UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Law - JD

Law - JD

Cycles included in this report:
Oct 1, 2017 to Sep 30, 2018
Oct 1, 2018 to Sep 30, 2019
Oct 1, 2019 to Sep 30, 2020

Program Name: Law - JD

Reporting Cycle: Oct 1, 2017 to Sep 30, 2018

Academic Program Coordinator Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Randy Beck

Description of Program UGA School of Law JD program

The fundamental academic mission of the Law School is to educate and prepare law students for successful and meaningful careers within the legal profession. Because of the complexity of the law and the concomitant breadth of potential career paths, there is no single model for adequately preparing our students. Some students will become prosecutors, others commercial litigators, and still others transactional or international attorneys, just to name a few possibilities. The particular skills required to excel in a given specialty will necessarily vary as will the mode of teaching, the outcomes desired, and the method of assessment. Accordingly, this assessment plan is built around the assessment requirements of the American Bar Association, which is the law school's outside accreditor. The ABA requires assessment of law students' knowledge, skills and professionalism. This plan uses direct and indirect measures to assess these outcomes, including rubrics, course completion and progression rates, professional licensing exams, and student self assessments.

Outcome A1.1.1 Substantive and Procedural Law 1L
Graduates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of substantive and procedural materials studied in the required first year curriculum. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome through self-assessments, successful completion of the 1L program, and successful retention of knowledge evidenced by Bar passage.

Measure LSSSE

Law School Survey of Student Engagement regarding student learning experiences.

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer and aspirational institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in spring 2018. The student response rate was 52 %. Responding students were surveyed regarding 1) how much their course work emphasized analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth; 2) how much their coursework emphasized making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions; and 3) to what extent their experience at law school contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills.

Analysis of Data

In 2018, when asked how much of their course work emphasized analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth, 95.9% of responding 1Ls reported favorably. Our peer and aspirational schools' rate for responding 1Ls was 93.7%. 83.7% of our responding 1Ls perceived their course work as emphasizing making judgments about the value of information, how to interpret data, and how to assess the soundness of conclusions. Our peer and aspirational group for responding 1Ls was 77.3%. In regard to the extent to which law school had contributed to acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills, 75.9% of our responding 1L students indicated "quite a bit" or "very much". Among our peer and aspirational schools, the comparable figure for that cohort was 65.4% of those responding.

Improvement Based on Analysis

This measure shows our graduates' self-assessment of their coursework in regard to this learning outcome is very positive and meets or exceeds the self-assessment of students at our peer and aspirational institutions. Moreover, our positive response percentages on these questions have increased when compared to last year's LSSSE data with the only exception concerning making judgments, which fell slightly (by 3%).

Measure Bar Passage

Overall Bar Passage rate for the July and February bar examination.

Threshold for success (if available)

Meeting or exceeding the American Bar Association requirement that of students who graduated from the law school within the five most recently completed calendar years: (i) 75 % or more of graduates who sat for the bar passed a bar examination; or (ii) in at least three of these calendar years, 75 % of the students graduating in those years and sitting for the bar have passed a bar examination. Alternatively, schools can demonstrate that their annual first time bar passage rate is no more than 15 points below the average first time bar passage rates for graduates of ABA approved law schools taking the bar examination in the same jurisdiction.

Data Collected

Overall bar passage rate from the class of 2016 (comprised of graduates from December 2015; May 2016, and August 2016) who were first time bar takers, and the class of 2015 (comprised of graduates from December 2014; May 2015, and August 2015) who were first time bar takers within 2 year post-graduation. Data were retrieved from 15 state bars for the class of 2016 and 18 state bars for the class of 2015.

Calendar Year of graduation	# of graduates in calendar year	2016 Grads who sat for a bar examination within 1 year of date of graduation.			2015 Grads who sat for a bar examination within 2 years of date of graduation			# with no information	# who did not take a bar examination	
		# of takers	# who passed	% passed	# of takers	# who passed	% passed		within 1 yr of grad	within 2 yrs of grad
2016	197	186	176	94.62%	-	-	-	4	7	-
2015	190	-	-	-	187	178	95.19%	2	-	1

Analysis of Data

77.66% of our 2016 graduates sat for the Georgia Bar Exam. Out of our first time takers, 90.19% passed the Georgia Bar (July 2016 and February 2017 bar exams), and UGA Law had an overall pass rate of 94.62% across all 15 state bar exams represented in the data. For the class of 2015, 95.19% passed a state bar exam within two years of graduation.

