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Constitution

• Team will adopt PDIA values while approaching problems and working together as a team.
• Team will operate at the speed of trust. Team will collaborate and communicate openly, assume the best intentions, and view disagreement and debate with a positive lens.
• The team will be flexible and accommodating to one another.
• The team will make sure that each member is given the chance to express their opinion, and that each person is carefully heard.
• Team members will accept feedback or critique on work done from other team members without hard feelings. The team works on the basis of “All for one and one for all.”
• Members will respect one another and attend meetings on time, otherwise communicate reasons for not attending or being late. Team members will also give each other the benefit of the doubt.
• Members will communicate any difficulties, hurdles, or expected delays early on so action can be taken to resolve the situation.
• Team will not discriminate based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity, disability, age, medical condition, ancestry, marital status, citizenship, sexual orientation, or status.
### Policy Unknowns Exercise

#### Policy description: *Quality of Legal Education in Ukraine*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of policy unknown</th>
<th>Level of concern (0-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How unknown is the problem your policy is addressing (do you know all views of the problem, how accepted the problem is with stakeholders, what is causing it, etc.)?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How unknown are the product(s)/other deliverables you think will help address the problem (do you really know what kinds of laws, infrastructure, regulations, etc. will solve the problem)?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How unknown is the impact you aspire to achieve (and can commit it) in the policy (can you really make promises to deliver and solve the problem, in specific timeframes)?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How unknown are existing implementation processes you will face in the context and do you know how to navigate these processes to make your policy succeed (like budget processes to access needed financial resources, and human resource processes to mobilize people, and decision-making processes to ensure timely decisions are taken)?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How unknown are the new implementation processes you will need to implement the policy (do you know if you will need changes to budget, procurement, HR and other processes and do you know that you can actually effect these needed changes)?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How unknown is the political support for your policy (do you know what support you need and do you know if this support exists and will be sustained)?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How unknown is the ‘supportiveness’ of the overall political context (is it stable, for instance, and will that stability hold for the duration of your policy engagement)?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How unknown is the bureaucratic support for your policy (do you know what support you need from those who will ensure funds flow, people are hired, etc. and do you know if this support exists and will be sustained)?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How unknown is the contextual ‘fit’ with your policy (do you know the geography, customs, culture etc. of the place you are working in and do you know that these contextual factors are conducive to your policy and will be maintained)?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How unknown are the practical capabilities needed for success (do you know what information access, capacities, etc. exist and that these are sufficient for your policy or can be developed with certainty when needed)?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Score out of 40:** 32
• Tools

• Weekly:
  • Reflection
  • Feedback
  • Meeting with Authorizer
  • Engagements with stakeholder
Stakeholders We Engaged With

- Anton Geraschchenko, Deputy Minister of Interior of Ukraine
- Andriy Meleschevych, Law Professor at the National University “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy”
- Ivan Shemelynets, DEJURE Foundation
- Serhiy Kvit, Head of National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance
- Yuriy Rashkevych, National Qualifications Agency
- Svitlana Khyliuk, Academic Director, UCU School of Law
- Andy Hunder, American Chamber of Commerce, President
- Maksym Sheverdin, Legal Education Committee Coordinator of the Association of Lawyers in Ukraine
- Yuriy Pukavskyi, Deputy Head of Student’s League
- Nataliya Petrova, USAID & New Justice Program
- Calvin Chong, Deputy Director in Singapore Ministry of Education
NAQA evaluations do not include specific criteria for legal educations.

Proactive engagement of private sector

No standardized exit exams

Too many teachers and students are engaging in bribes and cheating

There is no differentiation between the types of attorney education creating conflicts of interest with government responsibility & funding

Too many law schools are providing poor quality legal education

No standardized exit exams

Proactive engagement of private sector

NAQA evaluations do not include specific criteria for legal educations

AAA: Mid-High

AAA: Mid

AAA: Low-Mid

Poor quality of legal education in Ukraine is perpetuating corruption

Au: Authority
Ac: Acceptance
Ab: Ability
Priority Stakeholders and areas of engagement

- National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance (NAQA) – accreditation
- Private Legal Associations – opportunity for practical experience and market-based solutions
  - AmCham
  - Legal Education Committee of the Association of Lawyers
- Minister of Education – Exit exam and a common entrance exam
- Minister of Internal Affairs – Exit exam, fairness in allocation of fund to law schools
- Donors (USAID and others) – support and facilitate pilot activities
- Law Schools – develop a culture of quality
- Students – demand for quality education
Ideas

Involvement of AmCham and Business Associations

Independent Ranking and Market Based Theory

Specific Accreditation Criteria

Thank You Notes

Blog Posts

Ukrainian Deputy Minister of Interior and Singapore Model

Standardized Exit Exam

Autonomy of Educational Institutions
Strategic Way-Ahead

- AmCham engagement
- Singapore reform concept paper
- Private sector engagement with NAQA
- Legal education reform awareness campaign
- International donors – law enforcement
- Exit exam
Lessons learned drove our final thoughts

**Lessons Learned**

**Strategy:** Execute AAA early - that would have led to a stronger strategic interview-order

**Inputs:** Include more law enforcement in engagements

**Structure:** Create a team structure would have helped for dividing and concurring

**Final Thoughts**

Global teams bring stronger ideas and creative solutions

We wish that we had more time to grow together as a team

Having an authorizer to take us through the journey made the experience unforgettable
Appendix – Documents Read

In addition to the 20+ readings provided to us on CANVAS, our team examined:


