

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): 7/2022	Primary Assessment Contact: Erika Cohn (committee chair)/Ann Scarlett (Associate Dean)

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2021

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 lawyers.

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.

*Learning Outcome #4 was also assessed but final evaluation is not yet complete. A separate report will be submitted in early fall.

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 artifacts were collected for Spring 2021 and Fall 2021 semesters. Here are the artifacts identified, with notations as to when they were collected:

5.1

- Civil Practice (all sections): add-on rubric (collected for Spring 2021 and Fall 2021)
- Civil Advocacy Clinic: assessment rubric (collected for Spring 2021)
- Entrepreneurship & Community Development Clinic: assessment rubric (collected for Fall 2021)
- Human Rights at Home Litigation Clinic: assessment rubric (collected for Spring 2021 and Fall 2021)
- Field Placements: site supervisor survey (collected for Spring 2021 and Fall 2021)

5.2

- Civil Practice (all sections): add-on rubric (collected for Spring 2021 and Fall 2021)
- Civil Procedure (1 of 3 sections): dispute resolution quiz (collected for Fall 2021)

5.3

Civil Practice (all sections): add-on rubric (collected for Spring 2021 and Fall 2021)

Civil Advocacy Clinic: assessment rubric (collected for Spring 2021)

Entrepreneurship & Community Development Clinic: assessment rubric (collected for Fall 2021)

Human Rights at Home Litigation Clinic: assessment rubric (collected for Spring 2021 and Fall 2021)

Field Placements: site supervisor survey (collected for Spring 2021 and Fall 2021)

Legal Research & Writing II (1 of 11 sections): final oral argument rubric (collected for Spring 2021)

Evidence & Advocacy-Trial Advocacy small group (1 section): final trial rubric (collected for Spring 2021)

5.4

Civil Practice (all sections): add-on rubric (collected for Spring 2021 and Fall 2021)

Civil Advocacy Clinic: assessment rubric (collected for Spring 2021)

Entrepreneurship & Community Development Clinic: assessment rubric (collected for Fall 2021)

Human Rights at Home Litigation Clinic: assessment rubric (collected for Spring 2021 and Fall 2021)

Field Placement: site supervisor survey (collected for Spring 2021 and Fall 2021)

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 or revised with the assistance of task force members for the express purpose of evaluating whether students had achieved basic competency or higher for the skill. Those rubrics are attached. The task force evaluated the artifacts to determine if at least 80% of students achieved basic competency for each skill.

For the multiple-choice quiz in Civil Procedure used to evaluate students' understanding of arbitration and mediation in Learning Outcome 5.2, correct responses were deemed to show only exposure to the skill rather than competency.

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)?

Most rubrics were collected in Experiential courses which include law clinic, field placement, and simulation courses. Experiential courses are limited enrollment courses that have been approved by the faculty as Experiential. The rubrics showed that 90% or more of students achieved at least basic competency on Learning Outcomes 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 in these Experiential courses.

--For 5.1, 160 of 168 students (96%) achieved basic competency or better.

--For 5.2, 44 of 44 students (100%) achieved basic competency or better.

--For 5.3, 195 of 217 students (90%) achieved basic competency or better.

--For 5.4, 149 of 166 students (90%) achieved basic competency or better.

For the multiple-choice quiz in Civil Procedure used to evaluate students' understanding of arbitration and mediation, 85% of responses were correct, but that was deemed to show only exposure to the skill rather than competency.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

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

The data shows that our students achieve basic competency or better on Learning Outcomes 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4. However, the number of artifacts collected for Learning Outcome 5.2 was much smaller than for the others.

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?

These results and findings were presented at the law faculty meeting on May 4, 2022.

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.

Advanced Legal Research sections included Learning Outcome 5.2 in quizzes during Spring 2022, which will provide at least 45 artifacts per year going forward. A rubric that includes Learning Outcome 5.2 has been created for Negotiations and Alternative Dispute Resolution courses, and it can be shared with the faculty teaching the Mediation course. If that rubric is utilized in all three courses, it will provide about 100 additional artifacts for Learning Outcomes 5.2 per year.

