Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Strengthening legal education: the SLEEI approach for innovating university courses

Veldhuizen, L.R. van; Wiratraman, H.P.; Vel, J.A.C.

Citation
Veldhuizen, L. R. van, Wiratraman, H. P., & Vel, J. A. C. (2022). Strengthening legal education: the SLEEI approach for innovating university courses.

Version: Publisher's Version
License: Leiden University Non-exclusive license
Downloaded from:

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

SLEEI
Strengthening Legal Education in Eastern Indonesia

Strengthening legal education: The SLEEI approach for innovating university courses

Laurens van Veldhuizen, Herlambang Wiratraman & Jacqueline Vel

SLEEI Working paper

November 2022

Van Vollenhoven Institute for Law, Governance & Society

Universiteit Leiden

Colophon

This paper is one of the series of reports and working papers of the project "Strengthening Legal Education in Eastern Indonesia". It describes the approach of SLEEI for readers interested in innovation of legal education. All SLEEI publications as well as more information on the project can be found on the SLEEI websites in Bahasa[1] and English[2].

Funding and coordination

The SLEEI project was funded by NUFFIC's Orange Knowledge Programme - 'Security and Rule of Law in Indonesia'[3] and coordinated by the Van Vollenhoven Institute of Leiden Law School, Leiden University.

Publisher

Van Vollenhoven Institute for Law, Governance and Society, Leiden University

Authors

- Laurens van Veldhuizen (Adult education and participatory approach specialist at the Royal Tropical Institute in Amsterdam)
- Herlambang P. Wiratraman (Lecturer at Department of Constitutional Law Faculty of Law Gadjah Mada University (UGM)
- Jacqueline Vel (Researcher at the Van Vollenhoven Institute, Leiden Law School, Leiden University)

Language and copy editing

Matthew Canfield

Cover photograph

Leaves of Eastern Indonesia's iconic lontar palm. Photo: J. Vel

© 2022 VVI/Authors.

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this report may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author(s) of the report.

[1] https://sleei.law.ugm.ac.id
[2] https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/en/research/research-projects/law/strengthening-legal-education-in-eastern-indonesia
[3] https://www.nuffic.nl/en/subjects/institutional-collaboration-projects

Contents

1. Introduction 4
2. The SLEEI project 4
3. The SLEEI approach 6
4. Studying the approach 8
5.The SLEEI approach in practice 8
5.1 Initiation, preparation, and planning 9
5.2 Capacity building and coaching 12
5.3 Changing education 15
6. The approach reviewed 17
7. Lessons learnt 21

1. Introduction

Strengthening and changing university level education in any field is a complex activity. It is not only about the educational content of courses but also addresses the teaching approach and methods. When one course is changed, the links with other courses also have to be considered because of the overall curriculum design and other possible institutional implications, such as criteria and mechanisms for student evaluation and examination. The complexity further increases if the education strengthening effort is undertaken through an externally funded and facilitated collaborative project.

Against this background, the international cooperation project "Strengthening Legal Education in Eastern Indonesia (SLEEI)" developed and used an approach for innovating legal education that takes these complexities into consideration. Well known international innovation models in legal education like 'Legal Clinics and 'Problem Based Learning' are aimed at including societal problems into legal education. However, experience in Indonesia has shown that the preconditions for implementing these models are not often not met due to a variety of factors, including the lack of facilities, resistance from lecturers, or restrictions by the university bureaucracy.[4] More generally, Indonesian Law Faculties face barriers against innovation due to conservatism and vested interests of senior professors and lecturers, lack of funding to spend on teaching and research, organizational problems in changing the curriculum, and internal debates about the nature of law.[5]

A central premise in the SLEEI approach is that innovations in legal education should match the realities and needs of the universities in their own regional contexts in order to ensure that course innovations are easily integrated and institutionalized. This paper discusses the basic choices, the main principles, underlying the SLEEI approach and the way these have been implemented in practice. This working paper is based on SLEEI project's internal review of results and experiences and analysis by key persons within the project, and formulates lessons that could help others interested in improving university level education. Although the SLEEI project was specifically addressing legal education, its approach might be applicable in other faculties as well.

In applying the approach as it was designed, the SLEEI team had to show flexibility and adapt it to changing circumstances due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Early 2020, in the eighth month of the project and just after SLEEI had successfully concluded its major training of trainers workshop in Ambon, the COVID-19 virus started to spread rapidly, effectively closing down opportunities to travel and working together face-to-face across countries and across islands in Indonesia. This paper also discusses how the SLEEI team managed to continue its mission in times of COVID.

[4] Laras Susanti, Adrianto Dwi Nugroho, Rikardo Simarmata, Tody Sasmitha Jiwa Utama (2022) "Pemajuan Pendidikan Hukum: Dari Universitas Gadjah Mada untuk Indonesia", Fakultas Hukum Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta.

[5] Bedner A.W. & Vel J.A.C. (2021), Legal Education in Indonesia, *The Indonesian Journal of Socio-Legal Studies* 1(1): 1-30 (6)

2. The SLEEI project

The SLEEI project aimed at strengthening legal education, which is a crucial part of maintaining the rule of law in the country. Many Indonesian citizens cannot realize their rights and continue to face a lack of legal certainty. It is often unclear what laws apply in particular situations and it is hard to predict how the courts or the government will interpret them. In the Eastern part of the country, universities educate law graduates, many of whom find careers in the regional government, judiciary, NGOs or in private enterprises. These universities are less privileged in terms of budget and staff capacity compared to the top universities on Java—a reason SLEEI concentrated its activities on universities in Eastern Indonesia.

SLEEI activities focused its work on course development and teaching methods that would produce graduates who master key legal skills required by the labor market with an emphasis on the basic skill of legal reasoning and awareness of ethical, inequality, and gender issues. To develop these skills, SLEEI promoted the use of more diverse, interactive and student-centered teaching methods.

The SLEEI project was implemented by a consortium of four law faculties in Eastern Indonesia (University of Pattimura in Ambon, University Kristen Artha Wacana in Kupang, University Kristen in Waingapu, and the University of Mataram), supported by two law faculties on Java (Gadjah Mada University and Jentera Law School), one in the Netherlands (Leiden University), and the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT). A central role was played by a group of Indonesian experts who are alumni of Leiden Law School now working at top universities in Indonesia. Annex 1 gives further details on the consortium and the people involved.

