

[MUSIC PLAYING]

INTERVIEWER: Hello, and welcome back to the Student Hub Live. In this session, we're going to look at social justice and public legal education. And joining me are Simon Lee, Paul Catley, and Hugh McFaul. Thank you for coming today.

Now, we've got some big questions here to tackle. And I'm hoping that we can have a look at them, because some of the key themes that we're going to look at are, what is the connection between social justice and legal education? What role can OU law students play in providing public legal education? And should a law school be concerned with social justice?

So lots of very topical issues there. So I'd like to start with this idea that changes in funding have had a negative impact on access to justice. So can you tell us what we mean by access to justice, and why it's under threat?

HUGH MCFAUL: Well, access to justice, I think, is fundamental to any legal system, because not only do you need to have a system of courts and judges whereby rules are fairly adjudicated on, so if I've got a dispute, say, with Simon, I know that if I go to court, a judge will be there to give a fair hearing to my arguments, and he will also listen to Simon's point of view, and he'll reach a judgement according to the law.

Now, that's all well and good that you've got judges and a court system that is functioning. And the judges can be of really good quality and very fair. But it's the extent to which people understand and can get the right advice to be able to access those rights, is what we mean by access to justice.

Do you know that you've got a legal problem? If you know that you've got a legal problem, can you get the right advice to know how to present it in court? And can you get representation? Because most people aren't uncomfortable in knowing enough about the law to be able to present their own case. So that's really what we mean by access to justice.

And students who studied law before might have heard the phrase "the rule of law," and it is the case, I think, that access to justice is fundamental to upholding the rule of law. So to make our society work in an orderly and lawful way, access to justice is fundamental to that. And I think it's fair to say that in recent years, the way in which legal advice and representation has

been funded has been changed quite radically, and the amount of money that the government is spending on providing this advice and representation is really a lot less than it used to be. So there's a squeeze on this kind of support for free legal advice.

So the Legal Aid Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act, 2012, which is often known as LASPO, is an example of an act that changed the way the funding was organised, which means that the effect of it is that there's less money for legal aid, so less opportunities for solicitors to provide free legal advice to people who couldn't otherwise afford it. So this is a cause of concern to quite a lot of civil society groups, certainly to the legal profession, and also across the political spectrum. There is a sense in which there's a problem for the way in which we adjust to this new regime of funding legal advice.

So there really is a big question, and some people are talking about it in terms of a crisis in access to justice. But I would argue that there is an issue for us to address, in the sense that, have we got a system that works for all of the people who will need advice and representation in order to access that justice when they need it?

INTERVIEWER: Some big questions. You're nodding while we're talking, Simon.

SIMON LEE: Well, yes. I mean, earlier today, I was at the launch of the Justice Borders and Rights research group in the university. And they were looking at the case of Abdul Haroun, that students might remember. A chap walked through the Channel Tunnel a couple of years ago. He'd come from Darfur through Libya and continental Europe, and then was in Calais, and then walked through the Channel Tunnel. He was about a mile away from freedom, if you like, when he was arrested for obstructing the railway, essentially.

And he was in jail for a few months before any group could get help to him to understand his rights. And there was a big media fuss, political fuss, saying that he should be made an example of. Normally, the Crown Prosecution Service might not have prosecuted. But they did.

In the end, he pleaded guilty. But he'd already served enough time in prison that he was then allowed out. But that would be an example where somebody who is a stranger to the system would be literally disorientated, might be looking for help. And there are all kinds of refugee support groups, in Kent, for instance, where he came. And they want to help, but they need to have support, funding, and they need to have access, literally, to be able to get to their potential client.

But it's not just refugees who are in this sort of situation. The cuts to legal aid mean that the vast bulk of the population are in positions where, really, being able to go to court and claim their rights and get representation, which for many people is vital, is beyond their ability to pay. And that's a real problem. And you know, it's an issue when groups like Amnesty International, which are normally talking about sort of international issues, are raising the state of legal aid, and when judges like the president of the Supreme Court and the Lord Chief Justice are talking about the problems of individuals not being able to access justice. So this is a big question, not just for a few minorities, but really for an awful lot of the population.

INTERVIEWER: So these two groups, really, I mean, people who are obviously in need of some sort of legal support, which they know about, but here you mention that a lot of people may not know about things. And of course, it's difficult to measure these statistics when there are these unknowns. But arguably, I mean, we were talking before about some examples of some mock advice people would give about a toaster, a pair of jeans, for example, all these things that people might write into the pro bono clinic about and our students would answer. So to what extent is there an issue in terms of people not being aware that they may be beneficial to have some legal aid?

