAR

To determine the status of the Department of Law of Jagannath University, the SAC of the Department collected data from five stakeholders namely the current students, alumni, teaching staff and non-teaching staff. The stakeholders expressed their views on different aspects of the Department. The overall view of the stakeholders is discussed below:

4.1. Governance

The expression 'governance' refers to the 'institutional underpinnings' of public authority and decision making. In this way, governance encompasses the 'institutions, systems… other factors' that determine how 'political and economic interactions' are structured and how decisions are made and resources allocated.[1] One of the objectives of achieving excellence in governance is to 'enhance education'.[2] The key areas of governance of the Department of Law of Jagannath University, inter alia, include adoption and circulation of its vision, mission and objectives; procedure of academic decision making, maintenance of academic calendar and observance of disciplinary rules.

As per the table below, 43%, 82%, 80% and 91% of the student, alumni, teaching staff and non-teaching staff respectively agree that the vision, mission and objectives of the entity are clearly stated. While 85% and 90% of the alumni and teaching staff respectively agree that academic decisions are taken by the entity with fairness and transparency, the current students and non-teaching staff remain aloof from making any comment on the issue. Though 42%, 70% and 50% student, alumni and teaching staff respectively express their positive note that the intended learning outcomes (ILOs) satisfy the stated mission and objectives but none of the non-teaching staffs made any comment on the point. On infrastructural issue, all the stakeholders showed their disagreement that the entity does not have adequate infrastructure but a quite opposite picture is seen on the question of following academic calendar as all of them positively say that academic calendar is followed properly. According to the table, majority of the current students agree that results of the entity are published timely in compliance with the ordinance while almost all the alumni, teaching-staff and non-teaching staff express their positive note on the issue. Similarly a majority of all the stakeholders are of the opinion that the entity reviews its policy and procedures periodically for further improvement. Although the current students are equally divided on the question of observance of code of conduct, greater percentage of the alumni, teaching and non-teaching staff agree that codes of conduct are followed and are well communicated.

A simple analysis of the data collected say that 58%, 76%, 60% and 82% of the current students, alumni, teaching and non-teaching staffs respectively say that disciplinary rules and regulations are explicitly defined and well circulated. At

---

[1] Grindle, Merilee S 2010, Good Governance: The Inflation of an Idea, *HKS Faculty Research Working Paper Series, RWP10-023*, John F Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, USA;available at:https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4448993/grindle_goodgovernance.pdf?sequence=1; accessed on 15 January 2019; p 2.

[2] B Holidaty, Perspective on Good Governance, Importance, Practice and Challenges, *University of Utrecht*, The Netherlands; available at: http://www. kabgsxm.com/lecture%20good% 20governance %20Utrecht%20february%2018%202013-final.pdf; accessed on 15 January 2019.

the same time, while 46% of the students think that website of the Department is not updated properly, almost equal percentage of them disagree with it. On this point, 39% of the alumni believe that website is not updated regularly but 60% of the faculty members and 91% of the non-teaching staff agree that departmental website is updated regularly. On the question whether, the entity provides comprehensive guidelines to the students in advance by means of a brochure/handbook to the students, the stakeholder express quite contradictory views as 48% of the student stakeholders say that it does not provide brochure or guidelines to the students but 61% of the alumni, 60% of the teachers and 73% of non-teaching staffs agree that the Department does provides so.

The table finds that 57% of the current students are of the opinion that the Department does not properly address the opinion of the students regarding academic and extra-academic matters though 67% of the alumni express their positive view on this issue. On the other hand, though 50% of the teaching staff expresses their positive view on this issue but the non-teaching staff remains aloof from making any comment on this issue.

Almost 73% of the alumni and 70 of the teaching staff agree that the entity ensures an environment conducive to learning but the current students and non-teaching staff do not make any comment on this question. Though 90% of the faculty members agree that documentations are maintained properly and decision making procedure in the entity is participatory. However, none of the students, alumni and non-teaching staffs make any comments on these issues.

Stakeholders' Overall Assessment on Governance of the Entity

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Teaching Staff		Non-teaching Staff	
	Disagree	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*
Vision, mission and objectives of the entity are clearly stated	33%	43%	12%	82%	0%	80%	0%	91%
Academic decisions are taken by the entity with fairness and transparency	---	---	12%	85%	0%	90%	---	---
The intended learning outcomes (ILOs) satisfy the stated mission and objectives	35%	42%	3%	70%	10%	50%	---	---
The entity has adequate infrastructures to satisfy its mission and objectives	78%	16%	30%	30%	70%	10%	55%	36%

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Teaching Staff		Non-teaching Staff	
	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree
Academic calendars are maintained strictly	17%	80%	6%	91%	0%	90%	0%	100%
Results are published timely in compliance with the ordinance	38%	54%	12%	88%	0%	100%	18%	82%
The entity reviews its policy and procedures periodically for further improvement	29%	48%	12%	76%	0%	80%	9%	82%
Codes of conduct for the students and employees are well communicated	39%	41%	9%	85%	10%	80%	0%	100%
Disciplinary rules and regulations are explicitly defined and well circulated	26%	58%	9%	76%	0%	60%	0%	82%
Website is updated properly	46%	41%	39%	33%	20%	60%	9%	91%
The entity provides comprehensive guidelines to the students in advance by means of a brochure/handbook	48%	39%	15%	61%	10%	60%	9%	73%
Students' opinion regarding academic and extra-academic matters are addressed properly	57%	34%	12%	67%	20%	50%	---	---
The entity ensures a conducive learning environment	---	---	15%	73%	10%	70%	---	---
Documentations are maintained properly	---	---	---	---	0%	90%	---	---
Decision making procedure in the entity is participatory	---	---	---	---	0%	90%	---	---

