

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: Juris Doctor (J.D.)

Department: Law

Degree or Certificate Level: Professional

College/School: School of Law

Date (Month/Year): 08/2021

Primary Assessment Contact: Erika Cohn (committee chair)/Ann Scarlett (Associate Dean)

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2020

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2021

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

Learning Outcome #5 – Graduates will demonstrate competency in additional skills that are essential for effective lawyering.

Performance criteria:

- 5.1 Graduates will capably manage legal projects (case, memorandum, mediation, transactions, etc.) from inception to conclusion.
- 5.2 Graduates will identify and be familiar with alternative dispute resolution techniques such as negotiations, mediations, arbitration and lawmaking activities.
- 5.3 Graduates will effectively plan and control their use of time and other resources.
- 5.4 Graduates will demonstrate their ability to work as part of a team.

2. Assessment Methods: Student Artifacts

Which student artifacts were used to determine if students achieved this outcome? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

Artifacts were identified from law school courses and some of these artifacts were collected for the Fall 2020 semester. However, some courses were not taught in Fall 2020 and some courses did not generate the artifacts for Fall 2020 because exams/evaluations were altered for online administration due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Here are the artifacts identified, with notations as to whether they were collected for Fall 2020:

5.1

Civil Practice: add-on rubric (collected for Fall 2020)

Clinics: assessment rubric (collected for Fall 2020)

Field Placements: site supervisor survey (not collected for Fall 2020, because incorrect evaluation sent)

5.2

Civil Practice: add-on rubric (collected for Fall 2020)

Civil Procedure: dispute resolution assessment (collected for Fall 2020)

Advanced Legal Research: quiz (not collected because evaluation format changed)

Negotiations: rubric (not collected because evaluation format changed)

ADR: rubric (not collected because evaluation format changed)

5.3

Clinics: assessment rubric (collected for Fall 2020)

LRW II: oral argument rubric (not taught in Fall 2020)

Evidence and Advocacy: trial rubric (not taught in Fall 2020)

Field Placements: site supervisor survey (not collected for Fall 2020, because incorrect evaluation sent)
Trial Ad: trial rubric (not collected in Fall 2020, because evaluation altered for an online final trial)

5.4
Clinics: assessment rubric (collected for Fall 2020)
Urban Issues: peer evaluation rubric (not taught in Fall 2020)
ADR: rubric (not collected because evaluation format changed)
Negotiations: rubric (not collected because evaluation format changed)
Moot Court: oral argument rubric (not collected for Fall 2020, because evaluation altered for an online oral argument)
Field Placement: site supervisor survey (not collected for Fall 2020, because incorrect evaluation sent)

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the student artifacts, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

A faculty task force was assembled to evaluate the student artifacts.

Most artifacts were rubrics created with the assistance of task force members for the express purpose of evaluating whether students had achieved basic competency or above for the skill. Those rubrics are attached.

For the one multiple-choice quiz used to evaluate students' understanding, correct responses were deemed to show only exposure to the skill.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcomes? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

The results are limited, given only one semester of data was collected from a small number of courses.

5.1 – For Civil Practice and Clinics, 89% of students showed basic competency or above.

5.2 – For Civil Practice, 100% of students showed basic competency or above. For Civil Procedure, only exposure was evaluated with 71% showing an accurate understanding of negotiation and 85% showing an accurate understanding of mediation.

5.3 For Civil Practice and Clinics, 92% of students showed basic competency or above.

5.4 For Civil Practice and Clinics, 100% of students showed basic competency or above.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

The data indicates that 100% of students in Clinics and Civil Practice showed basic competency or above for 5.2 and 5.4. For 5.1 and 5.3, 89-92% of students in Clinics and Civil Practice showed based competency or above, which suggests about 10% of students may need additional practice to achieve basic competency in managing legal projects from inception to conclusion (5.1) and in effectively planning/controlling their use of time and other resources (5.3).

For a more inclusive data set, artifacts need to be collected from a broader range of courses and artifacts need to be collected for both fall and spring semesters in an academic year as some courses are taught in only one semester. In addition, if evaluations must occur online again due to the COVID-19 pandemic, rubrics need to be adapted so that the skills for the learning outcomes can still be evaluated.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

Results and findings will be shared and discussed at a faculty meeting in the 2021-2022 academic year.