All first-year Legal Writing courses included Learning Outcome 5.3 on the oral argument rubric for Spring 2022 and included the lawmaking aspect of Learning Outcome 5.2 on the final exam for Spring 2022, which will provide approximately 205 artifacts per year since all first-year students take the course. The rubric created for Trial Advocacy may be shared with all faculty teaching Trial Advocacy, which could provide an additional 70-80 artifacts per year for Learning Outcome 5.3.

The rubrics created for Field Placement, Clinics, Civil Practice, and Trial Advocacy will be shared with faculty teaching other Experiential courses to increase the artifacts collected on Learning Outcome 5.

The task force also recommends that the Curriculum Committee amend the course proposal form to include a question asking what learning outcomes will be addressed in the proposed course and how the learning outcomes will be measured.

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?

Future assessment of Learning Outcome 5 must collect artifacts to provide a broader perspective of students' achievement of these Learning Outcomes. To do so, faculty in more courses will need to assess students' achievement of Learning Outcome 5 using rubrics like those gathered or created during this assessment.

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?

The rubrics used to assess Learning Outcome 5 were shared at the faculty meeting to encourage additional faculty to collect artifacts that can be used in a future assessment.

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: ' CP1

Semester: Fall 2021

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): 4

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): 4

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

¹ SIU 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

CP1

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): 4

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:

CLC1

Semester: Spring 2021

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.

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

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.

Rating (0-4): 3

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.

CLC1

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

**ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CLINIC
FINAL EVALUATION**

Student Name:
Semester:
Supervisor Name:
Date:

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 comments area]

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:

[REDACTED]

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.

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

Student Name: _____
Semester: _____
Supervisor Name: _____
Date: _____

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**

iBattlett

Supervisor Signature

Form Builder: Contact Interface - Experiential Learning Employer Final Evaluation

Save Draft Preview Publish Cancel

Add Fields Add Section

How Do I Do This?

RELATED FORMS

There are no related forms

FORM VERSIONS

LOADED VERSION

Contact Interface - Experiential Learning Evaluation (Current)

Last Saved Dec 14, 2021, 8:33 PM

OTHER VERSIONS

Contact Interface - Experiential Learning Evaluation (Original)

Last Saved March 16, 2022 03:11 pm

Contact Interface - Experiential Learning Evaluation (Backup 0)

Last Saved December 14, 2021 08:33 pm

Contact Interface - Experiential Learning Evaluation (Backup 1)

Last Saved August 19, 2021 01:37 pm

Contact Interface - Experiential Learning Evaluation (Draft)

Last Saved November 5, 2020 04:53 pm

Contact Interface - Experiential Learning Evaluation (Backup 2)

Last Saved March 27, 2020 12:51 am

SEARCH/FILTER FIELDS

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

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 .f1 More Options

researching and finding the applicable law

Marshalling Information *

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement .f1 More Options

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

Analysis *

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement .f1 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 .f1 More Options

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

Practice Skills *

Outstanding Good Average Area for Improvement .f1 More Options

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

Professional Skills

Outstanding , Good , Average , Area for Improvement ,{1 More Options}

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 Blurp

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 ,{1 More Options}

Add Blurp

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

*

Outstanding , Good , Average , Area for Improvement ,{1 More Options}

Add Blurp

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

*

Outstanding , Good , Average , Area for Improvement ,{1 More Options}

Add Blurp

Did the student come with enough substantive legal knowledge to competently complete assignments?

(Custom Field)

*

Add Blurp

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

(Custom Field)

Add Blurp

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 situa ...

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

*

Outstanding , Good , Average , Area for Improvement ,{1 More Options}

Add Blurp

Distinguishing when to make independent decisions and when to consult with supervisor

Outstanding , Good , Average , Area for Improvement ,{1 More Options}

Add Blurp

*

Appropriate consultation with supervisor concerning ethical issues

Outstanding , Good , Average , Area for Improvement ,{1 More Options}

Add Blurp

*

Responsiveness to supervisor feedback and learning from experience

Outstanding , Good , Average , Area for Improvement ,{1 More Options}

Add Blurp

*

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

[Empty text box]

Add Blurp

(Custom Field)

*

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

[Empty text box]

Add Blurp

(Custom Field)

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

Add Blurp

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

Outstanding , Good , Average , Area for Improvement ,{1 More Options}

Add Blurp

*

Understanding of how legal Institutions work

Outstanding , Good , Average , Area for Improvement ,{1 More Options}

Add Blurp

*

Understanding of impact of budgetary and time pressures

Outstanding , Good , Average , Area for Improvement ,{1 More Options}

Add Blurp

*

Critical examination of legal system and role in the system

Outstanding , Good , Average , Area for Improvement ,{1 More Options}

Add Blurp

*

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

[Empty text box]

Add Blurp

(Custom Field)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT THE STUDENT

Add Blurp

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the performance of this student?

(Custom Field)

Add Blurb

**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

Spring 2022 Kowach Final Oral Argument Score Sheet

Legal Research
& Writing II

Student: _____

Score: ____/50

Strengths are starred; things to continue to work on are circled

Professional Appearance 1 point: SCORE: _____

- Appropriate business attire.

Persuasive Introduction 5 points SCORE: _____

- Began with “May it please the Court?” stated as a question
- Identified self and the party you represent.
- Identified relief requested.
- Provided judge with a roadmap (summary) of the arguments.
- **Memorized the entire introduction** – eye contact throughout.

Presentation/Delivery 10 points SCORE: _____

- General demeanor—poised, confident, professional.
- Engaging/persuasive—appeared to care about topic.
- Used transitions between each issue in argument: *i.e.* “Turning to the issue of . . . There are three reasons. First, . . . Second, . . . Third, . . . Turning to the first point. . . .”
- Voice—appropriate volume and speed.
- Eye contact—did not read too much.
- Effective use, if any, of notes—note handling was not distracting.
- Appropriate body language and posture. Avoided distracting movements.
- Respectful to the Court—did not interrupt the judge and stopped when questions were asked.
- Always addressed the judge as “your Honor.”
- Used persuasive techniques (*e.g.*, word choice, repetition, inflection, etc.).
- Avoided verbal fillers—“Um,” “Ah,” “Uh,” “Well,” “Okay,” “Like.”
- Avoid personal beliefs—“I/We think,” “I/We feel.”

Effective Presentation 10 points SCORE: _____

- Clear and organized presentation of your client’s position
- Demonstrated sufficient preparation.
- Knew and effectively used legally relevant facts to support assertions.
- Effectively used case law to support assertions.
- Knew cases supporting own position as well as opponent’s cases.

Responsiveness to Questions 10 points SCORE: _____

- Stopped talking when asked a question/did not interrupt the judge.
- Provided a direct response/short answer (*e.g.*, yes or no), included “Your Honor” at beginning or at some point in answer, and fully explained answer.
- Answered questions without evasiveness.
- Transitioned back to argument after answering questions
- Handled tough or hypothetical questions respectfully

Spring 2022 Kowach Final Oral Argument Score Sheet

Persuasive Conclusion 2 points SCORE: _____

- Provided an effective conclusion that started with a concluding word (*i.e.*, “In conclusion” or “Therefore”)
- Asked for the appropriate relief in a confident tone.
- Stopped when time was up or followed guidelines for alternate scenarios discussed in class.
- Clearly thanked the Court before sitting down
- **Memorized** the entire conclusion and maintained eye contact throughout.

Professionalism when Opposing Counsel spoke 2 points SCORE: _____

- Appeared interested in counsel’s argument
- Did not appear distracted
- Did not show any disagreement with counsel’s statements while counsel was speaking

Time Management 10 points SCORE: _____

- Used time well. Paid attention to how much time was spent on each issue and tried to make key points on each issue.
- Concluded when time ran or asked for additional time and concluded quickly.