Improvement Based on Analysis

The Law School's bar passage rate is excellent objectively, and also in relation to other Georgia law schools. Nonetheless, we continue to adapt our bar study program based on last year's feedback, and expect these changes to further improve our performance in this area. We added bar prep "boot camps" this year, with various faculty offering a 1 day intensive review of a subject tested on the bar exam. Additionally, we are in the third year of our bar study program. We have studied these results, examining numerous variables to identify correlations that could assist in designing an effective bar study program. These statistics are mostly consistent with expectations, demonstrating a correlation between bar passage and GPA, LSAT performance, and completion rate of bar prep study material. A review of the data from the past three years indicated a student is considered to

have an "at-risk indicator" of failing the bar if they had a first-year GPA less than 2.57, final GPA less than 2.90, and/or average LSAT less than 152. Most students who failed the exam had more than one at-risk indicator, and students with all three at-risk indicators failed the exam at a significantly higher rate. Students with a higher LSAT but a consistently low GPA had approximately 50/50 success rate on the bar. We are continuing to gather available data and improve our program.

Files:

Bar Prep Program_data for 1st two years

Measure   Course Completion

Successful Course completion rate for first year law courses.

Threshold for success (if available)

1L students successfully completing first year courses with 1.90 GPA or higher, enabling them to continue to the upper level curriculum.

Data Collected

The 1L student GPAs were reviewed at the end of Spring 2018.

Analysis of Data

Out of 183 students completing their first year in law school, only one of the students had a cumulative GPA below 1.90. There was 1 student with a final GPA under the 2.0 ultimately required for graduation but at the 1.90 threshold required to continue.

Improvement Based on Analysis

All but one of the 183 students in the 1L class were able to proceed to their 2L year. We have in place a tutoring program for the at-risk students should our academic attrition rate increase. Additionally, at-risk students whose GPA is severely below our threshold are counseled at the end of the Fall semester to determine if they should continue their legal studies.

Outcome   A2.2.1 Substantive and Procedural Law UL

Graduates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of substantive and procedural law beyond that required in the first year curriculum. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome through self-assessments, successful completion of the UL coursework, and demonstrating knowledge meeting ABA and Georgia standards for professional licensing.

Measure   LSSSE

Data from LSSSE regarding student learning experiences.

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2018. The student response rate was 52%. Responding students were surveyed regarding 1) how much has their course work emphasized analyzing the basic element of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth, and 2) whether their schooling helped them acquire a broad legal education.

Analysis of Data

In 2018, when asked how much course work emphasized analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth, 94.7% of responding 2Ls and 88% of responding 3Ls responded favorably. Our peer and aspirational schools' responses were: 92.6% of responding 2Ls and 85.6% of responding 3Ls.
On the question of whether law school helped students acquire a broad legal education, surveyed students responded using a scale of: 1 = never; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often; and 4 = very often. The reported data shows the mean of these responses. A comparison of these means showed the UGA Law means were slightly higher than those of our peer and aspirational schools.
2018 UGA 2L 3.37 / Peer and Aspirational 3.33
2018 UGA 3L 3.49/ Peer and Aspirational 3.35

Improvement Based on Analysis

The Law School continues to excel at helping students meet this learning outcome. It is vital that our graduates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of substantive and procedural law beyond that required in the first year curriculum. When asked about their coursework, students positively indicated the coursework at UGA Law emphasized the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth, and that UGA Law helped our students acquire the type of broad legal education promoted in the upper level curriculum.

Measure Bar Passage

Threshold for success (if available)

Meeting the ABA requirement that among students who graduated from the law school within the five most recently completed calendar years: (i) 75 percent or more of those graduates who sat for the bar passed a bar examination; or (ii) in at least three of these calendar years, 75 percent of the students graduating in those years and sitting for the bar have passed a bar examination.

Data Collected

Overall bar passage rate from the class of 2016 (comprised of graduates from December 2015; May 2016, and August 2016) who were first time bar takers, and the class of 2015 (comprised of graduates from December 2014; May 2015, and August 2015) who were first time bar takers within 2 years post-graduation. Data were retrieved from 15 state bars for the class of 2016 and 18 state bars for the class of 2015.

Analysis of Data

77.66% of our 2016 graduates sat for the Georgia Bar Exam. Out of our first time takers, 90.19% passed the Georgia Bar (July 2016 and February 2017 bar exams), and UGA Law had an overall pass rate of 94.62% across all 15 state bar exams represented in the data. For the class of 2015, 95.19% passed a state bar exam within two years of graduation.

Calendar Year of graduation	# of graduates in calendar year	2016 Grads who sat for a bar examination within 1 year of date of graduation.			2015 Grads who sat for a bar examination within 2 years of date of graduation			# with no information	# who did not take a bar examination	
		# of takers	# who passed	% passed	# of takers	# who passed	% passed		within 1 yr of grad	within 2 yrs of grad
2016	197	186	176	94.62%	-	-	-	4	7	-
2015	190	-	-	-	187	178	95.19%	2	-	1

Improvement Based on Analysis

The Law School's bar passage rate is excellent objectively, and also in relation to other Georgia law schools. This year we offered one-day, bar "boot camps" focusing on subjects tested on the bar exam. Additionally, we continue to offer a bar study program (the "BEST" program, standing for Bar Exam Success Team) and collect passage data to further improve our performance in this area. Through review of our bar passage data, we are now able to identify "at-risk indicators" for failing a bar. These are a first-year GPA less than 2.57, final GPA less than 2.90, and/or average LSAT less than 152. Most students who failed the exam had more than one at-risk indicator, and students with all three at-risk indicators failed the exam at a significantly higher rate.

Files:

Bar Prep Program_data for 1st two years

Measure Successful Course Completion Rates

Threshold for success (if available)

2L and 3L students passing upper level courses with 2.0 GPA or higher.

Data Collected

Review of GPAs for 2L and 3L students.

Analysis of Data

Cumulative GPAs for 2L and 3L students were reviewed at the end of Spring 2018. In the 2L class of 188, all students maintained a GPA above 2.0. In the 3L class of 196, all students maintained a GPA above 2.0.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Our course completion rate is excellent. We are continuing to enhance our mentoring process to further help the very few students who experience difficulty or do not succeed in individual courses.

Measure Graduation Audit

Threshold for success (if available)

Number of 3L students on track to graduate after their last semester of law school.

Data Collected

Individual degree audits conducted for all 3L students in October 2017 to ensure they would meet degree requirements by May 2018.

Analysis of Data

Student transcripts were individually assessed by the law school registrar's office to ensure students had met or would meet degree requirements by May. All 3L students were on track to graduate as of October 2017.

Improvement Based on Analysis

While the Law School enjoys an extraordinarily high graduation rate, the process will now be more efficient for the students through the use of DegreeWorks. This program will allow the students to track their progress from their first semester and eliminate human error. A trial run of DegreeWorks was completed this past academic year, and it will be in place for all law students in the Fall 2018.

Outcome B1.1.1 Skills: Issue Spotting
Graduates will demonstrate competency in analytical and reasoning skills, spotting legal issues in factual scenarios and identifying potentially applicable legal doctrines

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in spring 2018. The student response rate was 52%. Responding students were surveyed regarding how much their course work emphasized applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations.

Analysis of Data

When asked how UGA Law has helped them apply theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations, students responded using a scale of 1 = very little to 4 = very much. The 2L's and 3L's at UGA Law had a mean higher than our peer and aspirational schools.
1L UGA 3.18 / 3.38 peer and aspirational
2L UGA 3.39 / 3.32 peer and aspirational
3L UGA 3.34 / 3.23 peer and aspirational

Improvement Based on Analysis

Spotting legal issues in factual scenarios and identifying potentially applicable legal doctrines is important in legal practice. Student survey responses on this area were higher than peer and aspirational schools. Additionally, our percentages were slightly higher this year as compared to the 2Ls and 3Ls in 2017. This data shows that our new first year curriculum is successfully developing this essential skill in the 1L year.

Measure 1L Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For no less than 80 percent of sampled 1L students to exhibit proficiency in issue spotting; analysis; the use of counterarguments; and ability to argue by analogy.

Data Collected

A random sample of student work is drawn from a rotating selection of 1L doctrinal courses for analysis. Samples this reporting cycle were drawn from all 1L Criminal Law (Fall 2017) and 1L Civil Procedure (Spring 2018).

Analysis of Data

Students were randomly selected from all sections of the Fall 1L Criminal Law course and all sections of the Spring 1L Civil Procedure course. During the last assessment cycle, the final exams were evaluated for proficiency in Issue Spotting using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 42% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 43% were proficient; and only 15% were below proficient. During this assessment cycle, the final exams were evaluated for proficiency in Issue Spotting using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. In the Fall Criminal Law course, 31% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 53% were proficient; and only 17% were below proficient. In the Spring Civil Procedure class, 14% were found to be beyond proficient, 81% were proficient; and only 6% below proficient.
When the data is aggregated for the entire academic year, 89% of the 1Ls were found to meet or exceed level of proficiency with only 11% below proficient for the skill of issue spotting.

Files:

JD 2017-2018 rubric data

Improvement Based on Analysis

Current 1L students are doing well in mastering this skill. Overall only 11% of the sample was found to be below proficient in Issue Spotting.

Measure Upper Level Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For at least 80 percent of upper level students to exhibit proficiency in issue spotting; analysis; the use of counterarguments; and ability to argue by analogy.

Data Collected

A rotating selection of upper level doctrinal courses are used for analysis. For this cycle, a random sample of student work was selected from the upper level Fall and Spring sections of Corporations and Criminal Procedure I.

Analysis of Data

Upper level students were randomly selected from Corporations and Criminal Procedure I. Their final exams were evaluated for proficiency in Issue Spotting using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 21% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 75% were proficient; and 4% were below proficient.
The data is comparable to last year's findings in which 20% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 73% were proficient; and 7% were below proficient.

Files:

JD 2017-2018 rubric data

Improvement Based on Analysis

Current upper level students are excelling with this skill. Only 4% of the sample was found to be below proficient in Issue Spotting. Moreover, the analysis of 1L and upper level students showed increased proficiency between the first year and subsequent years.

Outcome B 3.3.1 Skills: Efficient Legal Research

Graduates will demonstrate achievement of conducting efficient and effective legal research through the selection of appropriate legal research tools, including cost-effective legal technology tools, to locate relevant primary and secondary authority and the ability to distinguish and correctly use different sources of legal authority available in the American legal system, including state and federal law, constitutional, and common and statutory law.

Measure 1L Rubric

1L Research Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For at least 80 percent of 1L students to exhibit proficiency in efficient legal research.

Data Collected

A random sample of student work was reviewed from each of the 1L Legal Research sections.

Analysis of Data

1L students were evaluated on three area of research: ability to select appropriate resources; ability to locate primary and secondary sources; and ability to analyze, interpret, and judge legal authority. In selecting appropriate resources, 47% scored beyond proficient and 44% were proficient. Only 8% of the sample was below proficient in this skill. In the ability to locate primary and secondary sources, 42% were beyond proficient and 47% scored proficient. Only 11% of the sample was below proficient. Regarding the ability to analyze, interpret, and judge legal authority, 39% scored beyond proficient, 53% were proficient, and only 8% of the sample was below proficient.

Files:

JD 2017-2018 rubric data

Improvement Based on Analysis

Last assessment cycle. 97% of students evaluated were found to be either proficient or beyond proficient in this skill. The percentage was slightly less this year with 91% proficient or higher in selecting appropriate resources and analyzing, interpreting, and judging legal authority. 89% were proficient or beyond proficient in locating primary and secondary sources. While the overall percentages are still excellent, the small decrease could be due to the fact our 1L Legal Research course was revised this past academic year to only be taught in the Fall semester, rather than over an entire academic year. This will continue to be monitored during the next assessment cycle.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2018. The student response rate was 52%. Responding students were surveyed regarding the extent to which their legal education has contributed to the development of legal research skills and to effective use of computing and information technology for legal research.

Analysis of Data

In this data, the means of the 2018 results are compared with peer/aspirational schools and UGA's 2017 means. Students responded using a scale of 1 = very little to 4 = very much. In the area of legal research skills, UGA scored higher this year than last year but continued to score lower than our peer/aspirational schools in the 1L and 2L classes.
1L UGA 3.19 / (2017) UGA 1L 3.19/ Peer/Aspirational 3.35

2L UGA 3.07 / (2017) UGA 2L 3.00/ Peer/Aspirational 3.11
3L UGA 3.19 / (2017) UGA 3L 3.06/ Peer/Aspirational 3.17

In regard to computing and information technology, UGA Law was a little below the peer/aspirational
group among 1L's and 3L's, but UGA Law 2L's were significantly higher.
1L UGA 2.25 / (2017) UGA 1L 2.54/ Peer/Aspirational 2.37
2L UGA 2.58 / (2017) UGA 2L 2.40/ Peer/Aspirational 2.26
3L UGA 2.27 / (2017) UGA 3L 2.48/ Peer/Aspirational 2.34