With funding support of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs through NUFFIC's Orange Knowledge Program and over a period of 3 years (2019-2022) SLEEI strengthened legal education in the four Eastern Indonesia universities through a series of capacity building activities for law lecturers and by helping them to improve and modernize their course plans and course teaching guides. After careful analysis of these experiences, the project team wrote a well-structured resource guide, published as a book in Bahasa Indonesia with the title "*Inovasi Pendidikan Hukum di Indonesia: Teori, Petunjuk dan Praktik.*"

3. The SLEEI approach

In designing their efforts to strengthen the educational offerings of their universities, SLEEI partners made a number of important choices that shaped the SLEEI approach. These became known as the five principles of the SLEEI approach.

The first principle is *to tailor the innovations* in legal education to specific *demands* and conditions rather than promoting a one-size-fits-all set of innovations. The SLEEI team realized that changes in education would only last if they respond to needs that the universities involved had expressed and really match their practical conditions and capacities. Each university knows its own practical realities best.
Secondly, SLEEI decided to focus on improvements that can be made *within the framework of existing curricula*. In Indonesia as in many other countries changing curricula is only possible in certain years and involves an intensive well-structured process following strict government guidelines. Focusing on improvements that could be made without curriculum overhaul made the project objectives much more doable in the eyes of the Eastern Indonesian universities. At the same time much more could probably be achieved if SLEEI central issues like ethics, critical thinking, and gender could be integrated into many existing law courses rather than be 'banned' to a separate new course. In practice some universities in the end decided to not only integrate the SLEEI topics into existing courses but also develop a new separate course on a topic they found to be a priority such as legal reasoning or gender and law-making use of a window for curriculum change that presented itself as part of the new policy of the Ministry of Education known as Kampus Merdeka.

The third basic choice the SLEEI project made in its approach was to make four *senior national resource persons* rather than foreign experts as the key *change agents* in the process. The Indonesian resource persons in the SLEEI project were mid-career law graduates attached to top Indonesian universities, well-known to the Dutch project partners for their interest and capacity in supporting legal education development. They acted as trainers in workshops for law lecturers at the four partner universities, and also coached and facilitated the universities in implementing the SLEEI agenda[6]. The SLEEI team assumed that they would be in the best position to understand and convey the needs and realities of the universities in Eastern Indonesia to the foreign partners in the collaboration, and would be best able to translate and help adapt international experiences and materials to the realities of universities in Eastern Indonesia. Being law lecturers in Indonesia with intimate knowledge of the institutional framework in which Indonesian universities operate, they were able to offer tailored advice on what would be realistically possible. And, not unimportantly, this choice made it possible to support up to four partner universities instead of just one.

[6] In this paper the four Indonesian experts are simply referred to as 'trainers', although their role mirrored that of facilitator and coach too.

The SLEEI key change agents: Herlambang Wiratraman, Widodo Dwi Putro, Bivitri Susanti and Rikardo Simarmata (J.Vel, Yogyakarta, 2019)

In what became known as the fourth principle, SLEEI maximized space for *horizontal networking and support* among law lectures involved at the different universities. Given the diversity in these lecturers' working context, capacities and experiences, such sharing of information and examples among colleagues served to support their activities for course innovation. In addition, the links and relationships that developed under SLEEI would create opportunities to provide help and support after the project closed. It could create the basis for the Indonesian partners to organize and structure their networking to continue with the project agenda as a way forward post-project.

Lasting changes in education can only be realized if they are accepted by the institution and integrated in its regular systems. Therefore, the fifth and final choice the SLEEI project made was to give high priority to *institutional embedding of all innovations* accomplished through SLEEI activities. This entailed the creation of opportunities for systematic interaction with and involvement of law faculty or university management in making key choices for the project and its activities to ensure that all innovations developed and promoted would match with the institutional realities of the universities involved.

Table 1: The five principles of the SLEEI approach

Main principle SLEEI
Legal education innovation demand-***driven*** and ***tailor made***
Innovations are made ***within framework of existing curricula***
Senior national experts (rather than foreign experts) as ***resource persons,*** trainers, facilitators, mediators
Focus on ***horizontal networking and support*** among lecturers & law schools
Systematic attention to ***institutional embedding***

4. Evaluation approach

The authors of this paper analyze the implementation and results of the SLEEI project by posing two sets of questions:

1. How did the project put the five principles in practice? Through what activities and actions? How did these work in practice?
2. To what extent did the SLEEI approach lead to lasting innovations in legal education in the participating universities? And to what extent were the project's success and failures linked to its approach and the 5 principles?

To answer these questions, we relied to a large extent on a careful process documentation by the project team during the various stages of project implementation. For this SLEEI developed a framework identifying clear indicators for monitoring realization of the key parameters of the SLEEI approach and its result. This framework is elaborated in Annex 2[7].

A critical look at project progress and the approach was also part of many internal project meetings – all on-line after February 2020 – and a central focus of the project Mid-term Review.[8] In October 2021, SLEEI partners undertook a final in-depth strength and weaknesses analysis of the project approach and its results during the SLEEI 'write-shop' in Kupang. The direct notes from this SWOT analysis are added in Annex 3. Additionally, we received inputs from all partner universities and the four trainers through their final narrative reports. The results of all these analyses have provided important inputs into the discussion below.

5.The SLEEI approach in practice

SLEEI followed a semi open-ended and flexible process. For sake of this analysis, three main clusters of activities can be distinguished: 1) Initiation, preparation, and planning; 2) Capacity building and coaching; 3) Implementing changes in legal education (Table2).

The project proposal as submitted to the funding agency NUFFIC served of course as point of departure in the discussions. The proposal included a general sketch of a work plan and budget, but how exactly the activities would be organized and planned, who would participate, and how exactly each partner would spend its own part of the budget were matters that still needed elaboration.

[7] SLEEI, 2020. The SLEEI learning framework and its key questions. Internal project document.

[8] Veldhuizen L.R. van, Simarmatra R. & Vel J.A.C, 2021. Report Mid-Term Review. Available from https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/en/research/research-projects/law/strengthening-legal-education-in-eastern-indonesia

Table 2: Summary of the SLEEI process

Step	Activities
Initiation, preparation & planning	Assessment current situation
	Analysis and planning;
	Development of training materials
Capacity building & coaching	Workshops for lecturers
	Coaching
	Other capacity building
	Horizontal sharing & support
Innovating courses	Improving course design (RPS)
	Courses given based on improved design
	Preparation study guides

5.1 Initiation, preparation, and planning

The five principles of SLEEI were applied from the start of the project. To put "tailor made and demand driven" into practice all partners were invited to discuss what 'demand driven' meant in their case by articulating their needs and identifying priorities for activities that could help them. To this end, they were assisted in undertaking a s*elf-assessment of the current offer in legal education* facilitated by the VVI. This formed an important input into the operational planning of work. The self-assessment involved sending out a phone-based questionnaire to four categories of 'informants': university's law faculty leadership, 20 last year students, 10 law lecturers and 6 to 10 employers of law graduates. A total of almost 100 male and female respondents across the 4 universities, half of which were students, submitted their answers.

