All case studies were equally weighted for purposes of assessment and assistance was provided to students in the research methods necessary in order to undertake the case studies. This took place via a study skills session and supporting handout, where recognised methods of collecting relevant literature and constructing legal arguments were discussed with students.

Perhaps the first point to recognise in the study is that a behaviourist/ cognitive split for levels I and II is not universally accepted and it cannot be relied upon in all cases of assessment because these two sets of theories are not mutually contradictory. Those engaged in teaching and instruction can, however, draw usefully upon them both, and see each of them as having greater or lesser relevance depending upon the level at which learning is intended to occur.

The grading system used for the study proved to be useful and consistent. There were, however, a number of shortcomings identified at both levels I and II. Level I saw a burdensome number of Progress Tests, leaving insufficient time between each test to provide opportunities for students to consider lessons learnt at each stage. The problem of using the behaviourist model of assessment, in determining the method to be used in assessing the Progress Tests for level I must also be considered. This issue arose during the Progress Boards held at the inter-semester break. The student profiles were considered and it became evident that there were gaps in the assessment profiles of a number of students, due to non-attendance for tests.

In analysing student achievement in the tests, the questions were designed to gradually increase in difficulty throughout the year. The results tend to show a fluctuating pattern of achievement. The results and student feedback suggest that, despite the fact that the behaviourist pattern has been used in preparing students towards a desired goal, they actually identify with different subject areas in differing ways, depending upon their association with other fields.

At level II the emphasis here was upon addressing issues in a 'meaningful' way, through shared and personal experience. Assignment 1 was based upon areas of experience related to Intellectual Property (Trade Marks and Patents) where students were encouraged, during lecture and seminar sessions, to draw parallels with industry and methods of dealing with these issues.

It has been recognised that a generic distinction between establishing assessment strategies for levels I and II is not universally accepted. The author submits, however, that the study has clarified methods by which, using both behaviourist and cognitive approaches to assessment, course content can be effectively tailored to areas of assessment and student requirements. In the author's view this constructive, if not definitive, distinction between behaviourist and cognitive approaches to teaching and learning is useful. The author also believes that the use of student feedback ensures a constant 'keeping in touch' with student requirements at each level of the study. From a general point of view, despite the previously acknowledged difficulty in drawing stark lines between the two approaches to assessment, conclusions from the study indicate that the use of the two approaches in isolation at each level, has resulted in a generally useful and constructive outcome.

Evaluating a change to seminar-style teaching
K Anker, C Dauvergne, M Findlay & J Millbank
11 *Legal Educ Rev* 1, 2000, pp 97-144

While the use of small to medium-sized seminar-style groups has long been a feature of some Australian law faculties, it is a recent innovation in others. In 1996 the Faculty of Law at the University of Sydney made a decision to move from a traditional lecture and tutorial structure to seminar-style classes of limited size. The faculty vote to adopt what was termed 'seminar style' (small-medium group) teaching followed a long process of curriculum review. This included the integration of skills

and substantive knowledge within units, and building up a synergy between all aspects of a unit - information, teaching methods, materials and assessment.

If students learn by doing, then in the traditional lecture format learning is largely limited to listening, note-taking, bulk reading and summarising, and verbatim regurgitation of information in an exam, particularly when it is readily admitted by students that knowledge gained in this way is often not retained in the long term.

Extrapolating back from the work that lawyers do produces a vast list of abilities, which may be broken down into categories, such as cognitive and skills objectives and objectives relating to values and motivation. When this is done, it becomes clear that the generic goals for educating lawyers are in fact the same as the ideals of a good university education - the liberal education of the whole person.

Student interaction in class discussion has radical implications in shifting the focus away from teachers as authoritative transmitters of meaning, to students as constructors of meaning. If student participation in discussion can help produce a degree of critical reflection necessary to put law into a wider theoretical context, then experiential exercises can provide the complementary context of law in operation.

There is nothing which prescribes the seminar method as the only model for teaching law. Some examples of teaching models and techniques which have been implemented in law schools around Australia indicate a variety of ways in which these issues can be addressed. The adoption of the seminar method does not guarantee that most or even many of the above elements will be incorporated into the classroom environment. It does, however, provide a space that is much more amenable to student participation and to student/instructor and student/student interaction, which can be used to encourage variety and experimentation in method and assessment.