Improvement Based on Analysis

Graduates of UGA Law have the capacity to conduct efficient and effective legal research through
utilization of computer and information technology. LSSSE data found 1L and 3L students were
reporting competency in this skill significantly below last year's report and below our peer and
aspirational schools. However, the 2L's reported higher than last year, and significantly higher than
our peer and aspirational schools.
There have been ongoing curricular changes (such as separate writing and research courses in the
first year curriculum) and the addition of a writing/drafting requirement during law students' second
year that was implemented in the 2017-2018 academic year. Reviewing this data from 2016 to
2018, the data indicates the 1L's remained constant on legal research skills while there was an
increase among 2L's. The findings could be a positive indication that our curriculum changes have
been successful. We will continue to follow this learning outcome and see if there continues to be an
increase next year.

Outcome B1.1.2 Skills: Analysis
Graduates will demonstrate competency in analytical and reasoning skills. Graduates will demonstrate
achievement of this outcome by critically reading and analyzing applicable case law and enacted law,
including identifying key facts, rules, and reasoning within each authority, and synthesizing relevant rules of
law into a logical and accurate framework for analysis.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student
responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2018. The student response rate was 52%.
Responding students were surveyed regarding 1) the extent to which law school has taught them to
think critically and analytically.

Analysis of Data

91% of responding 3Ls indicated GA Law has helped them think critically and analytically "very
much" or "quite a bit". The LSSSE data compared mean of the UGA responses (40.6 for
responding 1Ls, 38.3 for responding 2Ls, and 38.1 for responding 3Ls) who reported their courses
emphasized the critical and analytical thinking needed to think like a lawyer to our peer and
aspirational schools. While there was no significant difference, UGA Law was slightly higher than
our peer and aspirational schools.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Over 91% of responding 3Ls indicated GA Law has helped them think critically and
analytically "very much" or "quite a bit". This percentage has remained consistent from 2016.

Measure 1L Rubric

1L Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For at least 80 percent of 1L students to exhibit proficiency in legal analysis.

Data Collected

A random sample will be drawn of student work product from a rotating selection of 1L doctrinal courses. For this cycle, student work product was selected from all 1L sections of Criminal Law and Civil Procedure.

Analysis of Data

Students were randomly selected from all 1L sections of Criminal Law and Civil Procedure, and their final exams were evaluated for proficiency in analysis using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 15% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 67% were proficient; and 18% were below proficient. This is similar to last year's assessment where 84% of the students were found to be proficient or beyond proficient in this area and 15% were below proficient.

Files:

JD 2017-2018 rubric data

Improvement Based on Analysis

Current 1L students are doing well in mastering this skill. Only 18% of the sample was found to be below proficient in analysis.

Measure UL Rubric

Upper Level Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of upper level students will exhibit proficiency in legal analysis.

Data Collected

A sample will be drawn of student work product from a rotating selection of upper level doctrinal courses. For this cycle, random samples were selected from the Fall and Spring upper level sections of Corporations and Criminal Procedure I.

Analysis of Data

Student final exams were evaluated for proficiency in analysis using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. Last year, 18% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 57% were proficient; and 25% were below proficient. The data for this assessment cycle demonstrates positive increases in this area with 20% of the student scoring above proficient; 66% of the students were proficient; and 14% of the students below proficient.

Files:

JD 2017-2018 rubric data

Improvement Based on Analysis

Our revised curriculum increased student performance in this area. After review of the data, student performance has increased from 75% of the sample last year found to be either proficient or beyond proficient in this skill to 86% of the sample meeting or exceeding the proficient level. This increase now meets our 80% threshold of students' successfully mastering this skill.

Outcome B1.1.3 Skills: Use of Counterarguments

Graduates will demonstrate competency in analytical and reasoning skills. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome through application of the applicable rules to the legally significant facts, including weighing the relative merits of any potential counterarguments to determine the likely outcome of the case.

Measure UL Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of upper level students will exhibit proficiency in the use of counterarguments.

Data Collected

A sample will be drawn of student work product from a rotating selection of upper level doctrinal courses. For this cycle, random samples were selected from the Fall and Spring upper level sections of Corporations and Criminal Procedure I.

Analysis of Data

Students were randomly selected from upper level sections of Corporations and Criminal Procedure I. The random sample of final exams were evaluated for proficiency in the use of counterarguments using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 5% of the students were found to be beyond proficient; 71% were proficient; and 23% were below proficient. This is compared to last year's findings in which 7% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 52% were proficient; and 41% were below proficient.

Files:

JD 2017-2018 rubric data

Improvement Based on Analysis

Last year, 59% of students were found to be proficient or beyond proficient at using counterarguments. However, 41% scored below proficient. Since it was the first time the Legal Reasoning Rubric had been used, the Assessment Committee presented this portion of the rubric to doctrinal faculty for feedback regarding the accuracy of the rubric. After that consultation, the committee decided the rubric was reliable and should continue to be used. While we do not meet or exceed our 80% threshold, there was significant progress in this area. In this year's sample, 76% were found to be proficient or beyond proficient in the use of counterarguments. We will continue to discuss with faculty additional means by which we can foster student growth in this area.

Measure 1L Rubric

1L Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For at least 80 percent of 1L students to exhibit proficiency in the use of counterarguments.

Data Collected

A random sample will be drawn of student work product from a rotating selection of 1L doctrinal courses for analysis. For this reporting cycle, student work was selected from all 1L sections of Criminal Law and Civil Procedure.

Analysis of Data

Students were randomly selected from all 1L sections of Criminal Law and Civil Procedure. Their final exams were reviewed for proficiency in the use of counter arguments using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. In the last assessment 17% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 60% were proficient; and 24% were below proficient. Assessment of this year's random sample found 8% to be beyond proficient; 68% proficient; and 24% below proficient.

Files:

JD 2017-2018 rubric data

Improvement Based on Analysis

76% of students were found to be proficient or beyond proficient at using counterarguments. While the majority of our first year students are mastering this skill, we still had 24% of students who scored below proficient, indicating we are not yet meeting our 80% threshold. The Assessment Committee will continue to work with 1L faculty to discuss ideas for teaching new law students how to better use counter arguments.

Outcome B1.1.4 Skills: Arguing by Analogy

Graduates will demonstrate competency in analytical and reasoning skills. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome through, when appropriate, articulating meaningful analogies and distinctions between the precedent cases and the factual scenario presented.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in spring 2018. The student response rate was 52%. Responding students were surveyed regarding how much the course work has emphasized synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships.

Analysis of Data

85% of responding 3Ls, 91% of 2Ls, and 93% of 1Ls indicated the course work at UGA Law has emphasized synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships. This was compared to 82% of 3Ls, 88% of 2Ls, and 88% of 3Ls at our peer and aspirational schools.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Graduates will demonstrate competency in analytical and reasoning skills. This competency can be demonstrated by the ability to synthesize and organize ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships. 85% of responding 3Ls, 91% of 2Ls, and 93% of 1Ls indicated the course work at UGA Law emphasized this skill, and all three class years were slightly higher than our peer and aspirational schools. This student self-assessment indicates UGA Law is performing well in this area.

Measure 1L Rubric

1L Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For at least 80 percent of 1L students to exhibit proficiency in the ability to argue by analogy.

Data Collected

A random sample of student work product wil drawn from a rotating selection of 1L doctrinal courses for analysis. Student work was selected from all 1L sections of Criminal Law and Civil Procedure.

Analysis of Data

Final exams from all 1L sections of Criminal Law and Civil Procedure were evaluated for proficiency in arguing by analogy using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 13% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 63% were proficient; and 25% were below proficient. This data compared to last year's assessment in which 26% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 47% were proficient; and 26% were below proficient.

Files:

JD 2017-2018 rubric data

Improvement Based on Analysis

We still have not met our 80% threshold with 76% of students found to be proficient or beyond proficient at arguing by analogy; however, the percentage meeting proficient has slightly increased 3%. Last year was the first time the Legal Reasoning Rubric had been used, and the Assessment Committee presented this portion of the rubric to doctrinal faculty for review. Based on feedback, it appeared the rubric was likely effective in measuring this skill. Additionally, faculty are emphasizing these skills consistently across sections, since these are 1L courses. We will discuss as a faculty ideas for ensuring our 1L students are mastering this skill.

Measure UL Rubric

Upper Level Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of upper level students will exhibit proficiency in the ability to argue by analogy.

Data Collected

A sample will be drawn of student work product from a rotating selection of upper level doctrinal courses. For this cycle, random samples were selected from the Fall and Spring upper level sections of Corporations and Criminal Procedure I.

Analysis of Data

Student work was randomly selected from Corporations and Criminal Procedure I. Their final exams were evaluated for proficiency in arguing by analogy using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 14% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 54% were proficient; and 32% were below proficient.