HUGH MCFAUL: Well, some of the research literature is suggesting that very often, people are lacking in kind of legal literacy, if you like, that people in the wider public perhaps are unaware of their rights, unaware of where to turn to if they feel that they do have a legal problem. But even in a more fundamental level than that, sometimes it's difficult to actually recognise that there might be a legal dimension to a problem that they have. So it would be interesting to see what the students listening think about it.

But there is an argument that the general public do have a lack of understanding of the law. Perhaps the law is too complicated, too convoluted, too difficult, to-- the way it's written is perhaps inaccessible to most people. Unless you've studied it, you find it hard to understand what it's really saying to you in your particular situation.

So there is an argument that's out there to suggest that we need to do more to educate the public more widely about their basic legal rights, so they can, when they're in a position where they've got a problem, recognise that there might be a legal solution to that problem. So what we're talking about is really thinking about how-- is there a role for schools? Is there a role for universities or law schools like ourselves to try and provide more accessible, easily understood access to people's legal rights and duties?

So this phrase "public legal education" is used to try and pinpoint people's needs at an earlier stage, because in relation to the funding cuts that we've got, we can't leave it until someone's developed, you know, a full-blown legal problem to sort it out. We need to try and help people have the knowledge and understanding to address that problem at an earlier stage.

So intervening early stops a problem, often, escalating. And so to do that, people need to understand, and their communities need to understand, the basic legal framework. So the argument is, I think, is the law too complex for many people? And if it is, how can we address that? What kind of methods, what kind of ways can we try and improve wider levels of legal understanding, or legal literacy?

INTERVIEWER: Now, our audience agree, in terms of the point that they think the public don't understand the law very well. What's your opinion, Simon?

SIMON LEE: Well, a simple example would be phones. Most students and the wider public now have mobile phones. And they may have been lured in by a deal which said no contract deal. But it is a contract. And it is confusing. And it's been pointed out to the Advertising Standards Authority that they're allowing people to say there isn't a contract, by which they mean you're not tied in for a long time.

But then if you go on easyJet for a weekend away, and your phone deal turns out to cost you hundreds of pounds, and you know that your fellow student on the same trip isn't paying, and you want to get out of that deal, then the advice of a law student working pro bono would be much appreciated. And often it's in how to craft either your phone call or your email or your letter to make the point in a firm way.

HUGH MCFAUL: And the latest research suggests that a lot of law schools throughout the UK are getting involved in this kind of activity, both the public legal education side and providing advice in law clinics. And I think there's an opportunity for us in the Open University to try and reach a wider level of the public because of our use of technology. And I think it's really interesting to think about the place that the Open University-- we're coming to its 50-year anniversary, that it was conceived as a university of the air, to enhance technology and bring higher education to a wider audience. And I would argue that the advances in technology that we've seen recently would show that we can use technology such as video streaming that we're doing now to try and make public understanding of law more accessible to a wider audience.

And this is something that's been recognised by the civil justice system itself, because what the Briggs Report recently suggested, in a review of the way that civil justice is dealt with, is that we should be moving towards an online dispute resolution, an online court for certain low-level, low-value claims. And that is something that we'll be-- you know, we'll be progressing towards.

So in the last session, we were talking about-- the previous session, where we were talking about automation and how that's having an impact on people's jobs. This is another area where the advance of technology is going to have an impact. So the courts will be moving more to an online format in some settings, and I think the Open University has got a role to play, I think, in helping people to adjust to this kind of new world of a court system, but also to harness the technology to try and help alleviate what people are describing as the justice gap, this gap in funding for advice and representation.

PAUL CATLEY: And I think one of the ways in which we can really address that justice gap is through the online legal education. It is to have websites where people can find out basic information so that they are much more aware of perhaps when they have got a legal claim, but also sometimes where they haven't.

But you know, the idea of being informed and understanding your legal rights is, I think, something which is vital. And we've seen in recent years, you know, the sort of funding gap not just in legal aid, but also organisations like Citizens Advice Bureaus, which have been really sort of struggling to maintain the service which they're very well aware is needed. And so if we can play a part in that too, I think that would be a great step forward.

INTERVIEWER: We asked you at home how important it is for law students to try and educate the public about legal issues. And we'll get to the result of that very soon. If you haven't voted on that yet, you can just open that interactive widget and select where on the continuum you think, from not very important to very important, you would place your vote. And we'll have a look at that very soon.