The self-assessment generated useful information in a very timely manner.[9] The partner universities could present and discuss their results during the project's first meeting of partners in August 2019. The self-assessments had methodological limitations though, including the relatively small number of respondents per category, the respondent sampling process and possible biases often associated with self-administered questionnaires.

[9] Available at https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/en/research/research-projects/law/strengthening-legal-education-in-eastern-indonesia

Presentation of priorities in improving legal education by UNKRISWINA (UGM, Yogyakarta, August 2019)

Presentation and critical discussion of the results by each university as inputs into the joint planning meeting still played an important role as it affirmed the commitment of the project to follow a demand-driven approach. It also allowed all involved to come to a joint understanding where and how the project agenda overlapped with concerns and issues from local universities.

True to its demand-driven and tailor-made approach, SLEEI invested seriously in activities that allowed the partner universities *set priorities and plan* activities that fit their needs and the project overall framework. During the 3-day inception workshop in Yogyakarta in August 2019, all partners discussed the logic of each major component of the project framework in detail. For each component, university teams would sit together to reflect on its relevance and practical implications in their institution. Such discussions worked well because most partners had sent more than 2 representatives to the workshop using own budgets to cover related costs of the additional participants. During the content-oriented Training of Trainers in early 2020, a similar approach was followed in which university teams sat together regularly during the week to review what was discussed so far and to strategize and plan to what extent and how this could be implemented and made to work in their faculties.



During the inception workshop, a project Steering Committee was formed chaired by one of the partner universities and its Terms of Reference confirmed. The Steering Committee met several times to review progress and discuss possible new activities and directions. Key decision makers of the project partner institutions composed the steering committee. This helped the project to find the best ways forward and it increased understanding and commitment for the SLEEI agenda at partner management level. In addition, the involvement of university and faculty leadership conveyed to the decision makers the fundamental message of participation and a transformative process for strengthening legal education. This increased their support for the project and its activities.

Further operational planning took place within the four partner universities following-up on the results of the work of the teams of representatives during joint project events described above. Each institution used its own planning mechanisms for this. Generally, this involved appointing a SLEEI coordinator and sometimes a small SLEEI team within de law faculty. The coordinator or team proposed the planning of the workshops and other activities often in consultation with the dean. SLEEI activities and their planning were usually also regular agenda items at staff meetings through which other lecturers contributed to identification and prioritization of relevant activities. Each partner university received its agreed part of the SLEEI budget for activities over which they could decide autonomously as long as the activities were in line with the SLEEI purpose, themes and approach. The internal planning benefitted very much from the fact that three of the four deans of the law faculties participated in both the inception workshop (by design) and the training of trainers (by own choice and budget).

A major effort of the preparation and planning phase went into the *development of the basic content materials* of SLEEI for its five main focus areas or themes. Working papers were prepared for each summarizing the main discussions around the theme and its relevance to legal education together with strategies for giving attention to it in law courses. The papers served the purpose of developing a joint understanding among partners of each theme and created the basis for training materials to be used in the project's capacity building activities. The working papers are thus not academic papers but relative brief (6 pages) and focused summaries of all relevant information.[10] They were written by the VVI and KIT resource persons with major inputs from the Indonesian trainers and finalized after detailed discussions with all partners during a Training of Trainers (ToT) workshop. In the course of the project, content development did continue. Staff training activities by universities with the trainers and the efforts to actually integrate this all in an existing course provided insights into what worked and what not in their specific context. All experiences and content learning by the project were finally analyzed during a one-week 'write-shop' among universities, trainers and Dutch resource persons. Based on this SLEEI was able to write the Resource Guide on Innovating Legal Education for inspiration of future efforts towards strengthening legal education in the country. Given that the guide targets law lectures and their management, it was published in Bahasa, both on-line and in hard copy.

[10] Available at : https://sleei.law.ugm.ac.id/publikasi-sleei/ (Bahasa Indonesia) and the SLEEI website at VVI (English)

The hybrid SLEEI write-shop organized by partner university UKAW (UKAW, Kupang, October 2021)

5.2 Capacity building and coaching

Just before Covid-19 induced lockdowns SLEEI was able to have its central one-week *Training of Trainers* (ToT) hosted by the partner in Ambon. More than 20 key staff from all partner institutions involved in the SLEEI project met for a week to discuss in detail the content of the 5 SLEEI themes and how these could best be discussed in the local staff training events. The ToT also had two days for the Indonesian trainers to try out and practice various training forms. In retrospect the ToT proved to be a pivotal activity for SLEEI, one that not only helped to build consensus and capacity on content and strategy, but also cemented the personal relationships that helped the project move forward when online meeting started to replace face-to-face engagement.

Following the ToT, there were *two rounds of capacity building* for law lectures at each of the 4 partner universities. Each round consisted of a one-week workshop facilitated by one of the Indonesian senior resource persons who acted as trainers in these local workshops. The four Indonesian trainers processed all the results from the ToT into one so-called training 'Module'. This had all the content for the workshops but also the learning objectives and training approaches and methods.

The Covid-19 pandemic that emerged right after the ToT not only led to some delay in the implementation of the follow-up workshops but also prevented the trainers to travel. As a result, the workshops were done either fully on-line or in a hybrid form in which university lectures would come together locally with only the trainers joining on-line. A total of 62 law lecturers participated in these workshops. The lecturers were thus trained in the five main themes of SLEEI and how these could be integrated in their courses by improving their course design. The second round of workshops in 2021 created opportunities to deepen understanding and monitor progress in course development and also for discussing locally relevant topics, such as best practices in on-line teaching or legal research approaches and methods.

Hybrid SLEEI workshop at University of Mataram (UNRAM, Mataram, August 2020)

The on-line character of the workshops has most likely led to a learning process that was not as deep as compared to what would have been accomplished through intensive face-to-face workshops, although the trainers made a major effort to maintain an interactive process during the workshops using various on-line tools. On the other hand, the online option made it easy for several trainers to contribute to each workshop or part of it, according his/her area of expertise. Under the face-to-face workshop model as in the proposal the costs of travelling would have limited involvement of trainers per workshop to only one.

During the inception workshop it was agreed that each of the Indonesian trainers would take responsibility for *coaching* and providing support to one of the four universities, if and when needed. Apart from helping in the organization and facilitation of the two rounds of capacity building workshops, the four coached the project team in "their" university but also sometimes individual lecturers who had participated in the workshops. The form and intensity of this coaching varied greatly over time depending also on the dynamics of the SLEEI teams at the four universities and the trainers. In Sumba, for example, it involved several visits to the island while in other cases support was provided mostly through WhatsApp (WA) and email communication, virtual meetings, contributions to webinars and other on-line events organized by the university.