Spring 2022 Kowach Final Trial Score Sheet

Evidence & Advocacy:
Trial Adv small group

Student: _____

Score: ____/55

Opening/Closing Statements 10 points SCORE:

- Memorized – eye contact throughout.
- Clearly articulated legal theory of the case (for the party with the burden of proof).
- Clearly articulated theme for the case.
- Clearly articulated what you want (expect) the jury to do at conclusion of case.
- Used communication techniques discussed in class like Cold/bold; language of visualization; rule of three.
- For closing, used theme and theory.
- For closing, used reasonable inferences from established facts.
- For closing, used jury instructions.

Questioning on Direct 10 points SCORE:

- Asked non-leading questions
- Directed the witness (and thereby the court and jury) to specific areas of inquiry (as opposed to narrative questions – “*what happened next . . . ?*”)
- Used and admitted exhibits with a witness at trial.
- Refreshed a witness’s memory (should the need arise)
- Used courtesies with opposing counsel, the court and witnesses
- Logically organized your direct examination (the use of sub-files in the preparation of the examination).
- Effectively re-directed examination (focusing the testimony back on the primary issues-within the scope of cross).

Questioning on Cross 10 points SCORE:

- Used short leading questions to obtain concessions from the witness.
- Cross examined on the major themes/theories of your case.
- Impeached (should the need arise).
- Avoided arguing with the witness

Objections and Exhibits 10 points SCORE:

- Recognized objectionable evidence
- Timely made objections.
- Articulated specific legal grounds for objection.
- If appropriate sought additional relief (limiting instruction, motion to strike)
- Anticipated and thereby properly responded to objections lodged against you.
- Avoided quarreling with opposing counsel/court.
- Showed effective planning and control of use exhibits; admitted exhibits into evidence and published to the jury.

Time Management 10 points SCORE:

- Used time well. Paid attention to how much time was spent on each witness and tried to make key points on each issue.

Spring 2022 Kowach Final Trial Score Sheet

- Completed trial within the time allotted for each side. Showed effective planning and control of use of time.

Miscellaneous 3 points SCORE:

- General demeanor—poised, confident, professional.
- Eye contact—did not read too much.; effective use, if any, of note (note handling was not distracting)
- Respectful to the Court; always addressed the judge as “your Honor”; accepted rulings

Professional Demeanor when Opposing Counsel was Speaking 2 points: SCORE:

- Did not appear distracted
- Did not show any disagreement with counsel’s statements while counsel was speaking

Program-Level Assessment Plan

Program: Negotiation	Degree Level (e.g., UG or GR certificate, UG major, master's program, doctoral program):
Department:	College/School:
Date (Month/Year):	Primary Assessment Contact:

Note: Each cell in the table below will expand as needed to accommodate your responses.

		Assessment Methods	
#	Student Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Artifacts of Student Learning (What)
	What do the program faculty expect all students to know or be able to do as a result of completing this program? Note: These should be measurable and manageable in number (typically 4-6 are sufficient).	In which courses will faculty intentionally work to foster some level of student development toward achievement of the outcome? Please clarify the level at which student development is expected in each course (e.g., introduced, developed, reinforced, achieved, etc.).	Evaluation Process (How) 1. What process will be used to evaluate the artifacts, and by whom? 2. What tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) will be used in the process? Note: Please include any rubrics as part of the submitted plan documents.
1	Students will be able to understand the principles of negotiation		1. What artifacts of student learning will be used to determine if students have achieved this outcome? 2. In which courses will these artifacts be collected? Class exercises, journal entries, and final paper Student keep a journal and will write a paper Professor
2	Students will be able to identify the key terms in negotiation		Class exercises, journal entries, and final paper Student keep a journal and will write a paper Professor
3	Students will be able to conduct an effective negotiation		Class exercises, journal entries, and final paper Student keep a journal and will write a paper Professor

4	Student will learn how to conduct a negotiation in a professional and ethical manner	Practice negotiations/ role play in class	Student keep a journal and will write a paper Professor
5	Students will be able to distinguish between negotiation and arbitration	Class exercises, journal entries, and final paper	Student keep a journal and will write a paper Professor

Use of Assessment Data

1. How and when will analyzed data be used by program faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment practices?
2. How and when will the program faculty evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes made in previous years?

Additional Questions

1. On what schedule/cycle will program faculty assess each of the program's student learning outcomes? (Please note: It is not recommended to try to assess every outcome every year.)
2. Describe how, and the extent to which, program faculty contributed to the development of this plan.