Table 2: Stakeholders' overall evaluation on Governance

[Here in every segment, percentage of agree= (strongly agree +agree) and percentage of disagree = (strongly disagree + disagree) and the rest denotes undecided]

From the above table, it becomes apparent that theentity does not have adequate infrastructures to satisfy its mission and objectives. However, it has a number of issues to be praised of, such as the POE has clearly defined vision, mission and objectives in line with the ILOs. Its results are published following the academic calendar. The entity reviews its policy and procedures periodically and maintains an ambience conducive to learning.

4.2. Curriculum Content Design and Review

Curriculum refers to a well-defined and prescribed course of studies, lessons and activities, which students must complete to fulfill the requirements for acquiring the degree.[3]Curriculum covers the knowledge, attitude, behaviour, manner, performance and skills that are imparted or inculcated in a student. It contains the teaching methods, lessons, assignments, physical and mental exercises, activities, projects, study material, tutorials, presentations, assessments, test series, learning objectives, and so on.[4]

A curriculum emphasises on school subjects and the knowledge included in them, guidelines for imparting that knowledge, providing the minimum knowledge, skills and values that learners must gain and articulating what vacuum designers and policy makers regard as important knowledge for learners and society.[5]

The Department of Law of Jagannath University has taken initiatives to design its curriculum. It is planning for its further enrichment.

The following table expresses the views of the current students, alumni and faculty members on the status of curriculum design and review. As the table speaks up, 67%, 85% and 70% of the current students, alumni and faculty members respective agree that courses in the curriculum from lower to higher levels are consistently arranged. Similarly, majority of them express their positive view that teaching strategies are clearly stated in the curriculum. As per table, 43%, 52% and 80% of student, alumni and faculty members respectively agree that assessment strategies are explicit in the curriculum. In response to a query whether curriculum load is optimum and exerts no pressure, 63% of the current students and 50% of the faculty members express their positive view though the 85% of the alumni say that curriculum load is normal and exerts no pressure.

---

[3] *SA Manual*, Criteria 2.

[4] For details see: https://keydifferences.com/difference-between-syllabus-and-curriculum.html; accessed on 15 January 2019.

[5] Y Reed, J Gultig& M Adendorff (eds), *Curriculum: organizing knowledge for the classroom* (3rd ed), (Cape Town: Oxford University Press), p 30. Cited in Petro du Preez and Shan Simmonds; Curriculum, curriculum development, curriculum studies? Problematising theoretical ambiguities in doctoral theses in the education field, *South African Journal of Education; 2014; 34(2);* available at: http://www.sajournalofeducation.co.za; accessed on 15 January 2019.

As it is found, 85% of the alumni and 70% of the teaching staff think that the curriculum is effective in achieving day-one skill which happens right at the beginning in the first day at job place but none of the current student express any opinion on this point. Finally, though 70%, 50% and 70% of the faculty members respectively agree that curriculum is reviewed and updated at regular intervals, opinions from the relevant stakeholders are duly considered during review of the curriculum and curriculum addresses the program objectives and program learning outcomes but the other stakeholders show their reluctance to express any opinion on these issues.

Stakeholders' Overall Evaluation on Curriculum Design and Review

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Faculty-member	
	Disagree	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*
Courses in the curriculum from lower to higher levels are consistently arranged	23%	67%	3%	85%	0%	70%
Teaching strategies are clearly stated in the curriculum	30%	56%	9%	58%	0%	50%
Assessment strategies are explicit in the curriculum	33%	43%	9%	52%	10%	80%
Curriculum load is optimum and exerts no pressure	63%	25%	12%	61%	50%	20%
The curriculum is effective in achieving day-one skill (which happens right at the beginning in the first day at job place	---	---	9%	66%	20%	50%
Curriculum is reviewed and updated at regular intervals	---	---	---	---	0%	70%
Opinions from the relevant stakeholders are duly considered during review of the curriculum	---	---	---	---	20%	50%

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Faculty-member	
	Disagree	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*
Curriculum addresses the program objectives and program learning outcomes	---	---	---	---	10%	70%

Table 3: Stakeholders' overall evaluation on curriculum design and review

[Here in every segment, percentage of agree= (strongly agree +agree) and percentage of disagree = (strongly disagree + disagree) and the rest denotes undecided]

From the above discussion it is evident that curriculum load is not optimum and exerts pressure. It also reveals that the courses in the curriculum from lower to higher levels are consistently arranged, teaching strategies are clearly stated in the curriculum, assessment strategies are explicit in the curriculum which is effective in achieving day-one skill.

4.3. Student Entry Qualification, Admission Procedure, Progress and Achievements

It is very important to have the eligibility of the students interested in higher education under a particular programme.[6] Prior educational attainment remains the best single indicator to complete an academic program successfully.[7] The eligibility requirements may vary from one programme to another and university to university.**[8]** Entry requirements are the minimum qualifications, knowledge, skills and/or experience that an applicant must have in favour of his candidature for a particular academic programme.**[9]**Similarly, for admission at the Department of Law of Jagannath University, the admission seekers are required to have certain criteria which may vary from year to year. The University Central Academic Committee is the final arbiter in this respect followed by the Syndicate.

The following table presents a summary of the views of the current students, alumni and faculty members on the question of student entry qualification,

---

[6] *SA Manual*, Criterion 2.3.1.
[7] *SA Manual*, Criterion 2.3.1.
[8] *SA Manual*, Criterion 2.3.1.
[9] *SA Manual*, Criterion 2.3.1.

admission procedure and achievements of the POE. According to the table, 66% of the current students, 88% of the alumni and 100% of the faculty members agree to the view that admission policy ensures entry of quality students. In response to a query whether commitments among students is observed to ensure desired progress and achievement, 46%, 73% and 60% of the current students, alumni and teaching staffs respectively express their positive view and the question of fairness in the admission procedure, 66% of the alumni and 90% teaching staffs express similar view but the current students find no interest to make any comment.

However, an opposite picture is found among the stakeholders on the question of recording and monitoring of students' progress. On this issue, 54% current students express their negative view but 67% of the alumni do the opposite to them. According to 39%, 58% and 50% of the current students, alumni and faculty members respectively, the teachers provide regular feedback to the students about their progress though 46% of the current students do not agree with this view. About 40% of the students, 58% of the alumni and 70% of the faculty members agree that the entity maintains individual student's records properly. However, 44% of the current students do not subscribe to this view.

Stakeholders' Overall Evaluation on Student Entry Qualification, Admission Procedure, Progress and Achievements

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Faculty-member	
	Disagree	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*
Admission policy ensures entry of quality students	27%	66%	9%	88%	0%	100%
Commitment among students is observed to ensure desired progress and achievement	37%	46%	6%	73%	10%	60%
Admission procedure is quite fair	---	---	9%	66%	0%	90%
Students' progress are regularly recorded and monitored	54%	35%	9%	67%	20%	30%

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Faculty-member	
	Disagree	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*
Teachers provide regular feedback to the students about their progress	46%	39%	27%	58%	30%	50%
The entity maintains individual student's records properly	44%	40%	15%	58%	20%	70%

Table 4: Stakeholders' overall evaluation on student entry qualification, admission procedure, progress and achievements

[Here in every segment, percentage of agree= (strongly agree +agree) and percentage of disagree = (strongly disagree + disagree) and the rest denotes undecided]

The analysis made above shows that there is no weakness in student entry qualifications, admission procedure and progress and achievements. Besides, it demonstrates that admission policy ensures entry of quality students, commitment among students is observed to ensure desired progress and achievement and admission procedure is quite fair. It further states that students' progress are regularly recorded and monitored, teachers provide regular feedback to the students about their progress and the entity maintains individual student's records properly.

4.4. Structure and Facilities

Infrastructural facilities are *sine qua non* for academic institutions to flourish and impart quality education to the learners. Students and staff of both categories can maintain a peaceful life during their stay in their respective academic institutions if such institutions are well designed in terms of physical structure and other equipments necessary for exercise of inner faculty of the learners. Buildings, classrooms, laboratories, and equipment- education infrastructure - are crucial elements of learning environments in educational institutions. There is strong evidence that high-quality infrastructure facilitates better instruction, improves student outcomes, and reduces dropout rates, among other benefits.[10]

---

[10] See: Why education infrastructure matters for learning; available at: http://blogs. worldbank. org/ education/why-education-infrastructure-matters-learning; accessed on 15 January 2019.

The table below shows the overall evaluation of the stakeholders on the structure and facilities of Jagannath University in general and the POE in particular. The stakeholders in general believe that the university does not have adequate structure and required facilities to meet the demand of the time. As for instance, 81% of the current student and 90% of the faculty members do not agree that the POE has classroom facilities suitable for ensuring effective learning though the alumni are found almost equally divided on the issue, 42% disagreeing while 39% of them agree that it has such facilities. On the question of laboratory facilities, 45% and 80% alumni and teaching-staff respectively believe that the Department of Law does not have laboratory facilities congenial for practical teaching-learning though the current students show reluctance in making any comment on the issue. The table points out that 92% of the students, 48% of the alumni and 70% of the teaching staff disagree to the proposition that the POE has adequate research facilities for conducting research.