Capacity building was also provided through a *series of webinars* on topics related to the SLEEI themes. The webinars were not foreseen in the project design but developed by universities during the Covid-19 period. Some of these specifically targeted university lecturers, while others targeted students and/or other stakeholders. Resource persons always included a combination of SLEEI trained staff of the host university, one or more of the Indonesian SLEEI trainers and one or more other experts (that were either local to the university or from other parts of Indonesia). In selected cases, the Dutch experts provided inputs thereby upgrading the webinar to become one with international status. As resource requirements for organizing webinars are relatively limited, by January 2022 partners were able to organize quite a few webinars on SLEEI themes which usually attracted many participants through the chosen on-line platform or YouTube. The Indonesian trainers also often acted as speaker in national webinars that were not organized by SLEEI, engaging in national discussions on themes similar to SLEEI's that attract many viewers. They encouraged the lecturers of eastern Indonesian universities to participate in these by circulating the announcements.

As mentioned, SLEEI choose to make an effort to encourage *sharing, learning and support between law lecturers* involved, horizontally. All key activities of SLEEI thus had important components which facilitated exchange of views, sharing of experience and learning from each other. SLEEI also created a WhatsApp (WA) discussion group, through one of the partners, that became the regular platform for exchange involving around 20 law lecturers. As data on the WA group of Table 3 per 1st July 2021 show, the SLEEI WA group proved to be very active with almost 100 posts per month. Most of these were from the Indonesian trainers and lecturers from the 4 partner universities. While half of the posts had a more social networking character, important for any functioning network, the other half either shared relevant information on law, law development and legal education or on project related issues. At the partner university UKAW in Kupang the content posts were forward directly to the WA group of the Faculty of Law thus reaching another 20 lecturers.

Table 3: Functioning of the SLEEI WA group

Number of unique posts over time

	Q1-2 20	Q3 20	Q4 20	Q1 21	Q2 21	**Total**	**Av/month**
Eastern Indonesia university	351	91	97	38	79	**656**	
International resource persons	104	66	86	40	48	**344**	
Indonesian trainers/facilitators	220	144	131	91	125	**711**	
Total	**675**	**301**	**314**	**169**	**252**	**1711**	**95**

No of Apps per category over time

	Q1-2 20	Q3 20	Q4 20	Q1 21	Q2 21	**Total**	**Av/month**
Content posts	86	36	52	109	149	**432**	24
Practical organisational posts	101	116	76	43	30	**366**	20
Social networking	488	149	186	17	73	**913**	51
Total	**675**	**301**	**314**	**169**	**252**	**1711**	95

The repeated suggestion from the Dutch partners at VVI and KIT—that lecturers giving the same course in different universities meet on-line and exchange notes on course designs and their study guides—was never followed-up though.

5.3 Changing education

All these planning and capacity building activities were designed to lead to actual changes compared to the way legal education was done before at the four partner universities. The lecturers at these universities suggested that a major step to this end – one without major institutional implications – would be to *adapt and improve the course designs of current law courses* (Rencana Pembelajaran Semester (RPS) in Bahasa Indonesia). These course designs are usually well-developed tables (Word files) of several pages following a format such as in Figure 1. The RPS lists for every session and each week: the learning objective(s), the main content of the session, the teaching methods, time required, required previous knowledge/courses for students and the evaluation criteria. Course designs, which are managed by the faculties of law or their departments, form the main guidance for lecturers in giving a course and can be adapted as required following relatively 'light' internal procedures that vary across universities.

Figure 1: Typical course design format

	RENCANA PEMBELAJARAN SEMESTER						
	Program Studi: Ilmu Hukum			Fakultas: Hukum			
Mata Kuliah:			Kode:		SKS: 2	Semester: VI	
Dosen Pengampu:							
Capaian Pembelajaran Mata Kuliah:							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Minggu ke	Kemampuan akhir tiap tahapan pembelajaran	Bahan Kajian/Pokok Bahasan	Metode Pembelajaran	Waktu	Pengalaman Belajar Mahasiswa	Penilaian: Kriteria dan Indikator	Penilaian: Bobot (%)

Up to July 2022, 52_designs of law courses were reviewed by their respective lecturers or teams of lecturers and modified by integrating some or all of the themes raised by SLEEI. Often this would include adding SLEEI related issues under content of one or several sessions/weeks and diversifying the teaching methods by including more student-interactive methods such as group assignments, discussion forms and Question & Answer sessions.

To further consolidate the integration of SLEEI issues in their law courses, the universities proposed to review and update the *study guides* (Buku ajar in Bahasa Indonesia) of the relevant courses. These are documents of up to 100 pages or more that have a description of the full content of the course with teaching forms and references. In one case, the universities did not have study guides yet and thus prepared fully new ones. The work on the study guides was done by the lecturers involved, often in teams, but sometimes by an individual lecturer. Often, they followed a format based on guidelines from the Ministry of Education. After some form of internal review Indonesian resource persons supported by the VVI and KIT looked at drafts and provided inputs and suggestions. They also reviewed the level of integration of the SLEEI themes as basis to decide whether the guides would qualify to be "SLEEI endorsed" publications. This review followed a set of criteria about integration of SLEEI themes shared with the authors early-on in the process. A total of 20 study guides were ultimately taken-up for review. Writing or innovating study guides was not foreseen in the project design and was initiated relatively late. Therefore, there was not always enough time available to give this demanding task all the attention that required.

Workshop on writing study guides at Universitas Kristen Artha Wacana (UKAW, Kupang, September 2021)

The Ministry of Education also requested universities to prepare well-developed study guides for their courses. This provided additional encouragement for partner universities to include work on study guides for law courses under the project while offering the project a further opportunity to integrate its themes in regular university teaching materials. The project agreed to cover the costs associated with writing, editing and publishing study guides.

Sometimes study guides remain internal documents but often they are published and made available through local bookshops. The SLEEI team noticed a wide variety in quality of the manuscripts. Writing well-structured study guides would have to be an important topic of a follow up activity of SLEEI. There is also a wide variety in extent to which the SLEEI themes have been integrated and explained in the study guides. The process of review by the SLEEI team continued after project closure in July 2022, but more structural assistance in how to incorporate SLEEI innovations into study guides would be another topic for follow-up support. The SLEEI book "*Inovasi Pendidikan Hukum di Indonesia*" will be very helpful in any further effort to strengthen and revise the new study guides.

All these activities led to actual *implementation of the improved law courses* following the improved course designs. At least 52 courses were given in their improved design as part of the regular university program reaching around 3500 students. Later impact studies will need to determine to what extent the RPS proposed changes have been followed in practice and what the quality of teaching on those subjects was. And whether this did make a change for the students following the courses as compared to their answers in the final assessment conducted for SLEEI in May 2022.

To increase interest of students and the faculty at large in the content of SLEEI themes the project encouraged the partner universities to organize *student-led activities linked to these themes* and provided a small budget for co-funding. These activities could include intra- as well as extra-curricular activities, from student field research and internships to facilitation of moot-courts and student competitions. Unfortunately, due to restrictions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, student field activities and research could not be organized. The universities thus organised mostly student competitions - some live, but often online – including a competition on writing essays on legal reasoning, several competitions in public speaking in English on gender and law and general law debating competitions.

6. The approach reviewed

Was the project able to effectively implement its approach of the 5 key principles? And did this lead to significant improvements in the legal education of the four partner universities, accepted and integrated into their regular systems?

One way to assess whether the project created strong *ownership* at the level of the universities through *a tailor-made approach* is to look at the pro-activity of universities in initiating new activities. Looking at the number of activities undertaken by the project not foreseen in the project proposal but done on the initiative of partners (Table 4), partners did indicate considerable ownership of the project and managed to steer it into directions best suiting their conditions.

Table 4: New SLEEI activities initiated and undertaken by project partners

	Activity initiated by partners	Origin	Implementation
1	SLEEI logo	Participants Inception Workshop	UNRAM organized design; used by all partners everywhere
2	SLEEI website in BI	Participants Inception Workshop	Designed and maintained by UGM, still operational, part of UGM website
3	Integration of SLEEI themes in more than 1 course through RPS improvements	Participants ToT in Ambon	Implemented project strategy in all 4 partner universities
4	Webinars	Partner university in Sumba – all partners	Series of webinars on SLEEI themes; accelerated by Covid-19 pandemic
5	SLEEI case study & jurisprudential data bank	Participants ToT in Ambon	Under development by SLEEI partner Jentera.
6	University level case study & jurisprudential data bank	Partner university Timor	Implemented in Timor building the data bank from student master theses
7	Capacity building in on-line teaching	Partner university Lombok; also mentioned in the project Mid-Term Review	Integrated into 2nd round of local workshops; INSPIRIT provided technical support
8	Preparation and publication of study guides for law courses	Partner university in Lombok	All 4 universities; 20 study guides under development

Practically, the realization of the tailor-made principle is also evident when looking at how universities were able to select activities and set priorities. After the local training workshops each partner university selected parts from the SLEEI themes that they felt were the needed most in their own context, choose the courses that they wanted to strengthen and selected lecturers to be involved. The lecturers themselves proposed how to integrate specific changes in their courses.

Further evidence of this principle is in the choices made for timing of activities by partners, who detailed their design to suit own agenda's and initiated new project activities to support the SLEEI agenda where opportunities presented themselves.

During the strength and weakness analysis of the SLEEI approach conducted during the SLEEI write-shop, the most frequently mentioned strength referred to this first principle of the SLEEI approach (Annex 3). The Eastern Indonesian universities mentioned they felt really involved, being listened to, and given the flexibility and responsibility to organize the work according to their own situation. In their view this played a key role in the success of SLEEI.

The ToT in Ambon was very important for team building and networking (Unpatti, Ambon, February 2020)

The choice for *working within existing curricula* translated itself into a focus on reviewing and innovating existing course designs (RPS) of selected law courses, and writing or revising the related detailed study guides. Data mentioned earlier on improved course designs and published study guides suggest that this strategy paid-off. Both the improved course designs and the study guides have become part and parcel of the educational system of the partner universities. What is less clear, and beyond the control of the SLEEI project – and of any three-year project – is to what extent current and future lecturers will actually use these innovations and how that affects the quality of their teaching.

In the strength and weakness analysis of the SLEEI approach during the write-shop in Kupang in October 2021, the work on the course designs and study guides was also mentioned as an important strength of the project (Annex 3). One participant underscored the importance of the follow-up training given to lecturers in how to integrate what they had learned in the workshops in their own teaching. While another one stressed the relevance of addressing the teaching approach and methods – SLEEI's 5th theme – in addition to content issues. Lecturers who had been participating in all activities throughout the process, from the first local workshops to RPS improvement and work on the Study Guides, were better equipped for integrating the innovations in their teaching than those who had participated only partially.

The individual lecturers of selected courses thus played a key role in the SLEEI approach. Their commitment and availability for doing extra work to accomplish such innovations cannot be taken for granted, though. Fortunately, many lecturers at the SLEEI partner universities have been quite motivated, but there were also staff members who seemed just interested in being involved with international partners or only followed instructions from faculty management. While usually well facilitated interactive workshops can be a major motivating factor the SLEEI project had to rely on mostly online or hybrid workshops that were probably a bit less effective for motivational purposes and also suffered from technical hic-ups.

After the central ToT in Ambon led by staff of VVI and KIT, in all further capacity building activities, workshops, webinars, coaching, *the four Indonesian trainers* did indeed play the key role foreseen, always in close consultation with the four partner universities. The Dutch experts only provided specific inputs if and when needed and on specific request from one of the partners. They also coached the four Indonesian trainers, called for regular meetings to exchange experiences and lessons learnt and strategize further actions.

As the four Indonesian trainers are quite senior legal experts in Indonesia and have busy agendas their availability for SLEEI related work was a potential constraint. Indeed, one partner university mentioned in the strength and weakness analysis of the SLEEI approach done at the write-shop that one challenge was matching agendas of people involved at different levels. But by and large, availability of the Indonesian trainers proved to be more than adequate and their selection during proposal writing thus justified. In supporting SLEEI they easily spent 20 days per year or more in addition to their own teaching and many other professional activities. Maintaining adequate levels of communication between the partner universities and the trainers proved to be a challenge. Particularly the Indonesian trainers would have hoped to receive more regular updates on progress made in the partner universities leading to longer term joint strategic planning rather than supporting a sequence of one-off events.

In the strength and weakness analysis of the project approach mentioned the partner universities identified the role of the Indonesian trainers as a crucial success factor for the project (Annex 3). Universities in Eastern Indonesia rarely have the opportunity to have direct linkages and committed support from national Indonesian experts. Inputs from the Indonesian trainers were considered

always ‘down to earth’, their availability more than adequate, willing to assist even under difficult conditions.



Trainer Bivitri Susanti supporting UNKRISWINA’s webinar on sexual violence (UNKRISWINA, Waingapu, December 2021)

As the date from Table 3 on the functioning of the SLEEI WA group suggests, the project succeeded in creating regular *horizontal sharing and networking* among partners on issues related to the SLEEI agenda. Further evidence for the realization of horizontal support can be found in the involvement of partners in each other’s activities such as the webinars that partner universities organized spontaneously. The Indonesian trainers played a major a role in these webinars, either by acting as speakers or by linking the Eastern Indonesian partners with other Indonesian resource persons. As mentioned before, cooperation between lecturers giving the same course in different universities with each other for mutual support in for example reviewing course designs (RPS) or preparing study guides did not take off. Perhaps because there were too many institutional or bureaucratic barriers.

The networking dynamics thus created could – in the logic of the SLEEI approach – form the basis for continued collaboration and mutual support in legal education development after the SLEEI project ended in 2022. Partners are indeed confident that relationships established will continue to benefit them over the next years. Moreover, they have discussed whether or not this networking should be organized or even formalized in some form so as to make it more effective and sustainable. VVI and KIT facilitated this discussion by writing a brief discussion note on networking options based on interviews with selected partners as well as 2 non-project resource persons. The meeting of the project Steering Committee in May 2020 discussed this note and confirmed the importance of organizing the networking and collaboration post-project. During the final partner meeting – face-to-face at the end of the final project conference in Mataram – it was agreed to opt for the time being for a relatively simple semi-informal network. SLEEI partner UGM agreed to act as network ‘hub’ and to continue to maintain the SLEEI website and spread SLEEI publications, such as the SLEEI book (Resource Guide). Partners also agreed to sign bilateral MOUs to facilitate further collaboration and networking. UNRAM made a draft MoU and invited the other partner universities to join.

Whether or not these arrangements end up being strong enough to continue as well as further develop and expand the SLEEI network is yet to be seen. The final conference in Mataram did show that there is great interest from other universities to become part of the SLEEI process. The SLEEI

resource persons have received many requests to this end. And during the final conference participants from 33 universities not yet included in the SLEEI joined the sessions live or online. The conference developed a set of clear recommendations for further strengthening legal education in the country that would become part of the SLEEI network agenda.[11] The option of founding a new professional association in Indonesia for legal education development was thus not yet considered a priority. With the existing SLEEI website, the resource guide, the active WA group of SLEEI advocates and other SLEEI resources a new association would potentially have a strong basis.

It is probably too early to fully assess the real level of *institutional embedding* of the innovations developed and promoted through SLEEI, the fifth SLEEI principle. Have the innovations become integrated into the regular teaching procedures of the four universities? First signs seem to be positive such as the faculty approval of the improved course designs of law courses that have integrated SLEEI themes, and their subsequent use in teaching. When the partner universities will publish the SLEEI-inspired Study Guides for law courses written by their own lecturers, it will be a next sign of institutional embedding.

Only one of project teams in the partner universities reported somewhat less support at times from management levels for implementing the SLEEI proposed activities in spite of above mechanisms. The other three teams continued to report full support from the institution. The substantial level of co-funding provided by all four partner universities - almost 30 percent of total expenses encountered - is further evidence of this.

To bring and keep the universities as institutions fully on board, key processes proved to be: The international SLEEI seminars at the partner universities facilitated by SLEEI and the Steering Committee as well as involvement of the four deans in well-facilitated SC meetings. What also helped is that three of the four deans also participated in the ToT and the write-shop so that they were fully updated on and involved in SLEEI. An underlying factor for success in this has probably been the selection process of the four partner universities during proposal writing. Using existing informal networks VVI and KIT managed to select partner universities with by and large very open and cooperative management at the level of the law faculty and/or departments.

It is fair to note again that policy directions from the Indonesian Ministry of Education in a number of ways proved to be important supporting factors for raising interest of faculty and university management in SLEEI and its innovations, such as easing the rules for curriculum adjustment and the policy that all courses should have study guides.

7. Lessons learnt

The success or failure of a project like SLEEI depends on the commitment of actors at all levels. This underlines the importance of a careful selection of both partner institutions and resource persons for joining the program. This received ample attention during the proposal development phase, which benefitted very much from experiences in previous research as well as other projects and existing contacts and linkages with the VVI, KIT partners and Indonesian partners.

The second lesson concerns the importance of the institutional conditions for innovation. The larger a university is, the more difficult it often is to change the existing culture of teaching, in particular if there is resistance among certain groups of lecturers. Often, not all law lecturers in the larger

[11] See the full declaration at https://sleei.law.ugm.ac.id/2022/05/23/tiga-hasil-utama-program-strengthening-legal-education-in-eastern-indonesia-sleei/

universities can participate due to limitations of resources such as training capacity and budget. The SLEEI approach works better if all law lecturers participate, as happened at the smaller universities. Support of the university's leadership is crucial, not just because of its interest in international projects in general associated with money, status, and a boost to accreditation, but more specifically because of interest in the content and direction of the innovations.

The SLEEI experience shows the importance of giving enough attention to the processes of collaboration and interaction at all levels. And of mobilizing effective capacities to handle these well. Without it a demand-driven approach is likely to fail. In SLEEI this was acknowledged as a key success factor with specific reference to the open and egalitarian interactions, the willingness to learn from each other and the facilitating role of VVI and KIT too realize this. The organization of well facilitated partner workshops and meetings right from the start of the project and throughout the journey was felt to be an important part of this. The fact that all SLEEI team members – including the Dutch – communicated in Bahasa Indonesia was also crucial for good interaction, because at the partner universities most lecturers did not speak English very well.

For work on the Gender and Law theme, SLEEI could link-up with gender champions at each partner university, some of which had already created separate 'gender and law' courses at their faculty. However, in spite of the training provided, many law lecturers found it difficult to integrate gender issues in their course planning and, particularly, in their course study guides. Unfamiliarity and unease and resistance were among the reasons why SLEEI's capacity building followed by long distance coaching was not fully successful for this theme. More intensive forms of support would be required. Such support would need to include guidance on how to deal with resistance among fellow lecturers or university leadership. Sourcing or developing more examples of course modules and quality study guides incorporating gender and law would help the lecturers imagine how integration in their own courses could be shaped.

The emphasis in the approach on horizontal sharing, learning and support among law lectures seems to be paying off. It has led to the emergence of an informal network that is continuing after the SLEEI project among others through the active WA group. Furthermore, UGM Law School in Yogyakarta agreed to function as a "hub" and contact point for the network post-project and to continue to host the SLEEI website and spread SLEEI materials such as the Resource Guide. This creates a basic structure

that may help the network to continue and expand. The SLEEI hub would best be institutionally embedded within UGM through integration into an existing research center, such as the Research Center for Law and Social Justice (LSJ) or the Djojodiguno Institute, in both of which former SLEEI trainers have a central role. In addition, the SLEEI's approach has already been used and adopted into special education programs of the Indonesian Association for Socio Legal Studies (ASSLESI), the Critical Legal Education School (Sekolah Hukum Kritis) in the Law and Human Rights Program at the Institute for Research, Education and Information on Economy and Social Affairs (LP3ES) and at the Faculty of Law at Universitas Brawijaya.

Considering the important wider challenge of strengthening legal education in Indonesia beyond the four Eastern Indonesia universities participating in SLEEI, a good strategy is needed for sharing its approach and material in Indonesia beyond the project partners. Much more use could be made of the opportunities offered by various social media. The wider dissemination of the approach should be high on the agenda of a next SLEEI project, following-up achievements of the first 3 years. There is great interest in and support for SLEEI type of education innovation work from other law faculties in the country as evident among others from the intensive discussions during the SLEEI national conference in Mataram, April 2022. It is up to the emerging network and its allies to find ways and resources to meet this demand.

Annex 1: Further information about the SLEEI team

Partners

Van Vollenhoven Institute, Leiden Law School, Leiden University

- SLEEI project director: Prof. Adriaan W. Bedner
- SLEEI project coordinator: Dr. Jacqueline A.C. Vel

Royal Tropical Institute (KIT), Amsterdam

- Adult education and participatory approach specialist: Ir. Laurens R. van Veldhuizen

Jentera Law School, Jakarta

- SLEEI Trainer/facilitator: Bivitri Susanti L.L.M

Law Faculty Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta

- SLEEI Trainer/facilitators: Dr. Rikardo Simarmata and Dr. Herlambang Perdana Wiratraman

Law Faculty, University of Mataram (UNRAM)

- SLEEI Trainer/facilitator: Dr. Widodo Dwi Putero
- Chairman of the Steering Committee and representative of the four universities in Eastern Indonesia: Prof. Hirsanuddin
- SLEEI coordinator UNRAM: Dr. M. Riadhussyah

Wira Wacana Christian University (UNKRISWINA) in Waingapu

- SLEEI coordinators: Dr. Rambu L.K.R..Nugrohowardhani and Rambu Susanti Mila Maramba LL.M

Law Faculty, Artha Wacana Christian University (UKAW) in Kupang

- SLEEI coordinator: Liven Erfelis Rafael, SH.MHum

Law Faculty, Pattimura University (UnPatti) in Ambon

- SLEEI coordinator: Dr. Revency Vania Rugebregt

Annex 2: The SLEEI learning framework for learning on the approach

*Central question: Does **the approach used by SLEEI and its partners to introduce improvements** in legal education (systems) in universities work well and is it effective?*

Sub-questions: Which parts of the approach work well and which do not? In which situations? What are essential conditions and principles to make it work?

"Approach" refers here to the coherent set of activities, mechanisms, and ways of work that the project uses to realise changes in legal education. From the self-assessments, through the ToT and capacity building at university level to the ultimate changes in the education offer itself. The approach is considered "effective" if it leads to lasting changes in the way law is taught in the four Eastern Indonesian universities.

To be able to monitor and study this, 5 key elements of the SLEEI approach, their rationale and the underlying assumptions on which they are based are summarized as below. Key indicators for each element are also identified.

	Main element SLEEI approach	**Rationale, why chosen**	**Assumptions**	**Project activities or mechanism**	**How / what to look at to know this works**
1	Changes in legal education are made ***demand-driven*** and ***tailor made***	Changes will only be lasting if they are felt needed by the universities and fit their practical conditions and capacities. Universities know the practical realities best, including the boundaries set by the government	Universities and relevant staff feel the need to improve the quality of their legal education Interest in improving education quality is the main reason for participating in SLEEI	Self-assessment Analysis and planning per university during and for all project activities	Evidence of own initiatives in initiating project activities (from progress reports, evidence from tindak lanjut planning, diversity in using small grant fund)
2	Changes are to be made ***within existing curricula***	In Indonesia there are strict government guidelines for university education and their curricula that very difficult to change. Curricula changes are made by universities in certain years only. Only when this happens during a SLEEI year can the project have an influence on an overall curriculum	"Incremental" changes in existing courses are significant enough to realize the SLEEI objectives	Focus on and support universities to integrate SLEEI themes through RPS improvements Making available WPs and other materials for use in existing courses by unis	Review Sillabi / RPS in their changes to integrate SLEEI themes Comparing pre and post SLEEI RPS Student understanding and acceptance of SLEEI themes from end of term tests
3	Capacity building of EI lecturers by ***senior Indonesian legal experts as trainers*** from top universities (rather than foreign experts)	These trainers are more (cost) effective as they can bridge the gap between the improvements as designed from theory/on paper and the real-life situation of knowledge, language and teaching experience of EI lecturers.	Selected key Indonesian trainers can make enough time available to support and train EI lecturers With capacity building support from SLEEI the trainers can provide good interactive training.	Criteria for selection of trainers ToT Ambon Facilitation of sharing among trainers learning Provision of WPs for inclusion in their Module	Indonesian resource people operating as trainers, not experts Resource people are able to respond to issues from lecturers / interaction level Good match of their advice with local reality, in the case of RPS change

		Being lecturers in Indonesia, they are able to give very focused advice on how to integrate SLEEI in courses			Source: Stijn observations; review of video recording of trainers. Anecdotal evidence from trainers (coordination meetings, writeshop) Compare with LEAP?
4	Systematic attention to ***institutional embedding***	Even changes made in teaching within existing curricula need to be supported by the institution (dean, committee of peers?) to be accepted Understanding and acceptance of the SLEEI agenda for legal education by the institution	People at management positions open and responsive Other factors determining room for manoeuvre for change are supportive	SLEEI seminars Steering Committee Involvement of deans in SC	Formal approval of proposed changes Supportive measures versus obstructive actions Source: informal interviews during writeshop; anecdotal evidence; e.g., Opening of SLEEI courses by deans; public expressions of university support through media.
5	Creation of ***horizontal network*** among Indonesian law schools	Strong networking between EI law schools and those in other parts of the country, including Java, can continue after the project ends thus ensuring sustainability of SLEEI efforts in strengthening legal education	Network will be able to find an institutional form and host in Indonesia (and resources?) that allows it to continue post-project	Face to face meetings (inception workshop, TOT) WhatsApp group Network design discussion starting inception workshop, MTR-SC, … Website BI UGM	Commitment expressed by members for network continued, institutionally (SC meeting minutes) Joint activities through the network not foreseen in the proposal (e.g., set-up of case bank or jurisprudential bank, the website BI, webinars – source Stijn) Information exchange and learning and access to external resource persons. *Source* WA group analysis over the years

The final column of above framework suggests what needs to be monitored, observed, studied regarding the SLEEI approach to be able to answer this learning question well and indicates how this would be done.