We've had this issue, then, about what can be done, and how one can do it. And Simon, you've had some experiences in Belfast as the head of the law school. So thinking about this idea, then, about how law schools can play a part in supporting access to open justice, outside of the Open University, what are some of the experiences that you've had?

SIMON LEE: Well, yes. So here in the Open University Law School, Paul is the head of it, and has led this

initiative, which Hugh and colleagues are taking forward. If you go back 20, 30 years, say, in Queens University Belfast, which was the only law school at that time in Northern Ireland, which is a separate legal system, and obviously, the legal system was in the middle of a conflict. And so it was very important, I think, that the law school had a mission to try to make a difference, to try to move towards a more just society.

My colleagues included, on the staff, David Trimble, who became the first minister of Northern Ireland and won the Nobel Peace Prize, and Mary McAleese, who became the president of Ireland. And they were seen as being on different sides of the community. They'd both been students in the law school. David Trimble had taught Mary McAleese.

And if you have a law school culture in which people are expected to go out and give advice, literally on the streets, if there's a parade going on in Northern Ireland or in the prisons, where the Open University did fantastic work in Northern Ireland educating the prisoners, which made a massive contribution to the peace process. And for me, all of that was very moving, and it built on my own experiences as a student in America, where we were all expected to do the kind of thing which is being encouraged here.

And as part of that, I went into a prison where Yale Law students were trying to help prisoners mount a claim that they were in inhuman conditions, because they were three to a cell. It was meant to be one to a cell. And just walking into the prison, which is a male prison, the most obvious thing as a white English person is to see that, well, virtually everybody here is black-- you now say African-American-- or Hispanic. And it was a real shock, if you like, as to, well, what is the system doing?

And so it isn't just that you're trying to make a difference in Northern Ireland or America or wherever it might be, but also it makes a difference to you as a student of the law to think, well, yes, this is an important vocation, if you like, or profession. So I'm fully behind this. And I think the idea that people can come into the Open University pro bono Open Justice initiative and be helped wherever they are and wherever the student is in the country, is obviously a terrific advantage that law schools such as Queens didn't have. But they did their best in difficult times.

HUGH MCFAUL: I guess I think what's exciting about that, when you were talking about your experience at Yale Law School, is that the fact that the OU's a national university, students will be able to engage in communities all through the United Kingdom, which is the point about this kind of public

legal education model we're looking at isn't that we're expecting people to come to us, but we will be going out into the community.

So we heard from the two students before, Owen and Eva, about them going to the school in Milton Keynes. But that's the plan for this project, is to take the knowledge that students have gained while studying law with the Open University and taking it out into their community. So this kind of model is what's known as street law, which did start in the United States, and its model is-- I mean, the strength of it really is that those who are going to talk about the law with a particular group will want, in the first instance, to actually find out what is of interest to that group. What are the issues that they're dealing with?

So it's not about going in and just talking about any old aspect of law. It's what's the law that's relevant to them in that particular place? So we are building on this to work with prison communities with recently released offenders and so on, and also in a variety of community settings.

But the key thing is that students getting involved in this project from the Open University angle will be working with the community to think, well, what are the issues that are important to you? And then trying to explain to that community what are some of the legal aspects that they could think about? So it's not necessarily a top-down approach. It's about working with that community to think, well, what are the issues that you're facing? Hence, the work that Eva and Owen did about social media and cyberbullying, which is an issue that's of real relevance to school pupils nowadays, because they're having to negotiate what is a fairly tricky world of dealing with smartphone technology at all times, and some of the pitfalls that are involved in that.

So that model, I think, is quite powerful, that street law model. So what we're talking about with public legal education is, yes, providing good quality, easily accessible legal education and advice with a virtual law clinic, but also about going into the community to work with groups. And I think that's what makes it a really exciting initiative, really.

PAUL CATLEY: I think something that's really great about it is it's the benefits on both sides. It's the benefits for those who are receiving the legal education, which is really tailored to things that matter to them, but also for the students. You know, the skills that they are developing, of thinking about their audience, tailoring the event to really work for that audience, getting presentational skills, working as part of a team. You know, they are all hugely valuable skills. Plus, the feeling of

doing some good.

INTERVIEWER: We're going to take a look at public legal education in prisons very soon. And we've spoken earlier about the huge benefits that students have in terms of employability, and of course the moral aspects here in terms of social justice. But shouldn't the role of a law school be to teach students law? I mean, shouldn't that be the primary aim? I appreciate all of these areas are so beneficial and nourishing, but where is that balance?