Stakeholders' Overall Evaluation on Structure and Facilities

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Teaching-staff	
	Disagree	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*
Classroom facilities are suitable for ensuring effective learning	81%	13%	42%	39%	90%	10%
Laboratory facilities are congenial for practical teaching-learning	---	---	45%	18%	80%	10%
Facilities for conducting research are adequate	92%	4%	48%	18%	70%	10%
The library has adequate up-to-date reading and reference materials to meet the academic & research needs	96%	1%	52%	15%	80%	10%
Indoor and outdoor medical facilities are adequate	---	---	61%	15%	70%	10%
There are adequate sports facilities (indoor and outdoor)	---	---	48%	24%	90%	0%

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Teaching-staff	
	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree
Existing gymnasium facilities are good enough	---	---	82%	9%	90%	0%
Office equipment are adequate to support the students' need	---	---	---	---	80%	10%
Seminar room and access to internet facilities with sufficient speed are available	94%	4%	64%	27%	30%	70%

Table 5: Stakeholders' overall evaluation on structure and facilities

[Here in every segment, percentage of agree= (strongly agree +agree) and percentage of disagree = (strongly disagree + disagree) and the rest denotes undecided]

The above analysis of data brings a clear picture of the downtrodden infrastructural condition of the University in every sector. It shows that the class room facilities are not suitable for effective learning, facilities for conducting research are not adequate and the library does not have adequate up-to-date reading and reference materials to meet the academic and research needs. It is also clear conspicuous from the analysis that there is no adequate arrangement for indoor and outdoor medical facilities and sport facilities including gymnasium. More importantly, seminar room and access to internet facilities with sufficient speed are not available.

4.5 .Teaching and Learning Assessment

Assessment is the process of gathering and discussing information from multiple and diverse sources in order to develop a deep understanding of what students know, understand and can do with their knowledge as a result of their educational experiences.[11]

The table given below provides information about the stakeholders' overall assessment on teaching evaluation of the Department of Law. According to the table, 61% of the students, 88% of the alumni and 50% of the faculty members

---

[11] Dr Declan Kennedy, Department of Education, University College Cork, Ireland; Linking Learning Outcomes to Teaching and Learning Activities and to Assessment; available at: http://smpf.lt/uploads/ extra/mokymai/Linking% 20LO%20to%20 Teaching%20 and% 20 Learning %20activities%20and%20to%20Assessment_DC.pdf; accessed on 15 January 2019.

agree that teaching learning is interactive and supportive. While 68% of the students and 70% of the faculty members disagree that class size is optimum for interactive teaching learning, 52% of the alumni agree that it is optimum for interactive for teaching learning. Of the stakeholders, 76% students and 60% faculty members show their disagreement to the view that the entity provides adequate opportunities for practical exercises to apply in real life situation though majority of the alumni participants subscribe to the same. However a contradictory view is found between the alumni and the faculty members on the question of students' attainment of practical knowledge as 52% of the former agree while 60% of the latter disagree to the view.

Of the participating stakeholders, a majority of students participating in the survey do not agree with the view that modern devices are used to improve teaching-learning process though 85% of the alumni and 60% of the faculty members agree that the modern devices are used for teaching learning purposes. On the issue of diversification of methods used for attaining learning objectives, view of the current students is quite opposite to that of alumni and faculty members as the former group deny subscribing to it though the latter group agrees that such methods are practised for achieving learning objectives. The table shows that 63% of the students, 88% alumni and 80% of the teaching staff think that lesson plans or course outlines are provided to the students in advance though a small percentage of the students disagree to this proposition.

Stakeholders' Overall Evaluation on Teaching Assessment

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Faculty-member	
	Disagree	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*
Teaching-learning is interactive and supportive	29%	61%	3%	88%	20%	50%
Class size is optimum for interactive teaching learning	68%	26%	30%	52%	70%	30%
Entity provides adequate opportunities for practical exercises to apply in real life situation.	76%	13%	21%	61%	60%	30%
Students attained additional practical ideas apart from class	---	---	21%	52%	60%	20%

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Faculty-member	
	Disagree	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*
room teaching						
Modern devices are used to improve teaching-learning process	54%	40%	6%	85%	30%	60%
Diverse methods are practiced to achieve learning objectives	54%	18%	21%	48%	30%	40%
Lesson plans/course outlines are provided to the students in advance	29%	63%	9%	88%	0%	80%

Table 6: Stakeholders' overall evaluation on teaching assessment

[Here in every segment, percentage of agree= (strongly agree +agree) and percentage of disagree = (strongly disagree + disagree) and the rest denotes undecided]

The following table offers data about the learning assessment of the POE. As it is stated, 49% students, 94% alumni and 70% faculty members agree that assessment systems are duly communicated to students at the outset of the term or semester. About 49%, 79% and 80% of the students, alumni and teaching staff respectively agree that assessment procedures meet the objective of the course. The data shown on the table says that 60% of faculty members make positive view that the assessment system is reviewed at regular intervals. However, the students and alumni refrain from making any comment on the issue.

In response to a query as to whether both formative (quizzes, assignments, term papers, continuous assessments, presentations etc.) and summative assessment (final examination) strategies are followed, 44%, 76% and 70% of the students, alumni and teaching staff respectively answer in the affirmative though the 54% of the students disagree with the view that diverse methods are used for

assessment compared to 45% alumni and 60% teaching staff agree to this proposition. To 54% of the current students participating in the survey, the students are not provided feedback immediately after assessment but 67% alumni and 50% teaching staff show their positive view to the same. Finally, it is seen that to 80% of the teaching staff, fairness and transparency is maintained in assessment system while the other participants show reluctance in making any comment on this issue.