IMPORTANT: Please remember to submit any rubrics or other assessment tools along with this plan.

Program-Level Assessment Plan

Program: Arbitration Degree Level (e.g., UG or GR certificate, UG major, master's program, doctoral program):
 Department: College/School:
 Date (Month/Year): Primary Assessment Contact:

Note: Each cell in the table below will expand as needed to accommodate your responses.

#	Student Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Assessment Methods	
			Artifacts of Student Learning (What)	Evaluation Process (How)
	What do the program faculty expect all students to know or be able to do as a result of completing this program? Note: These should be measurable and manageable in number (typically 4-6 are sufficient).	In which courses will faculty intentionally work to foster some level of student development toward achievement of the outcome? Please clarify the level at which student development is expected in each course (e.g., introduced, developed, reinforced, achieved, etc.).	1. What artifacts of student learning will be used to determine if students have achieved this outcome? 2. In which courses will these artifacts be collected?	1. What process will be used to evaluate the artifacts, and by whom? 2. What tool(s) (e.g., a rubric) will be used in the process? Note: Please include any rubrics as part of the submitted plan documents.
1	Students will be able to understand the principles of negotiation		Class exercises, drafting exercises, and final paper	Student will write drafting exercises and a final paper Professor
2	Students will be able to identify the key terms in negotiation		Class exercises, drafting exercises, and final paper	Students will write drafting exercises and a final paper Professor
3	Students will be able to conduct an effective negotiation		Class exercises, drafting exercises, and role play in class	Students will write drafting exercises and a final paper Professor

4	Student will learn how to conduct a negotiation in a professional and ethical manner		Practice negotiations/ role play in class Professor	Student will write drafting exercises and a final paper Professor
5	Students will be able to distinguish between negotiation and arbitration		Class exercises, drafting exercises, role play, and final paper Professor	Student will write drafting exercises and a final paper Professor

Use of Assessment Data

1. How and when will analyzed data be used by program faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment practices?
2. How and when will the program faculty evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes made in previous years?

Additional Questions

1. On what schedule/cycle will program faculty assess each of the program's student learning outcomes? (Please note: It is not recommended to try to assess every outcome every year.)
2. Describe how, and the extent to which, program faculty contributed to the development of this plan.

IMPORTANT: Please remember to submit any rubrics or other assessment tools along with this plan.

Civil Procedure I – Fall 2021
Quiz #3 – JML, New Trial, Appeal, and Miscellaneous

6. Which of the following is correct?

- A. Mediation involves a person unconnected to the litigation assisting the parties to settle a case.
- B. Mediation involves the judge assigned to the litigation assisting the parties to settle a case.
- C. Mediation involves only the parties in a case discussing how to settle the case.
- D. Mediation involves a mediator deciding the dispute between the parties.

7. Which of the following is not correct?

- A. The parties in arbitration may choose arbitrators with expertise in the subject matter in dispute.
- B. The parties do not conduct any discovery in an arbitration.
- C. After a hearing, the arbitrators decide the dispute between the parties.
- D. The arbitrators' judgment can be enforced in a federal court.

Program-Level Assessment Plan

Program: ALR Degree Level (e.g., UG or GR certificate, UG major, master's program, doctoral program):
 Department: College/School:
 Date (Month/Year): Primary Assessment Contact:

Note: Each cell in the table below will expand as needed to accommodate your responses.