Files:

JD 2017-2018 rubric data

Improvement Based on Analysis

During the last assessment cycle, 59% of students were found to be proficient or beyond proficient at arguing by analogy and 41% scored below proficient. There were positive increases this year with 68% meeting or exceeding the proficient level. Based on feedback, it appeared the rubric was likely effective in measuring this skill. However, faculty did note that upper level courses are not taught with the same consistency across sections as 1L courses. One assessor pointed out that while arguing by analogy was referenced in their class, the skill was not highlighted in the course in the same depth as demanded by the rubric. Therefore, this could be a contributing factor to the lower scores regarding this area of legal reasoning. We will discuss as a faculty ideas for ensuring our UL students are mastering this skill.

Outcome B2.2.1 Skills: Communication

Graduates will communicate effectively and efficiently to individuals and groups. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this learning outcome by writing legal documents that are clear, precise, concise, well-reasoned, well-supported, professional in tone, and appropriate to the audience and the circumstances and which, when appropriate, contain proper citation to authority.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2018. The student response rate was 52%. Responding students were surveyed regarding the extent to which their legal education has contributed to their competency for writing clearly and effectively.

Analysis of Data

Students were asked if they had worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources. UGA Law means from responding students were comparable to those of our peer and aspirational schools.
UGA 1L 3.27 / peer/aspirational 3.23
UGA 2L 3.00 / peer/aspirational 3.12
UGA 3L 3.00 / peer/aspirational 3.16

Students also were asked how many written papers they would produce within a year of 20 or more pages. A large majority of 1Ls, 2Ls, and 3Ls said 1-3 papers. The reported production of longer papers for our 1L students is significantly higher than our peer and aspirational schools. Lastly, students were asked to what extent law school had contributed to their development in regard to writing clearly and effectively. This was compared to our peer and aspirational schools.
UGA 1L 3.18 / (2017) 3.22 / peer/aspirational 3.26

UGA 2L 3.11 / (2017) 2.96 / peer/aspirational 3.19
UGA 3L 3.09 / (2017) 3.06 / peer/aspirational 3.18

Improvement Based on Analysis

When students were asked how many written papers they would produce within a year of 20 or more pages, all of the responding class years indicated 1-3 papers. This was comparable to our peer and aspirational schools with our 1L finding being much higher. There was no significant difference between peer and aspirational schools when asked how they felt law school contributed to their development in writing clearly and effectively. UGA Law has recently revised Legal Writing in our 1L curriculum as well as adding a mandatory document drafting course in the 2L year which impacted the current 1L and 2L students. All students must successfully complete both the 2L Writing Requirement and the Capstone Writing Requirement. Before the conclusion of their second year, students must take a one semester class (for a minimum of two credit hours) that has been designated as meeting the criteria for the 2L Writing Requirement. The Capstone Writing Requirement requires each student, prior to graduation, to complete an additional analytical writing project of at least 20 double-spaced pages.The revisions seem to have had a positive impact as the means for UGA increased for the 2L students. We will continue to monitor the data in this area.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2018. The student response rate was 52%. Responding students were surveyed regarding the extent to which their legal education has contributed to their competency in speaking clearly and effectively.

Analysis of Data

The responding students perceived UGA Law as contributing to their competency in speaking clearly and effectively. Surveyed students responded using a scale of: 1 = never; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often; and 4 = very often. The reported data shows the mean of these responses. The means were compared to peer/aspirational law schools and the 2016 and 2017 UGA Law data. There was statistical significance in the mean difference in the 1L class year between UGA Law and peer /aspirational schools.
2018 UGA 1L 3.03/(2017)2.92/ (2016)UGA 1L 3.06/Peer/Aspirational 2.78
2018 UGA 2L 2.90/(2017) 2.92/(2016) UGA 2L 2.89/Peer/Aspirational 2.90
2018 UGA 3L 2.86/(2017) 2.79/(2016) UGA 3L 2.98/Peer/Aspirational 2.9

Improvement Based on Analysis

Graduates are expected to speak effectively and efficiently to individuals and group in an articulate and professional manner. This year, the LSSSE data showed a significant difference between the 1L means for UGA Law and peer and aspirational schools. We believe the revisions to our first year oral argument competition have improved this outcome. Next year we will begin gathering data from experiential learning settings in which students practice this skill to determine if this finding was reliable.