B. How specifically have you decided to use findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies

- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites

- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan

- Student learning outcomes
- Student artifacts collected
- Evaluation process

- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of the findings.

The rubric created for Civil Practice can be adapted for other courses that teach skills for this learning outcome, and the task force will share this rubric with faculty to facilitate broader data collection.

To expand the course offerings focused on 5.2, a new course on Mediation has been added to the curriculum and at least two sections of the course will be offered in AY2021-2022.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

N/A – this is only the second year of the School of Law’s program-level assessment process.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

N/A

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

N/A

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

N/A

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools and/or revised/updated assessment plans along with this report.

CIVIL PRACTICE
L.O. 5 Rubric
Professor Roediger

Student Name: _____

Semester: Fall 2020

Date: 12/19/20

INSTRUCTIONS: For each skill, please rate the student using the scale below and provide a brief written explanation.¹ There is additional space for comments at the end of the document.

Rating scale:

4 – First Year Attorney: student performs this skill as well as an average first-year attorney without direction from a supervisor.

3 – Basic Competency: student has performed this skill in a simulated setting but needs additional exposure and supervision

2 – Exposure: Student has been exposed to the skill

1 – No Experience: student has had no experience performing or attempting to perform this skill.

1. Management of Large Projects (LO 5.1): As evidenced by student's performance in the development of litigation plans and discovery/motion practice in furtherance of those plans

Rating (1-4): 3

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

2. Alternative Dispute Resolution/Mediation (LO 5.2): As evidenced by the negotiation planning, final negotiation, and settlement drafting.

Rating (1-4): 3

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

¹ SLU Law has adopted Learning Outcomes (LO) to measure student success. These are available on our website and sections of the LOs are referenced here in the evaluations as well

3. Management of Time (LO 5.3): As evidenced by completing multiple litigation tasks each week and timely completion.

Rating (1-4): 4

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

4. Team Work (LO 5.4): As evidenced by small group collaboration

Rating (1-4): 3

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

/s/ Brendan Roediger

**CIVIL LITIGATION CLINIC
FINAL EVALUATION
Professor Roediger**

Student Name: _____

Semester: Fall 2021

Date: 12/19/20

INSTRUCTIONS: For each skill, please rate the student using the scale below and provide a brief written explanation.¹ There is additional space for comments at the end of the document.

Rating scale:

4 – First Year Attorney: student performs this skill as well as an average first-year attorney without direction from a supervisor.

3 – Basic Competency: student has performed this skill in the law clinic setting, but needs supervision.

2 – Attempted Experience: student has attempted to perform this skill in the law clinic setting, but struggles with one or more details required for performance.

1 – Simulated Experience: student has performed or attempted to perform this skill in a classroom or other simulation (moot court, for homework, etc.), but has not yet performed this skill in the law clinic setting.

0 – No Experience: student has had no experience performing or attempting to perform this skill in clinic.

1. **Communication Ability (LO 3.1 and 3.2):** How clearly does the student communicate with clients, witnesses, opposing counsel and others involved in the court process? How well does the student translate complicated legal concepts into plain language? How clearly does the student communicate with office personnel, supervisors, and other students? How respectful is the student in communications? How poised is the student in communicating?

Rating (0-4): 4

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments

2. **Persuasive Advocacy (LO 3.4):** How persuasive is the student in arguing for the client's position? Students' oral advocacy in pre-trials, hearings, trials, and plea negotiation may be evaluated. Students' community presentations, as well as non-client specific advocacy before city council meetings and in other public forums, may also be evaluated. Students' written work may also be evaluated.

¹ SLU Law has adopted Learning Outcomes (LO) to measure student success. These are available on our website and sections of the LOs are referenced here in the evaluations as well

Rating (0-4): 4

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

3. **Written Competency (LO 3.3)**: How well does the student commit ideas to writing? How well does the student approach writing as an iterative process that includes self-editing and incorporating feedback from others? This skill can be measured by the student's performance in writing memos, notes to files, correspondence, pleadings, and other legal documents.

Rating (0-4): 4

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

4. **Fact Investigation (LO 2.1)**: How well does the student seek out the facts necessary to advocate for the client? Fact investigation includes not only formal discovery but also interviews and obtaining evidence through other means.