Stakeholders' Overall Evaluation on Learning Assessment

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Faculty-member	
	Disagree	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*
Assessment systems are duly communicated to students at the outset of the term/semester	42%	49%	3%	94%	20%	70%
Assessment procedures meet the objectives of the course	32%	49%	9%	79%	10%	80%
The assessment system is reviewed at regular intervals	---	---	---	---	30%	60%
Both formative (quizzes, assignments, term papers, continuous assessments, presentations etc.) and summative assessment (final examination) strategies are followed	36%	44%	6%	76%	20%	70%
Diverse methods are used for assessment	54%	19%	18%	45%	30%	60%
The students are provided feedback immediately after assessment	54%	29%	15%	67%	40%	50%

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Faculty-member	
	Disagree	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*
Fairness and transparency is maintained in assessment system	---	---	---	---	10%	80%

Table 7: Stakeholders' overall evaluation on learning assessment

[Here in every segment, percentage of agree= (strongly agree +agree) and percentage of disagree = (strongly disagree + disagree) and the rest denotes undecided]

What appears from the foregoing discussion is that the class size is not suitable for interactive teaching learning and the entity provides inadequate opportunities for practical exercises to apply in real life situation. However some positive features also come out from the analysis as the data find teaching-learning is interactive and supportive, use of modern device in teaching learning process and practice of diverse methods to achieve learning objectives. Moreover, supply of lesion plan in advance, timely communication of assessment results and use of both formative (quizzes, assignments, term papers, continuous assessments, presentations etc.) and summative assessment (final examination) strategies are some of the mentionable features of the entity.

4.6. Student Support Services

A Student support service programme provides opportunities for academic development, assists students with basic institutional requirements, and serves to motivate students toward the successful completion of their postsecondary education.[12] The major areas that occupies the term student support services are cost affordability, financial aid, academic reputation, size of institution, opportunity to play sports, recommendations from family or friends, geographic setting, campus appearance and personalized attention prior to enrollment.[13] Student support services programme intends to provide academic assistance and encouragement to 'academically disadvantaged populations'.[14] These

---

[12] Caren Kelley-hall, "THE ROLE OF STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES IN ENCOURAGING STUDENT INVOLVEMENT AND ITS IMPACT ON STUDENT PERCEPTIONS AND ACADEMIC EXPERIENCES" (2010), *All Dissertations*, 546, available at: https://tigerprints. clemson. edu/ all_dissertations/ 546; accessed on 16 January 2019, p 19.

[13] Andrea Marie Cummings, 'The Impact of Student Support Services on Academic Success at a Select Historically Black College and University' (2014), *UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations*, 532; available at: https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd/532; accessed on 16 January 2019, p 125.

[14] Caren Kelley-hall, "THE ROLE OF STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES IN ENCOURAGING STUDENT INVOLVEMENT AND ITS IMPACT ON STUDENT PERCEPTIONS AND

programmes not only assist students with communication, interpersonal skills, engagement, academic growth, and critical thinking but also provide all-encompassing access to the larger institutional community and its resources for further development.[15]

The following table offers a presentation on overall evaluation of the stakeholders on the student support services. It is seen that 60% of the students disagree to the view that there is an arrangement in the entity to provide an academic guidance and counseling though 48% of alumni and 100% of the faculty members express the contradictory view. Around 68% of the students and 36% of the alumni disagree to the view that financial grants are available to the students in case of hardship but 60% of the teaching staff agree that such grants are provided to the students in hardship. Again, 68% of the students and 40% of the faculty members think that the entity does not provide co-curricular and extra-curricular exposures to the students but 64% of the alumni express opposite view in this regard. It appears from the table that 43% of the student and 42% of the alumni are of the opinion that the Department has an organised and supportive alumni association but 80% of the faculty members express opposite view. Meanwhile, majority of the students do not believe that the entity collects alumni feedback to update the learning outcomes of the programme though 50% of the faculty members stand opposite to this view. Finally on the question of whether there are opportunities to be involved with community services, students and teachers answer in the negative though the alumni take a neutral position.

Stakeholders' Overall Evaluation on Student Support Services

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Faculty-member	
	Disagree	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*
There is an arrangement in the entity to provide an academic guidance and counseling	60%	24%	18%	48%	0%	100%
Financial grants are available to the students in	68%	21%	36%	27%	30%	60%

ACADEMIC EXPERIENCES" (2010), *All Dissertations*, 546, available at: https:// tigerprints. clemson. edu/all_dissertations/ 546; accessed on 16 January 2019, p 1.

[15] Caren Kelley-hall, "THE ROLE OF STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES IN ENCOURAGING STUDENT INVOLVEMENT AND ITS IMPACT ON STUDENT PERCEPTIONS AND ACADEMIC EXPERIENCES" (2010), *All Dissertations*, 546; available at: https; accessed on 16 January 2019, p 79.

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Faculty-member	
	Disagree	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*
case of hardship						
The entity provides co-curricular and extra-curricular exposures to the students	68%	18%	18%	64%	40%	30%
There is an organized and supportive alumni association	43%	46%	42%	36%	20%	80%
The entity collects alumni feedback to update the learning outcomes of the program	51%	24%	24%	36%	40%	50%
There are opportunities to be involved with community services	51%	27%	33%	33%	50%	20%

Table 8: Stakeholders' overall evaluation on students support services

[Here in every segment, percentage of agree= (strongly agree +agree) and percentage of disagree = (strongly disagree + disagree) and the rest denotes undecided]

It is evidenced from the above analysis that the entity is unable to provide co-curricular and extra-curricular facilities to the students due its physical facilities constraints. It also cannot render community services for the same reason. On the other hand, the entity provides academic guidance and counseling and collects alumni feedback to update the learning outcomes of the programme. The entity is blessed to have an organised and supportive alumni association.