An internal impetus for change within the faculty was the feeling that there was an urgent need to improve the quality of the teaching and learning experience of both staff and students. Student feedback for compulsory courses indicated a negative student response to large lectures with low levels of student participation.

A review of how this model was working in practice was conducted. Its general aims were to take stock of the opportunities provided by seminar-style teaching, identify when and how generic skills were being taught, and to reflect on how the discrete units fitted together to constitute our degree program. Students' views were sought through a combination of surveys and focus group research.

Many staff and student concerns centred upon what was actually happening in the classroom as a result of the new model (such as difficulty in initiating, or controlling, student interaction, and assessing student participation). The majority of instructors expressed the view that the seminar model offered advantages over the previous lecture/tutorial format. Benefits included a more relaxed teaching environment, with groups offering far more scope for personal interaction, questions, and student contribution than large lectures.

While there was generalised support for the new model, students and teachers both identified some reservations. Student concerns were directed more towards what happened in each individual class, rather than the model as a whole, and reflected anxiety about their own performance and marks. Staff concerns were focused on the difficulties of putting the model into practice - how to generate (and to appropriately assess) participation, manage discussion, interact with an often sizeable group, and structure classes so that the range of desired material was covered.

Students tended to take one of two contrasting positions on the new model, depending upon the delivery style they were experiencing. Those who were experiencing the new model in a fully interactive manner expressed some resistance based on fears that they would not 'learn

enough' from discussion, while those who were receiving less interaction were often frustrated and bored. There was observably less resistance over time as students became accustomed to the different requirements of seminar-style teaching, and both students and instructors gained experience in the new format.

For some instructors, the shift in teaching culture was a fairly abrupt one, and they felt the stresses of trying to make it work in practice and to adapt both their own and the students' expectations to the new model. Generating and controlling discussion was seen as something which was not always easy.

As part of the staff interviews, instructors were asked for solutions they adopted as well as the problems they faced. This discussion generated a great many ideas and demonstrated that the new model is being implemented in a wide variety of ways. Interaction is significantly assisted when instructors know their students' names. Breaking down student resistance to discussion, whether through inertia or shyness, may require different approaches.

Given the considerable feedback relating to both the challenges faced by staff and students and the solutions proposed by staff, various recommendations were formulated which were directed towards making the new model work better in practice in the classroom. Several of these recommendations related to developing better staff training, both internally and externally.

The audit review found that the move to seminar-style teaching has necessitated a change of culture, both at the micro level of what is happening in the classroom and at the macro level of program delivery. Within the classroom there have been issues of adjustment as staff and students become accustomed to the new model and struggle, at time, to make it work effectively. Methods of didactic teaching have reflected and reinforced traditional conceptions of law as a discipline. The perceived need to find 'the right answer' may undermine students' willingness to engage in discussion-based learn-

ing, even though many admit to finding it a more interesting way to learn. What becomes clear is that, in implementing a model of learning which is unfamiliar to many students and instructors, it is vital that students be given clear instructions as to what is expected of them and the purpose of their activities.

Student-led classes and group work: a methodology for developing generic skills
A Greig
11 *Legal Educ Rev* 1, 2000, pp 81-95

The challenge for any educator is to make the process of learning interesting. In practice, this entails acceptance of the fact that the purpose of education is to stimulate inquiry and skill in the process of knowledge getting, rather than requiring students to memorise a body of knowledge. While traditional legal education emphasised the acquisition of knowledge or cognitive learning, today professional legal education must seek to achieve other goals, including the ability to use that knowledge in a legal context; and the cultivation of other social and interpersonal characteristics and qualities.

Over the last two years, an assessment task has been used at the University of Wollongong, Australia, in which students studying Torts were required to take charge of the 'teaching' of seminars. The students worked co-operatively in groups of three to five and were each assigned two weeks of classes to conduct. There was a high level of involvement on the part of the lecturer 'behind the scenes' in supporting the development of their ideas and in clarifying legal principles, but the creative processes were largely left up to them. The groups were required to submit a plan of their meetings and intended tasks, keep a record of meetings and provide a Reflective Diary at the end of the process.

The outcome became a true celebration of the creativity of our students, and illustrated how innovative assessment can be used in core law subjects to develop generic skills and to increase the