Looking into the institutional embedding (element 4 of the above framework) will also ensure the assessment whether the SLEEI approach has been effective as this is being defined as realising institutional confirmation and approval of the changes SLEEI has worked on.

Annex 3: Results of the Strength and Weaknesses analysis of the SLEEI process during the 2021 SLEEI Writeshop.

Feedback berkaitan dengan persiapan sebelum SLEEI mulai

- Komitmen mitra yg kuat; (a/l sehubungan dengan seleksi mitra dalam menyusun proposal)
- Komitment yang kuat dari fasilitator dan contact person masing masing universitas
- Sudah ada analisis dan pengalaman sebelum kita mulai proyek ini, dari penelitian & proyek sebelumnya

Effectifnya strategy SLEEI:

- Integrasi 5 nilai SLEEI dlm RPS dan Buku Ajar itu mengubah cara pembelajaran hukum mainstream yg monodisipliner ‘
- Membantu kami dalam mengintegrasikan topik2 SLEEI dalam RPS
- Ada hal-hal baru yang kami dapatkan, bukan hanya ilmu hukum *tapi juga model pembelajaran.*
- Membantu teman2 dosen untuk lebih mengerti lagi proses integrasi dengan adanya workshop2

Target universitas betul didengar dan diberi tanggung jawab sepenuhnya

- Keterlibatan benar ‘target group’: Conto buku ajar muncul dari universitas, tidak ada di proposal SLEEI
- Kami dipercayakan untuk mengarrange kegiatan sendiri sesuai kondisi dan situasi kami
- Keluwesan/flexibility pelaksanaan program sehingga waktu-waktu kegiatan bisa disesuaikan dengan kampus masing-masing
- Pengertian untuk konteks lokal masing masing universitas
- Deadline yg ‘keras’ dari SLEEI tidak ada dan sebaiknya juga tidak akan ada
- Kami merasa didengar

Bentuk interaksi dalam SLEEI

- Interaksi yang terjalin sangat baik, saling melengkapi satu dengan yang lainnya. Vica
- Saling menghormati dan mengapresiasi
- Kerjasama yang baik, kompak, trainners 4 kampus yang sangat profesional
- Motivasi untuk saling belajar dari semua orang yang terlibat dalam proyek ini sangat besar
- Kesamaan keinginan untuk berbagi pengetahuan
- Semua anggota program setara, mitra yang dari Belanda-pun tidak patronizing atau memaksakan program, tapi berperan sebagai fasilitator
- Tradisi egaliter di SLEEI harus bisa tetap dirawat dan diperjuangkan

Match dengan kebutuhan

- Tujuan proyek ini sangat cocok dengan reformasi hukum yang di butuhkan di Indonesia

Misi dan visi yg sama dan dikembangkan:

- Ada mimpi dan imajinasi masa depan pendidikan hukum, perlulah strategic plan bagi kita
- Pertemuan dari awalnya, sehingga ada ikatan dan komitmen terhadap proyek & langkajnya

Role dan peran team fasilitator

- Fasilitator dari Indonesia yang sangat top
- Dukungan untuk mendapat expert dari luar untuk memperkuat lembaga maupun kapasitas dosen
- Para Narasumber yang luar biasa, yang selalu siap sedia; terbantu juga dengan informasi, materi dari semua narasumber
- Membantu dalam situasi dan kondisi apapun
- Komitmen dan pengalaman para faislitator
- Fasilitator luar biasa (baik dari dalam maupun luar negeri), tidak ada batasan dalam membagikan ilmu. Selalu siap sedia, dan penuh hormat.
- Narasumber yang sangat “down to earth”
- Para narasumber tidak arogan dan sombong dalam memberi materi

***Role team ‘Belanda*:**

- Pa Laurens, ibu Jaqualine dan Pa adriaan sangat sabar dalam menghadapi kami para Mitra
- Keterlibatan ‘ahli’ dari Belanda yang berbicara Bahasa Indonesia & komitmen (& waktu yang ditersediakan) oleh JV & LvV
- Satu faktor yang penting adalah bahwa kita bicara dalam Bahasa Lisa (L: karena semua mitra dari Belanda bisa berbicara BI)

Role dan peran 4 kampuses / koordinator

- Koordinator2 kampus berhasil menjalankan peran mereka dengan baik
- Mitra 4 universitas Indonesia Timur yg mengasyikan/fun/cool

Informasi dan kuliah bersama dosen pengasuh matakuliah tertentu

Isu - Perbaikan

- Komunikasi yg lebih intens untuk melaporkan kemajuan kegiatan
- Lebih baik kalau waktu programnya lebih lama dan jumlah kampus mitra di Indonesia Timur lebih banyak
- Kegiatan para peserta, narasumber, dan trainer yang sering berbenturan (clash)
- Dukungan kelembagaan yg lebih baik dari departemen & fakultas (tergantung kampus)
- Dalam workshop kepada para dosen, perlu evaluasi semacam pre dan post-test untuk mengukur keberhasilannya
- Kurang banyak dosen di kampus yang terlibat secara genuine, mungkin karena sibuk, kebanyakan karena ini program luar negeri saja; jalan keluar?

- Perlu Evaluasi berkala bagi mitra dan fasilitar; pertemuan berkala
- Workshop secara online, ada kendala-kendala teknis, dan terkadang membuat peserta tidak fokus, karena ada hal lain yg dikerjakan juga. *Harapannya bisa offline terus.*
- Monitoring utk memastikan lebih tersambungnya satu kegiatan dgn yg lainnya
- Media untuk mengkomunikasikan program ke luar kurang efektif, hanya website (mungkin perlu ditambah medsos dan lainnya)

Ke depan:

- Sukses artinya bermakna, jadi pemaknaan ini harus dirawat dan dijaga, dilipatgandakan, dan diperjuangkan (bayangkan Papua, Sulawesi, dll)
- Informasi SLEEI untuk Fakultas Hukum diluar Mita harus menjadi tanggunjawab mitra
- Perlu menghubungkan dunia kampus dengan dunia aktivisme
- SLEEI perlu memanfaatkan jaringan asosiasi akademik untuk akselerasi program atau pendekatan
- Perlu imajinasi: Setelah integrasi dlm RPS dan buku ajar, tangga berikutnya: apa yg harus ditngkatkan dg kondisi kampus yg berbeda-beda? (tidak bisa disamaratakan)
- Perlu mempertimbangkan jangka waktu program agar terjadi proses evaluasi dan monitoring integrasi SLEEI pada RPS yang berkelanjutan