Rating (0-4): 4

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

5. **Research (LO 2.2 and 4.1-4.3)**: How well does the student perform research on behalf of a client? Can the student devise and implement a logical research plan that appropriately considers time constraints? How well does the student assess the weight of authority and employ the fundamental tools of legal research? Is the student able to synthesize applicable rules from the relevant authorities? This skill can be demonstrated in writing or orally.

Rating (0-4): 4

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

6. **Clients (LO 3.1)**: How well does the student build relationships with clients? Are the client relationships loyal, trusting, open, and transparent? How well does the client listen to the student?

Rating (0-4): 4

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

7. **Legal Analysis (LO 2.5)**: How well does the student analyze the facts in light of the law to develop and evaluate potential solutions to advance client goals? This skill can be demonstrated not only in written memorandums and research, but also in oral advocacy.

Rating (0-4): 4

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

8. **Tactics and Strategy (LO 2.5)**: How well does the student grasp the concept of tactics and strategy in the pursuit of a client's objective? Does the student give thought to the long-term ramifications of a particular tactic? Does the student consider the client's ultimate goal when evaluating the short-term steps that need to be taken?

Rating (0-4): 4

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

9. **Ethical and Professional Judgment (LO 6.1 and 6.2)**: How well does the student recognize the professional obligations of a practicing attorney? Does the student know where to look for guidance? How does the student react to ethical dilemmas? This skill can be demonstrated not only by being cognizant of the ethical boundaries imposed upon an attorney but also by an overall evaluation of the student's demeanor, dress, and how the student presents as a professional while working in the clinic.

Rating (0-4): 4

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

10. **Timekeeping and Time Management (LO 5.3)**: Has the student completed the hours required for the semester as laid out in the Clinic Manual? Have time entries been thorough and promptly recorded? Does the student manage their time effectively and efficiently working on client cases and projects? Has the student demonstrated the ability to get tasks completed in a timely manner? Does the student show up on time and complete clinic tasks during designated clinic hours? Does the student meet internal and external deadlines?

Rating (0-4): 4

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

11. **Case Management (LO 5.1)**: How well has the student managed their caseload overall? How well has the student kept detailed client notes and copies of all correspondence and pleadings in client files, kept client files organized and up to date, and/or written detailed and coherent transfer memos? Has the student kept copies of all client documents in Clio? How proactive is the student in moving cases and projects forward? Can the student appropriately sequence out steps needed to advance a given strategy? How much does the student rely on the supervisor to assign every task? Is the student able to take the next steps on their own?

Rating (0-4): 4

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

12. **Cross Cultural Competency and Jesuit Mission (LO 6.3, 7.1, and 7.2):** How well is the student able to provide competent and culturally sensitive legal services? How well does the student use interpreters? Does the student show respect for other cultures and people from other cultures? Can the student effectively serve diverse client populations? Does the student demonstrate a commitment to serve others?

Rating (0-4): 4

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

13. **Self-Assessment & Reflection (LO 7.4):** How well does the student recognize their own excellence and areas for growth? How well does the student put together a plan for new learning and/or experiences and follow through with that plan?

Rating (0-4): 4

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

14. **Collaboration (LO 5.4):** How well does the student collaborate with a partner, client, supervisor, colleagues, and others? Does the student work well in a group setting? Does the student provide assistance to other students when asked or needed? Does the student reach out to other students for assistance when appropriate?

Rating (0-4): 4

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

Additional Comments:

/s/ Brendan Roediger

**HUMAN RIGHTS AT HOME LIGATION CLINIC
FINAL EVALUATION**

Student Name: _____
Semester: Fall 2020
Supervisor Name: Lauren Bartlett
Date: December 15, 2020

INSTRUCTIONS: For each skill, please rate the student using the scale below and provide a brief written explanation. There is additional space for comments at the end of the document.

Rating scale:

4 – First Year Attorney: student performs this skill as well as an average first-year attorney without direction from a supervisor.

3 – Basic Competency: student has performed this skill in the law clinic setting, but needs supervision.

2 – Attempted Experience: student has attempted to perform this skill in the law clinic setting, but struggles with one or more details required for performance.

1 – Simulated Experience: student has performed or attempted to perform this skill in a classroom or other simulation (moot court, for homework, etc.), but has not yet performed this skill in the law clinic setting.