4.7. Staff and Facilities

Basically an academic institution is officially manned by two classes of staff, academic and non-academic. Compared to the academic, the non-academic staffs are vested with the duty to carry out the decisions made by the institution. On the other hand, academic staffs though principally discharge their duties

through imparting and creating knowledge through triggering the latent faculties of the learners, they are also very found doing the non-academic jobs. Regardless of the nature of the job they carry out, staffs of both classes are the treasure trove of an academic institution particularly of a university. The reputation and achievement of a university largely depend upon the qualities and excellences of its staff specially the faculty members. The academic and non-academic staffs are the 'major players' in teaching learning and research sector.[16] Success of a programme offering entity, by and large, depends upon the 'efficiency and commitment' of these staffs.[17] Fair recruitment process, lucrative salary and incentives, well-formulated and transparent promotional policies and necessary training can make them more efficient and committed to carry out the very objectives of inaugurating the entity.[18]

The following table contains information concerning stakeholders' overall evaluation on staff and facilities of POE. Almost all the faculty members and non-teaching staff agree that the recruitment policy and practices of the University are good enough for recruitment of competent academic and non-academic staff though they have some different views regarding salary and incentives. In this respect, 50% of the teachers and 73% of the non-teaching staff think that salary and incentives are attractive but a small percentage of them think otherwise. It is found that 60% faculty members and 73% non-teaching staff subscribe to the view that good team spirit exists among different academic staff but a few of them disagree with it.

The table shows that the faculty members are equally divided on the issue of congenial atmosphere of the Department though majority of the non-teaching stakeholders express opposite view concurring that a congenial atmosphere prevails to enhance professional knowledge through research and higher studies. The teaching staffs do not believe that academics have enough opportunity to take part in different seminar/workshop/training programs for skill development which is quite opposite to the view expressed by the non-teaching staff.

While both the teaching and non-teaching staff disagree to the view that non-academics have enough opportunity to take part in different training programs for skill development, 50% of the teaching staff disagree that the entity has a policy to provide mentoring/continuous guidance for new academic staff. While responding to the query whether the entity holds seminars and workshops to share knowledge and experience among the faculty members, 50% of the teaching staff answer to the negative but 82% of the non-teaching staff answer in the positive. Almost all the teachers agree to the proposition that the entity has a performance award policy to inspire academic staff. Though a small

---

16 *SA Manual*, Criteria 2.7.
17 *SA Manual*, Criteria 2.7.
18 *SA Manual*, Criteria 2.7.1.

fraction of the non-teaching staff expresses different standing on this aspect of the entity 55% of them agree that the entity has such performance award policy. In responding the to the last query, 50% and 64% of the teachers and non-teaching staff respectively agree that performance indicators are the criteria for promotion/up-gradation.

Stakeholders' overall Evaluation on Staff and Facilities

Aspects of Evaluation	Faculty-member		Non-teaching Staff	
	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree
Recruitment policy and practices are good enough for recruitment of competent academic and non-academic staff	20%	80%	0%	91%
Salary and incentives are attractive enough to retain the academic and non-academic staff	30%	50%	9%	73%
Good team spirit exists among different academic staff	30%	60%	0%	73%
A congenial atmosphere prevails to enhance professional knowledge through research and higher studies	40%	40%	18%	64%
Academics have enough opportunity to take part in different seminar/workshop/training programs for skill development	60%	30%	18%	73%
Non-academics have enough opportunity to take part in different training programs for skill development	70%	20%	45%	36%
The entity has a policy to provide mentoring/continuous guidance for new academic staff	50%	20%	---	---
The entity practices seminars and workshops to share knowledge and experience among the faculty members	50%	30%	9%	82%
The entity has a performance award policy to inspire academic staff	0%	90%	36%	55%
Performance indicators are the criteria for promotion/up-gradation	30%	50%	27%	64%

Table 9: Stakeholders' overall evaluation on staff and facilities
[Here in every segment, percentage of agree= (strongly agree +agree) and percentage of disagree = (strongly disagree + disagree) and the rest denotes undecided]

What is evident from the foregoing data scrutiny is that the academics and non-academic do not have enough opportunity to take part in different seminar/workshop/training programs for skill development. In addition, the entity does not have policy to provide mentoring/continuous guidance for new academic staff. But with all these odds, there are some positive sides in the entity as its recruitment policy and practices are good enough for recruitment of the competent academic and non-academic staffs with attractive salaries and incentives. The entity also has a good team spirit with congenial atmosphere to enhance professional knowledge through research and higher studies.