		Assessment Methods	
#	Student Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Assessment Methods
	<p>What do the program faculty expect all students to know or be able to do as a result of completing this program?</p> <p>Note: These should be measurable and manageable in number (typically 4-6 are sufficient).</p>	<p>In which courses will faculty intentionally work to foster some level of student development toward achievement of the outcome? Please clarify the level at which student development is expected in each course (e.g., introduced, developed, reinforced, achieved, etc.).</p>	<p>Artifacts of Student Learning (What)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What artifacts of student learning will be used to determine if students have achieved this outcome? 2. In which courses will these artifacts be collected? <p>Evaluation Process (How)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What process will be used to evaluate the artifacts, and by whom? 2. What tool(s) (e.g., a rubric) will be used in the process? <p>Note: Please include any rubrics as part of the submitted plan documents.</p>
1	Will be able to know the difference between state, local, federal, foreign, and international law, and how to locate each		<p>Weekly homework, exam, project or pathfinder</p> <p>Professor</p>
2	Will be able to identify and distinguish between primary and secondary sources and know how to locate each		<p>Weekly homework, exam, project or pathfinder</p> <p>Professor</p>
3	Will be use both print and online resources efficiently and effectively		<p>Weekly homework, exam, project or pathfinder</p> <p>Professor</p>

4	Students will be able to conduct legal research on unfamiliar topics	Weekly homework, exam, project or pathfinder	Weekly homework, exam, project or pathfinder
5	Students will know the difference between statutes and regulations, and how to locate each	Weekly homework, exam, project or pathfinder	Weekly homework, exam, project or pathfinder

Use of Assessment Data

1. How and when will analyzed data be used by program faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment practices?
2. How and when will the program faculty evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes made in previous years?

Additional Questions

1. On what schedule/cycle will program faculty assess each of the program's student learning outcomes? (Please note: It is not recommended to try to assess every outcome every year.)
2. Describe how, and the extent to which, program faculty contributed to the development of this plan.

IMPORTANT: Please remember to submit any rubrics or other assessment tools along with this plan.

Advanced Legal Research -- Quiz

Please circle the correct answer(s). If a question has more than one answer, please circle all possible correct answers for question. This applies to questions 1 - 11 only.

1. Which of the following are primary sources of law?
 - a). Statutes/laws
 - b). Hornbooks
 - c). Treatises
 - d). Regulations/administrative codes
 - e). Constitutions
 - f). Speeches of elected officials
 - g). Treaty
 - h). Cases/Judicial opinions
 - i). Desk books

2. Which best describes the difference between a primary source and a secondary source?
 - a). They are the same, just different publishers
 - b). Primary sources are only published Westlaw.
 - c). Primary sources are the law itself. Secondary sources analyze and explain the law/primary source.
 - d). Primary sources are binding, and secondary sources are not.

3. How/what methods can you use to check the validity of case?
 - a). Use a citator
 - b). Look on the internet
 - c). Keycite it
 - d). Sheparize it
 - e). Ask the judge

4. What is the difference between a statute and a regulation?
- a). Statutes are only federal
 - b). Regulations are only suggestions
 - c). Statutes are enacted by elected officials and regulations are promulgated by agencies, unelected persons
 - d). Regulations need to be reauthorized every year, statutes do not.
 - e). The director of the FBI signs regulations and the President or Governor signs it.

5. Missouri is in which federal circuit?

- a). 9th
- b). 3rd
- c). 7th
- d). 8th
- e). 6th

6. Illinois is which federal circuit?

- a). 1st
- b). 4th
- c). 5th
- d). 8th
- e). 7th

7. Foreign Laws refer to:

- a). Laws of Finland
- b). Laws of another jurisdiction, other than your own state or US
- c). Laws of the European Union
- d). Laws of outer space

8. What is the name of the court of last resort in the Federal level?
- a) Highest Court
 - b) Supreme Court
 - c) Circuit Court
 - d) Appellate Court
 - e) The Hauge
9. Which of the following can become a federal law/statute:
- a) Senate bill
 - b) House Bill
 - c) House Con. Resolution
 - d) Senate Joint Resolution
 - e) Committee Print
10. You can find more cases on point by:
- a). Keycite/Shepardize the case
 - b). Use key number and topics
 - c). Search Core terms
 - d). Ask a partner
11. All regulations must be:
- a) Okayed by the Vice President
 - b) Signed by the President
 - c) Authorized by a statute
 - d) The agency department head creates

Questions 12 – 14 are True/false – please circle the correct answer.

12. Laws are passed by elected officials.

- a). True
- b). False

13. The Federal Register contain notices from your congresspersons.

- a). True
- b). False

14. Final Regulations can be found in the Statutes at Large.

- a). True
- b). False