0 – No Experience: student has had no experience performing or attempting to perform this skill in clinic.

1. **Communication Ability (LO 3.1 and 3.2¹):** How clearly does the student communicate with clients, witnesses, opposing counsel and others involved in the court process? How well does the student translate complicated legal concepts into plain language? How clearly does the student communicate with office personnel, supervisors, and other students? How respectful is the student in communications? How poised is the student in communicating?

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester: YES NO

Rating: 0 1 2 3 4

2. **Persuasive Advocacy (LO 3.4):** How persuasive is the student in arguing for the client's position? Students' oral advocacy in pre-trials, hearings, trials, and plea negotiation may be evaluated. Students' community presentations, as well as non-client specific advocacy before city council meetings and in other public forums, may also be evaluated. Students' written work may also be evaluated.

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester: YES

¹ SLU Law has adopted Learning Outcomes (LO) to measure student success. These are available on our [website](#) and sections of the LOs are referenced here in the evaluations as well

Rating: 0 1 2 3 4

3. **Written Competency (LO 3.3):** How well does the student commit ideas to writing? How well does the student approach writing as an iterative process that includes self-editing and incorporating feedback from others? This skill can be measured by the student's performance in writing memos, notes to files, correspondence, pleadings, and other legal documents.

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester: YES

Rating: 0 1 2 3 4

4. **Fact Investigation (LO 2.1):** How well does the student seek out the facts necessary to advocate for the client? Fact investigation includes not only formal discovery but also interviews and obtaining evidence through other means.

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester: YES NO

Rating: 0 1 2 3 4

5. **Research (LO 2.2 and 4.1-4.3):** How well does the student perform research on behalf of a client? Can the student devise and implement a logical research plan that appropriately considers time constraints? How well does the student assess the weight of authority and employ the fundamental tools of legal research? Is the student able to synthesize applicable rules from the relevant authorities? This skill can be demonstrated in writing or orally.

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester: YES NO

Rating: 0 1 2 3.5 4

6. **Clients (LO 3.1):** How well does the student build relationships with clients? Are the client relationships loyal, trusting, open, and transparent? How well does the client listen to the student?

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester: YES NO

Rating: 0 1 2 3 4

7. **Legal Analysis (LO 2.5):** How well does the student analyze the facts in light of the law to develop and evaluate potential solutions to advance client goals? This skill can be demonstrated not only in written memorandums and research, but also in oral advocacy.

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester: N/A

Rating: 0 1 2 3 4

8. **Tactics and Strategy (LO 2.5):** How well does the student grasp the concept of tactics and strategy in the pursuit of a client's objective? Does the student give thought to the long-term ramifications of a particular tactic? Does the student consider the client's ultimate goal when evaluating the short-term steps that need to be taken?

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester: YES NO

Rating: 0 1 2 3 4

9. **Ethical and Professional Judgment (LO 6.1 and 6.2)**: How well does the student recognize the professional obligations of a practicing attorney? Does the student know where to look for guidance? How does the student react to ethical dilemmas? This skill can be demonstrated not only by being cognizant of the ethical boundaries imposed upon an attorney but also by an overall evaluation of the student's demeanor, dress, and how the student presents as a professional while working in the clinic.

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester: N/A Preethi was already demonstrating excellence in this area at the start of clinic.

Rating: 0 1 2 3 4

10. **Timekeeping and Time Management (LO 5.3)**: Has the student completed the hours required for the semester as laid out in the Clinic Manual? Have time entries been thorough and promptly recorded? Does the student manage their time effectively and efficiently working on client cases and projects? Has the student demonstrated the ability to get tasks completed in a timely manner? Does the student show up on time and complete clinic tasks during designated clinic hours? Does the student meet internal and external deadlines?

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester: YES NO

Rating: 0 1 2 3 4

11. **Case Management (LO 5.1)**: How well has the student managed their caseload overall? How well has the student kept detailed client notes and copies of all correspondence and pleadings in client files, kept client files organized and up to date, and/or written detailed and coherent transfer memos? Has the student kept copies of all client documents in Clio? How proactive is the student in moving cases and projects forward? Can the student appropriately sequence out steps needed to advance a given strategy? How much does the student rely on the supervisor to assign every task? Is the student able to take the next steps on their own?

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester: YES NO

Rating: 0 1 2 3 4

12. **Cross Cultural Competency and Jesuit Mission (LO 6.3, 7.1, and 7.2)**: How well is the student able to provide competent and culturally sensitive legal services? How well does the student use interpreters? Does the student show respect for other cultures and people from other cultures? Can the student effectively serve diverse client populations? Does the student demonstrate a commitment to serve others?

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester: N/A

Rating: 0 1 2 3 4

13. **Self-Assessment & Reflection (LO 7.4):** How well does the student recognize their own excellence and areas for growth? How well does the student put together a plan for new learning and/or experiences and follow through with that plan?

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester: **YES** NO

Rating: 0 1 2 3 4

14. **Collaboration (LO 5.4):** How well does the student collaborate with a partner, client, supervisor, colleagues, and others? Does the student work well in a group setting? Does the student provide assistance to other students when asked or needed? Does the student reach out to other students for assistance when appropriate?

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester: **YES** NO

Rating: 0 1 2 3 4

Bartlett

Supervisor Signature

**ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CLINIC
FINAL EVALUATION**

Student Name: [REDACTED]
Semester: Fall 2020
Supervisor Name: Prof. Dana Malkus
Date: December 1, 2020

INSTRUCTIONS: For each skill, please rate the student using the scale below and provide a brief written explanation. There is additional space for comments at the end of the document.

Rating scale:

- 4 – First Year Attorney:** student performs this skill as well as an average first-year attorney without direction from a supervisor.
- 3 – Basic Competency:** student has performed this skill in the law clinic setting, but needs supervision.
- 2 – Attempted Experience:** student has attempted to perform this skill in the law clinic setting, but struggles with one or more details required for performance.
- 1 – Simulated Experience:** student has performed or attempted to perform this skill in a classroom or other simulation (in-class exercise, for homework, etc.), but has not yet performed this skill in the law clinic setting.
- 0 – No Experience:** student has had no experience performing or attempting to perform this skill in clinic.

1. **Communication Ability (LO 3.1 and 3.2):** How clearly does the student communicate with clients? How well does the student translate complicated legal concepts into plain language? How clearly does the student communicate with office personnel, supervisors, and other students? How respectful is the student in communications? How poised is the student in communicating?

Rating (0-4): 3

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments [REDACTED]

2. **Legal Drafting (LO 2.5 and 3.3):** How well does the student demonstrate their ability to draft written agreements? Does the student know how to find and critically evaluate sample forms?

Does the student demonstrate an ability to tailor agreements to advance client goals and incorporate client and supervisor feedback?

Rating (0-4): 2.5

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments: [REDACTED]

3. **Written Competency (LO 3.3)**: How well does the student commit ideas to writing? How well does the student approach writing as an iterative process that includes self-editing and incorporating feedback from others? This skill can be measured by the student's performance in drafting legal documents and correspondence, writing memos, and making notes to files.

Rating (0-4): 3

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments: [REDACTED]

4. **Fact Investigation (LO 2.1)**: How well does the student seek out the facts necessary to advance the client's goals? Fact investigation includes interviews, obtaining relevant information from public databases (e.g., real estate records), and activities to gather background information (e.g., Google and Lexis searches).

Rating (0-4): 3

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments: [REDACTED]

5. **Research (LO 2.2 and 4.1-4.3)**: How well does the student perform research on behalf of a client? Can the student devise and implement a logical research plan that appropriately considers time constraints? How well does the student assess the weight of authority and employ the fundamental tools of legal research? Is the student able to synthesize applicable rules from the relevant authorities? This skill can be demonstrated in writing or orally.

Rating (0-4): 3.5

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

[REDACTED]

6. **Clients (LO 3.1):** How well does the student build relationships with clients? Are the client relationships loyal, trusting, open, and transparent? How well does the client listen to the student?

Rating (0-4): 3

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

[REDACTED]

7. **Legal Analysis (LO 2.5):** How well does the student analyze the facts in light of the law to develop and evaluate potential solutions to advance client goals? This skill can be demonstrated not only in written memorandums and research, but also orally.

Rating (0-4): 3

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

[REDACTED]

8. **Tactics and Strategy (LO 2.5):** How well does the student grasp the concept of tactics and strategy in the pursuit of a client's objective? Does the student give thought to the long-term ramifications of a particular tactic? Does the student consider the client's ultimate goal when evaluating the short-term steps that need to be taken?

Rating (0-4): 3

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

9. **Ethical and Professional Judgment (LO 6.1 and 6.2):** How well does the student recognize the professional obligations of a practicing attorney? Does the student know where to look for guidance? How does the student react to ethical dilemmas? This skill can be demonstrated not only by being cognizant of the ethical boundaries imposed upon an attorney but also by an overall evaluation of the student's demeanor, dress, and how the student presents as a professional while working in the clinic.

Rating (0-4): 3

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments: [REDACTED]

10. **Timekeeping and Time Management (LO 5.3):** Has the student completed the hours required for the semester as laid out in the Clinic Manual? Have time entries been thorough and promptly recorded? Does the student manage their time effectively and efficiently working on client cases and projects? Has the student demonstrated the ability to get tasks completed in a timely manner? Does the student show up on time and complete clinic tasks during designated clinic hours? Does the student meet internal and external deadlines?

Rating (0-4): 3

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments: [REDACTED]

11. **Case Management (LO 5.1):** How well has the student managed their caseload overall? How well has the student kept detailed client notes and copies of all correspondence and relevant documents in client files, kept client files organized and up to date, and/or written detailed and coherent transfer memos? How proactive is the student in moving cases and projects forward?

Can the student appropriately sequence out steps needed to advance a given strategy? How much does the student rely on the supervisor to assign every task? Is the student able to take the next steps on their own?

Rating (0-4): 3

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

[REDACTED]

12. **Cross Cultural Competency and Jesuit Mission (LO 6.3, 7.1, and 7.2)**: How well is the student able to provide competent and culturally sensitive legal services? Does the student show respect for other cultures and people from other cultures? Can the student effectively serve diverse client populations? Does the student demonstrate a commitment to serve others?

Rating (0-4): 3

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

[REDACTED]

13. **Self-Assessment & Reflection (LO 7.4)**: How well does the student recognize their own excellence and areas for growth? How well does the student put together a plan for new learning and/or experiences and follow through with that plan?

Rating (0-4): 3

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

[REDACTED]

14. **Collaboration (LO 5.4)**: How well does the student collaborate with a partner, client, supervisor, colleagues, and others? Does the student work well in a group setting? Does the student provide assistance to other students when asked or needed? Does the student reach out to other students for assistance when appropriate?

Rating (0-4): 3

Has the student improved in this area over the course of the semester (yes/no)? Yes

Comments:

Additional Comments: My own learning and growth as a lawyer and teacher were enhanced by my interactions with you this semester, and I appreciated having you in my clinic. You have a strong work ethic, an easy-going style, and a desire to add value. As noted in this review, you have several areas of strength as well as areas for growth. I encourage you to take what you have learned this semester and apply it in your next practice setting. I hope you will stay in touch with me.

Form Builder: Contact Interface - Experiential Learning Employer Final Evaluation

Save Draft

Preview

Publish

Cancel

Add Fields

Add Section

[How Do I Do This?](#)

SITE SUPERVISOR EVALUATION

We recognize and appreciate the demands on your time and understand that supervision of a law student adds to existing duties and responsibilities. Your feedback is an essential part of the learning process for our students, and we appreciate your thorough evaluation of the student and our program.

Law Student *

Add Blurp

Field Placement Site *

Add Blurp

Your Name and Title *

(Custom Field)

Add Blurp

Based on your supervision of this student, indicate whether you recommend this student receive a grade of Pass or No Pass.

(Custom Field)

*

Enter "Pass" or "No Pass"

Did the student complete at least the minimum required hours?

(Custom Field)

*

No
 Yes

Students must complete at least 45 fieldwork hours (DC programs) or 50 fieldwork hours (all other pl

[Read More](#)

SKILL DEVELOPMENT. Rate the student's skill development in the following 6 skill areas

Consider the skill level you would expect of a similarly situated average law student.

Legal Research *

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement [\[1 More Options\]](#)

researching and finding the applicable law

Marshaling Information *

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement [\[1 More Options\]](#)

fact finding, questioning and interviewing, collecting and reviewing documents, e-discovery, and organizing/categorizing information

Analysis *

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement [\[1 More Options\]](#)

critical review, reasoning, problem-solving, understanding what facts mean, understanding what the law means, and applying the law to the facts

Legal Expression *

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement [\[1 More Options\]](#)

persuasive or objective oral and written communication of analysis, positions, opinions, arguments, and recommendations

Practice Skills *

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement [\[1 More Options\]](#)

RELATED FORMS

There are no related forms

FORM VERSIONS

LOADED VERSION

Contact Interface - Experiential Learning Employer Final Evaluation (Current)

Last Saved Dec 10, 2019, 10:30 PM

OTHER VERSIONS

Contact Interface - Experiential Learning Employer Final Evaluation (Backup 0)

Last Saved December 10, 2019 10:30 AM

Contact Interface - Experiential Learning Employer Final Evaluation (Original)

Last Saved November 22, 2019 02:15 PM

Contact Interface - Experiential Learning Employer Final Evaluation (Backup 1)

Last Saved January 7, 2019 09:45 AM

Contact Interface - Experiential Learning Employer Final Evaluation (Backup 2)

Last Saved December 4, 2018 09:45 AM

SEARCH/FILTER FIELDS

More Options]

executing tasks such as taking depositions, arguing motions, negotiating, drafting agreements, conducting due diligence, and counseling clients

Save Draft

Preview

Publish

Cancel

Add Fields ▾

Add Section

work flow management and planning, mistake management, building client relationships, collaboration, teamwork, building consensus, developing strategic relationships, networking, giving and receiving feedback

What additional comments do you have about the student's skill development?
(Custom Field)

Add Blurb

INCREASED UNDERSTANDING OF SUBSTANTIVE LAW. Rate the student's demonstration of the following

Consider the understanding you would expect of a similarly situated average law student.

Knowledge of law and regulations related to the work of the Field Placement Site

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement *[? More Options]*

Add Blurb

Integration of substantive knowledge with rules of procedure and ethics, strategic considerations, policy, and moral concerns

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement *[? More Options]*

Add Blurb

Competent completion of assignments that met and challenged his/her level of ability

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement *[? More Options]*

Add Blurb

Did the student come with enough substantive legal knowledge to competently complete assignments?
(Custom Field)

Add Blurb

What additional comments do you have about the student's understanding of substantive law?
(Custom Field)

Add Blurb

DEVELOPMENT OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND IDENTITY. Rate how well the student demonstrated the following

Consider the level of professional responsibility and identity you would expect of a similarly situated average law student

Assuming responsibility for his/her assignments, working effectively with reasonable guidance

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement *[? More Options]*

Add Blurb

Distinguishing when to make

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement *[? More Options]*

Independent decisions and when to consult with supervisor

More Options] Add Blurb

Save Draft

Preview

Publish

Cancel

Add Fields

Add Section

Issues

Add Blurb

Responsiveness to supervisor feedback and learning from experience

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement More Options] Add Blurb

About how often did the student meet with you to receive and discuss assignments and feedback? (Custom Field)

Text input field

Add Blurb

What additional comments do you have about the student's development of professional responsibility and identity? (Custom Field)

Text area

Add Blurb

INSTITUTIONAL UNDERSTANDING. Rate how well the student demonstrated the following

Consider the level of institutional understanding you would expect of a similarly situated average l... Read More

Understanding of the organizational structure and operation of the Field Placement Site

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement More Options] Add Blurb

Understanding of how legal institutions work

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement More Options] Add Blurb

Understanding of impact of budgetary and time pressures

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement More Options] Add Blurb

Critical examination of legal system and role in the system

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement More Options] Add Blurb

What additional comments do you have about the student's demonstration of institutional understanding? (Custom Field)

Text area

Add Blurb

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT THE STUDENT

Add Blurb

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the

performance of this student?
(Custom Field)

Save Draft

Preview

Publish

Cancel

Add Fields ▾

Add Section

**COMMENTS ABOUT THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE FIELD
PLACEMENT PROGRAM**

Add Blurb

Was the amount of contact with
the law school too much, too little,
or about right?
(Custom Field)

Add Blurb

Is there anything about the field
placement program or the student
you wish you had known before
starting?
(Custom Field)

Add Blurb

What was the best aspect of
participating in the field placement
program? What was least
beneficial?
(Custom Field)

Add Blurb