4.8. Research and Extension Services

A university typically called a place of learning and research. It is a general proposition that the higher in rank the position of a university, the wider is its research ability and research services. In the present day world, research is converted to a 'strategic goal' as a mean to 'improve competitiveness' to attract better and bigger financing and larger numbers of students.[19]The growing interest in research can be verified at universities 'strategic plans', 'international academics rankings' and 'higher-education accreditation agencies'.[20]

Library of a university is considered as a home to its research activities. The major indicators of a research service programme at a library are its research support link, advances reference services, research support training self-training guide, scientific writing support and repository management.[21]The research services of the university that it provides through university is its open access support, information evaluation, intellectual property support, special documents support and research data support.[22]Bibliographic/Content management, research metrics, social networks profiles, researcher identification and

---

[19] Viviana Fernández-Marcial, Luis Miguel Costa, and Llarina González-Solar, "Top Universities, Top Libraries: Do Research Services in Academic Libraries Contribute to University Output?" *Proceedings of the IATUL Conferences;* Paper 2; available at: http://docs.lib.purdue. edu/iatul/2016/spaces/2, p 2.

[20] Viviana Fernández-Marcial, Luis Miguel Costa, and Llarina González-Solar, "Top Universities, Top Libraries: Do Research Services in Academic Libraries Contribute to University Output?" *Proceedings of the IATUL Conferences;* Paper 2; available at: http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/ iatul/2016/spaces/2, p 2.

[21] Viviana Fernández-Marcial, Luis Miguel Costa, and Llarina González-Solar, "Top Universities, Top Libraries: Do Research Services in Academic Libraries Contribute to University Output?" *Proceedings of the IATUL Conferences;* Paper 2; available at: http://docs.lib.purdue. edu/iatul/2016/spaces/2, p 4.

[22] Viviana Fernández-Marcial, Luis Miguel Costa, and Llarina González-Solar, "Top Universities, Top Libraries: Do Research Services in Academic Libraries Contribute to University Output?" *Proceedings of the IATUL Conferences;* Paper 2; available at: http://docs.lib.purdue. edu/iatul/2016/spaces/2, p 4.

institutional cooperation also come under the ambit of research services of a university.[23]

On the other hand, extension services of a university include official support for use of university rooms, telephones, library, audio- visual equipment etc. for extension services directed at off- campus communities and organisations.[24]

The table inserted below pictures out the various aspects of the Department of Law regarding research and extension services. Current students, alumni and faculty members are the stakeholders in this case. In the opinion of 71% of the students, the entity lacks a well-defined research and development policy but majority of the alumni stakeholders agree to this view while the faculty members become equally divided on this point. Similar type of opinion is seen among the students on the question of engagement of the students in research. Almost 79% of them disagree to the view that the POE has mechanism exists for engaging the students in research and development while 64% of the alumni and 30% of the teachers agree to this view. Do the teachers always take initiative to hunt research fund for smooth running of the research? About 60% of the teachers answer this question affirmatively and the students and alumni show their reluctance to make any comment. A small component of the alumni and faculty members subscribe to the view that the entity has a community service policy while student remain aloof from making any comment.

Stakeholders' Overall Evaluation on Research and Extension Services

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Faculty-member	
	Disagree	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*
The entity has a well-defined research and development policy	71%	17%	15%	64%	40%	40%
Mechanism exists for engaging the	79%	13%	9%	64%	30%	30%

23 Viviana Fernández-Marcial, Luis Miguel Costa, and Llarina González-Solar, "Top Universities, Top Libraries: Do Research Services in Academic Libraries Contribute to University Output?" *Proceedings of the IATUL Conferences;* Paper 2; available at: http://docs.lib.purdue.edu /iatul/2016/spaces/2, p 4.
24 Dave Cooper, 'Extension Service Work at University'; available at: http://pdfproc.lib.msu.edu/? file=/DMC/African%20Journals/pdfs/transformation/tran018/tran018020.pdf; accessed on 16 January 2019, p 14.

Aspects of Evaluation	Student		Alumni		Faculty-member	
	Disagree	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*
students in research and development						
Teachers always take initiative to hunt research fund for smooth for running of the research	---	---	---	---	30%	60%
The entity has a community service policy	---	---	30%	21%	20%	40%

Table 10: Stakeholders' overall evaluation on research and extension services

[Here in every segment, percentage of agree= (strongly agree +agree) and percentage of disagree = (strongly disagree + disagree) and the rest denotes undecided]

With this deliberation, it is found that the entity suffers from the absence of a well-defined research and development policy despite its having a mechanism to engage students in research and development works.

4.9 Internal Process Control and Continuous Improvement

Quality assurance system refers to a set of administrative and procedural activities with systematic assessment in respect of standard, feedback, remedial measures and monitoring.[25]The total system is focused on process output, which refers to quality in education and achievement of objectives.[26] Several interventions are needed to assure internal quality and continuous improvement, which includes faculty development, external evaluation, linking program with corporate world, adopting good practices and developing quality culture in all walks of academic management.[27] The processes by which QA activities will be executed and quality in education will be assured must be in place, properly managed, periodically reviewed, evaluated and updated for continuous improvement.[28]Top management of the university should have commitment for developing quality culture which recognizes the importance quality assurance in practice.[29]

---

[25] *SA Manual*, Criteria 9.
[26] *SA Manual*, Criteria 9.
[27] *SA Manual*, Criteria 9.
[28] *SA Manual*, Criteria 9.
[29] *SA Manual,* Criteria 9.