HUGH MCFAUL: Well, I think that's a great question. I think, you know, this kind of project has raised a lot of interesting issues, not least, are we letting the government, the state, off the hook, really, in not providing proper access to legal advice and representation? Is it up to law students to try and fill that gap? I mean, that's a big question.

And I think there's a debate amongst people who teach in this kind of area, clinical legal education, about the extent to which the purpose of it is to foster social justice, which is what we've been talking about, or is the purpose of it to give students an experience that is of value to them? And I would argue it's both, really. And I'd say that students who engage in these kind of activities will find it immensely valuable.

And I think that really came through when Owen and Eva were discussing their experience. And I think, as a student, these kind of opportunities are really valuable to open up your eyes to different parts of society that you perhaps wouldn't have come across. And when Simon was talking about his visit to the prison in America and how shocked he was about the racial makeup of the prison, really brings things home.

So I think there are real advantages for students getting involved in this. But there are, I think, interesting political and ethical issues, which we probably won't resolve here, but it'd be interesting to talk about, about how-- is it right for a law school to have what some would say is a fairly kind of political agenda, really, in trying to serve the wider community? Or does a university just exist for itself, in a way that the business works, where we recruit enough students to pay the salaries of the staff, and as long as we keep the students happy, is that the end of our mission? Or do we have a responsibility to the wider community?

And also, there's ethical issues to be thinking about when students do engage in giving legal advice. You know, just as some people are a bit nervous about getting their hair cut by a trainee hairdresser, some people might be nervous about getting legal advice from a law student. So we need to make sure that the advice is properly supervised, and that the kind of

material that we're putting out in the public domain is of a sufficient quality for us to be able to say that it's worth the time of the public to engage with it.

So there are lots of issues around that. But I think, for me, it does raise really interesting issues about what the role of a university is, and how far is the purpose of a university to serve the interests of the wider community, or are we just about-- is it just a transaction between students who are willing to pay enough money to study hard enough so we can award them a degree that's for their own purposes? Or are we more than that?

So, both.

INTERVIEWER: 'I'll leave that to you two.

PAUL CATLEY: I think a university is more than just that. And certainly I think the Open University is more than just a place where students can get degrees. You know, I think it was set up with this idea of supporting social justice at its core. And I think that's something which is really important.

But I also don't think there's really the conflict between either we are about teaching students about the law or we're about promoting social justice, because in a sense, through these activities, students are learning a lot about the law. You know, if, as a student, you are giving legal advice, and you know that actually this is a real case, and this is a real issue, that is a very different situation from just looking at a piece of coursework and thinking, well, it doesn't really matter if I get it right or wrong. You know, it's only a few marks.

You know, this is something which really matters to this individual who you are advising. And therefore, not only do you need to work out accurately what the legal situation is, but you've then got to think about your audience and explain the law in a way that that person is going to be able to understand. And I think, you know, that is hugely valuable for the student, as well as answering a real sort of social need.

INTERVIEWER: Before I come to you, Simon, I just want to feed in some of the audience feedback, because we asked, should a university law school be concerned with social justice? And let's see what you said. 100% of people saying yes, we should be concerned with social justice. So I think we're all in agreement, even though there are obviously a lot of complexities and ethical issues. Simon?

SIMON LEE: Well, the people have spoken, so I'm not sure I need to--

INTERVIEWER: Closed!

SIMON LEE: --to add anything. But when I was a student, which was 40 years ago, as an undergraduate studying law, I studied Roman law, which hadn't been operating for quite some time, but it was still a valuable exercise. And I also studied European law. Now, you wouldn't-- or I wouldn't, anyway-- say in two years' time we should just stop considering European law, because we're only interested in what the law is in the UK. It's actually very important to think through the coming into a European partnership, international treaties more generally, what happens when you withdraw from them?

And so even when we're teaching the law, it's not as simple as it sounds. And it's about the skills, also, that you develop, and the virtues or passions or ideals, including justice, that you are imbibing through the course and obviously challenging. So I think the 100% are absolutely right.

INTERVIEWER: Now, you had some interesting experiences when you were training, you know, and in pro bono issues. I wonder if you could tell us about one of them.

SIMON LEE: Well, yes, but I think that it's so encouraging to see the students today really sharing what is the concern of people today, that it might seem as if we're going into ancient history if I look back on my career. But if I can give perhaps a different example, it would be in my early days as a young lecturer in law, the students were very concerned with miscarriage of justice cases, because we had the Guildford Four, the Birmingham Six, Winston Silcott, all these kinds of cases. And students were incensed and outraged. And they really felt let down by the legal system.

And one of the things I'm going to try and address tomorrow in my inaugural lecture, which is called "Open and Shut Cases," is how the media seems certain that somebody did it. Somebody is guilty. And actually, 10 years later, it turns out they didn't do it. They were framed.

And what does that do to the credibility of the legal system? But also, more positively, what does it teach us? That we should always be a little bit sceptical about what the media are telling us. And that's one of the things you learn, I think, in law school, that the path of the law, as a famous judge said, is strewn with cases which appear to be open and shut, but were not.

And that's very important, and both as a student and as a young lecturer, I think that I learned

that in action. And then you try to keep open-minded as you get older. Perhaps more difficult over time. But you have to work at that.

And so we've got the curious thing now where if the media say somebody is guilty or somebody is awful, whatever, people tend to believe it. But in fiction, I don't want to have any plot spoilers, but *Broadchurch* or *Line of Duty*, we all understand it's not going to be the obvious suspect. Or that there might be somebody who's been framed. And so what we actually have to do is to take that critical approach we have in fiction and apply it to fact, and to be really challenging of politicians and of journalists who are telling you things which you really deep down think cannot be true.

PAUL CATLEY: And I think that that's an issue in terms of the sort of cutbacks in legal aid, because it's very easy for a politician to talk about fat cat lawyers and to identify one or two cases which seem on the face of it to be running up very high legal bills and things like that, and to be about not particularly deserving individuals, and then to use that as a sort of shorthand to then say, so we must save money in this area. And you know, it fits very nicely into a dialogue about austerity and the need to cut back on public expenditure generally. But what isn't then looked at are individuals who are really going to suffer as a result of those so-called savings.

INTERVIEWER: I mean, the media has such a huge role in terms of how these things are influenced. And this sort of taps into this idea of how we educate people, because people are learning so much from such a range of sources. We asked students earlier today about how they were researching things, and the primary source was things like Google, et cetera. So we're gathering data from different sorts of sources.

And I guess one of the challenges in terms of public legal education is being able to give people bite-sized chunks of information, in particular with things like Brexit. You know, the public weren't aware of so many of the implications. But equally, they don't want to necessarily go off and do all of this research. So how do we provide this legal education in tangible, bite-sized chunks? I mean, as a distance education provider, shouldn't we be in a key position to be able to tackle this issue in a way that's appetising for the public to be able to tap into the right things?

PAUL CATLEY: Well, I think that that example of Brexit is a nice one, because it's an example where one of our colleagues, Ann has been involved in quite a lot of media work, so she was involved in the BBC programme with Jeremy Paxman looking at the sort of issues behind Brexit before the

referendum. But also it's the sort of area where we have then been through things like the conversation, getting a material out into the sort of public arena, but also, as Hugh was talking earlier about, our students going out into a school and talking about Brexit and human rights, and explaining the fact that the European Court of Human Rights is something different to the European Union, because you know, the media tends to just talk about Europe, and Europe's judges, and things like that, as if it's just one organisation. And it isn't. And it's important that people appreciate those differences.

SIMON LEE:

Can I give an example of Brexit as well? There was that case in the Supreme Court in December, the *Miller* case. It was actually two plaintiffs, Miller and Santos. And I was asked to write something for an obscure constitutional law blog on the history of Professor Dicey and others writing about this over 100 years ago.

And it went up in the early afternoon, and within half an hour, counsel, the QC, down at chambers for Santos, had emailed me, partly because I taught him when he was a law student at King's College London, and partly because he found it amusing what I was saying. Not necessarily helpful to him.

But that kind of engagement can now happen. Any academic, any student, can spot something, write it, and it doesn't have to be in, in my day, to the *Law Quarterly Review* or something, which takes a while to come out. You can be instant. And you can contribute to that public debate.

And then you can see people arguing in court. You can actually see them now on television, which was something I argued for many years ago. So I do feel that there is that engagement that our students have, and that we want to support.

HUGH MCFAUL:

Yeah, and I think, you know, following on from Eva's presentation at Denbigh High School, where she talked about social media and fake news and where do you find proper sources of information, I think that was an issue, again, in the Brexit referendum, that the whole discussion became very politicised. And I think there was a quite-- for some people, there was a lack of understanding about the institutions of the European Union. I mean, Paul talked about that there is often a confusion between the role of the European Court of Justice and the European Court of Human Rights, which have very distinct purposes.