The table given below gives a brief analysis of stakeholders' feedback on internal process control in the entity. Almost all the participating stakeholders respectively agree to the view that the entity always acts in compliance with the decision of the university regarding continuous quality improvement, the entity embraces the spirit of continual quality improvement, academic programs are reviewed by the entity for the enhancement students' learning and the entity ensures a usual practice for students'/ alumni's feedback as a culture.

Stakeholders' Feedback on Internal Process Control in the Entity

Aspects of Evaluation	Disagree	Agree	Undecided
The entity always acts in compliance with the decision of the university regarding continuous quality improvement	0%	90%	10%
The entity embraces the spirit of continual quality improvement	10%	90%	0%
Academic programs are reviewed by the entity for the enhancement students' learning	20%	70%	10%
The entity ensures a usual practice for students'/ Alumni's feedback as a culture	10%	60%	30%

Table 11: Stakeholders' Feedback on Internal Process Control in the Entity

The data for collected for the purpose of internal process control demonstrates that the entity always acts in compliance with the decision of the university regarding continuous quality improvement and embraces the spirit of continual quality improvement.

5. The PSAIP for the Department of Law of Jagannath University

The following steps are recommended to be taken in the PSAIP for the Department of Law of Jagannath University so as to improve the status of it.

A. Governance

(i)   Vision, mission and objectives of the programmes will be updated regularly and will be circulated to the stakeholders;

(ii) The Academic Committee will take appropriate steps to prepare Graduate Profile with a description of the competencies of the graduate and

(iii) The Department in collaboration with the Faculty will prepare a Student Handbook and a Faculty Handbook.

B. Curriculum

(i)   Organizing workshops to develop content-based curriculum;

(ii) POE will discuss to integrate more clinical courses;

(iii) The POE will adopt policy to invite guest lecturers for various clinical legal courses and

(iv) The POE will take necessary steps in this regard.

C. Structure and facilities

(i)   The Authority will take urgent initiative to provide the teachers office space with individual computer;

(ii) The Authority will take urgent initiative to provide more class room to the Department;

(iii) Authority will arrange for separate common room for male and female students and

(iv) The Authority will take urgent initiative to develop the structure and facilities of the University in general and the entity in particular.

D. Student admission and progress

(i)   The Department will introduce a formal system to track weak and slow learners and

(ii) The Department will introduce the Best Student Award for each semester.

E. Teaching learning and assessment

(i)   The Department in collaboration with the University will chalk out mechanisms for introducing teaching performance evaluation mechanism and formalize the existing peer observation system;

(ii) The Department will seek assistance from Authority to organize international workshop on curricula;

(iii) The Department will think over the issue and decide the matter in its Academic Committee meeting;

(iv) The Department will seek assistance from the University for alternative of fans during class and

(v)   The Department and individual course teacher will take initiative in this regard.

F. Student support services

(i) The Department will arrange for career counseling session for the students;

(ii) The Department will take initiative to arrange visit court functioning including human rights organizations to have practical knowledge of court proceeding and functioning of the organizations in the field of law and

(iii) The University Authority will take initiatives to increase the number of books in both formats.

G. Staff and facilities

(i) The Department will arrange for impart training and orientation to the newly recruited teachers and staff;

(ii) The Department will seek assistance of the University Authority to establish a moot court and seminar library and appoint staff for in each case and

(iii) The Department will communicate foreign universities to enter *Memorandum of Understanding* with them.

H. Research and extension

(i) The Department in collaboration with the University will engage the faculty members in research and provide research funds and

(ii) The Department in collaboration with the University will arrange for organizing national and international seminar and conference.

I. Internal process management

(i) The Department in collaboration with the University will take initiatives to impart training on IT, learning skills, effective questioning etc. and

(ii) The Department, the IQAC and the University Authority jointly will prepare a well-designed database and management information system to facilitate communication between the IQAC and the SAC of the Department.

6. Recommendation

To create a full-fledged university with all modern facilities, the authors of this article consider the following measures to be taken for the overall development of Jagannath University particularly the Department of Law:

(i) The infrastructure of the University shall be developed with all modern facilities which include academic buildings, administrative buildings, residential buildings for staff and students, TSCC, games and sports facilities etc.

(ii)   The library should be equipped with more books both in terms of hard copy and soft copy including wider access to e-books and e-journals.

(iii)   Internet facilities should be more accessible. It should be speedier.

(iv)   Communication facilities should be more convenient and widely accessible. To this end, more buses should be integrated to the communication pool for the staff and students.

(v)   The curriculum should be made complete and reviewed periodically and

(vi)   Feedback from the stakeholders should be gathered regularly with a view to enriching the curriculum and the improving the governance.

7. Conclusion

It is a desire of every institution to reach the peak of success. The Department of Law of Jagannath University is no exception to this. It wants to produce graduates with such skills and qualities with the help of which they will be able to offer the best in the global competitive market. However, to achieve success, an institution needs to frame policy and design action plan with required financial implications. Accordingly, the Department of Law of Jagannath University, with a view to accomplishing its desired goals, has identified its QA areas and framed the abovementioned action plan with required financial implications for the period of 2018-2021. It is highly expected that the Department will be able to reach its zenith if the concerned authorities equip it with necessary financial and other assistances.