And within this framework, where there can be some lack of understanding, then in a way, it's difficult for people to make informed decisions when they're voting, really. So in the same way

we talked about how access to justice is important for the rule of law, you could argue an informed electorate is important for the proper functioning of democracy. Otherwise, people can be swayed by opinions that aren't really grounded in fact.

So students who are studying law here have got the-- they're developing the skills to be able to be a bit critical, to be able to sift through different sources of information, to make informed decisions about which sources to rely on. And I think that this kind of project will allow us to have a space on the internet, using the Open Justice Centre website to provide sources of information around legal principles.

SIMON LEE:

If I can give another example from one of those miscarriage of justice cases, the Broadwater Farm, Tottenham estate riots, a police officer, Keith Blakelock, was killed. Winston Silcott was found guilty of his murder. And it emerged that he was on bail from another murder charge at the time. So MPs said that the judge should resign.

I was brought onto the television to talk about this. I said, but the MPs passed the law that said you have a right to be released on bail, at the time, unless you were likely to abscond or to intimidate a witness or to repeat the offence. And so it's your fault. It's the MPs' fault. But the media and the MPs were blaming this judge.

And then in the end, it turned out that Winston Silcott hadn't done it. So whenever something crops up, or take the example more recently, the Westminster attack, even channel 4, who had been complaining about fake news, they named the wrong person, because there is a rush in the media to have the news and the glory of it, but also to serve their public. But they may get things wrong.

And so there is a role for independent lawyers and educationalists to stand up and say, wait a minute. It's more complicated than that. And then to try to explain.

INTERVIEWER:

And I'd like to end the session by just saying that HJ has given a link in the chat. So if you've enjoyed this conversation and you'd like to go to Simon's lecture tomorrow, HJ has put a link that you can access that. That will be on livestream as well tomorrow.

I mean, it's a very, very complex issue. And the final thing I'd like to just talk about is the relationship with the BBC, because of course we've been talking about the media, and one of the things that the Open University, and indeed you, Hugh, are doing, is working with the BBC on some material to educate people in a more fun way.

HUGH MCFAUL: Yeah, well, we've got a great relationship with the BBC where we co-produce certain programmes. So Paul was talking about another colleague of ours, Ann, who was involved in a programme about the European Union before the referendum. So the series of programmes I'm involved in is called *The Detectives*, and it's going to be aired in September. And it follows-- it's four one-hour documentaries following the work of the serious incident team in Manchester. So following the work of police officers who are called to deal with very serious offences.

And in this case, it's all to do with murder or manslaughter offences. And it talks about how the detectives go about gathering the evidence to make a convincing case and following up through to the trial process and then the verdict. So this, I think, is a great example of how the Open University and the BBC can work together to explain some very important principles to do with the law.

So this is going to be focusing on issues to do with criminal justice, so some of the criminal justice processes, and also the importance of gathering evidence. And you see the way that the detectives work, how much time and effort is placed into gathering the right quality of evidence, because over the years, there's been a lot of legal principles that have developed about making sure that evidence is presented in a fair way in court, but also that it's collected in a fair way. And you can see, in some ways, the kind of burden that it puts the police officers under when they're actually trying to gather sufficient evidence to bring a case.

But also I think it's quite reassuring to see how the development of the law and legal principles has had such a direct and practical influence about the way evidence and the police do their job to avoid some of the miscarriages of justice that Simon was referring to. So yeah, so this is an example of how we can, as a university, provide opportunities that widen people's and deepen people's understanding of legal issues. And it isn't such a painful thing to do to sit down and watch an interesting documentary of an evening.

And then spinning off from that, we'll be using our website to provide some wider background information about some of the legal principles that are discussed in the programme. So yeah, so it's a great, great project to be involved in. I'm delighted to be part of it. And I hope students will be able to tune in in September. So look out for that one.

INTERVIEWER: No, I'm sure they will. And of course, OpenLearn is a great source of information that often has things that support a lot of the programming that we do. So check that out as well.

Hugh, Paul, and Simon, thank you so much for joining me tonight. I wish we had more time. This has been a fantastic conversation.

But we must break now, because joining me next we will be talking about public legal education to prisoners and in prison. But before that, we're going to have a brief video which is about practical legal writing.

And if you enjoyed this, you might like to check out the session that we had earlier today, where we talked about some key legal skills. And you can watch that on the catch-up. But I'll be back live in five minutes. See you soon.

[MUSIC PLAYING]