Measure UL Capstone Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of upper level students will exhibit proficiency in the ability to communicate effectively in writing. Since this was the first time the rubric has been applied to a capstone course, we chose a smaller random sample to test the rubric and collect feedback.

Data Collected

Random student work was selected from 8 of our Spring capstone writing courses.

Analysis of Data

Sampled student work was assessed for professional style, research, creative analytical thinking, and responsiveness to faculty input at both the development and revision stages of the paper. 100% of the students met the proficient level for professional style; 88% showed proficiency for research; 92% showed proficiency for creative analytical thinking; 96% showed proficiency in responsiveness to faculty input in the development stage; and 96% showed proficiency in responsiveness to faculty input in the revision stage.

Files:

JD 2017-2018 rubric data

Improvement Based on Analysis

The Capstone Writing Requirement requires each student, prior to graduation, to complete an analytical writing project of at least 20 double-spaced pages. The project, which may consist of a single writing or be comprised of a series of shorter writings on related topics, must meet the following criteria: 1) be written in a professional style; 2) require that the student engage in research and creative analytical thinking; and 3) be developed and revised based on faculty input and comments. Our students are meeting this skill through the satisfactory completion of the analytical writing project.

Measure 1L Legal Writing Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of 1L students to exhibit proficiency in efficient legal writing.

Data Collected

A random sample of student work was reviewed from each of the 1L Legal Writing sections.

Analysis of Data

Sampled student work was assessed for rule synthesis, rule application, appropriate research, correct use of authority, thesis development, organization, professional style, appropriate tone, and technical compliance. 86% of the students met the proficient level for rule synthesis; 86% for rule application; 89% for appropriate research; 81% for correct use of authority; 97% for thesis development; 83% for organization, 83% for professional style; 100% for appropriate tone; and 92% for technical compliance.

Files:

JD 2017-2018 rubric data

Improvement Based on Analysis

The sampled work met our 80% threshold for proficiency in all 9 areas. The legal writing courses have been restructured during the changes to the 1L curriculum, and we will discuss the idea of having faculty outside of the Legal Writing Instructors conduct the rubric assessments in the next cycle to see if our levels of proficiency in the 1L class hold consistent.

Outcome C1.1.1 Professionalism: Ethics

Graduates will understand a lawyer's professional, ethical, and legal duties to clients, courts, opposing parties, the legal system, and society. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome by applying professional disciplinary rules, common law rules, and constitutional rules that govern lawyers, and showing an appreciation of the historical and contemporary role of lawyers as agents for maintaining the rule of law, promoting fairness, and meeting the legal needs of the indigent.

Measure Course Completion Rate

The completion rate of the course, The Law and Ethics of Lawyering. Successful completion of this course prior to graduation is an ABA accreditation requirement and is essential to our students' success and our program of legal education.

Threshold for success (if available)

Number of all law students successfully completing JURI 4300, The Law and Ethics of Lawyering

Data Collected

The final grades for all sections of JURI 4300 in Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 were reviewed.

Analysis of Data

All students earned a passing grade of C or better.

Improvement Based on Analysis

The reported grades are indicative of all students gaining an understanding of the course material. This year, we have added a Legal Ethics Rubric as an additional means to evaluate this skill.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2018. The student response rate was 52%. Responding students were surveyed regarding their perceived gain in professional values and ethics.

Analysis of Data

57% of the responding 3L students indicated a perceived gain regarding development of a personal code of values and ethics. The entire student body was asked how much they felt the law school environment contributed to the development of a personal code of values and ethics. Surveyed students responded using a scale of: 1 = never; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often; and 4 = very often. The reported data shows the mean of these responses. These means were compared to our peer /aspirational schools:
1L UGA 2.62/ peer/aspirational 2.73
2L UGA 2.76 / peer/aspirational 2.66
3L UGA 2.73 / peer/aspirational 2.63
The 2L and 3L means were up from last year's data:
1L UGA 2.70
2L UGA 2.64
3L UGA 2.54

Students were also asked to what extent their law school encouraged the ethical practice of law. These means were compared to our peer/aspirational schools:
1L UGA 3.30 / peer/aspirational 3.27
2L UGA 3.36 / peer/aspirational 3.17
3L UGA 3.31 / peer/aspirational 3.13
This was significantly higher than last year:
1L UGA 3.22
2L UGA 3.18
3L UGA 3.21

Improvement Based on Analysis

Last year, data indicated 54% of students who participated in this survey perceived a gain regarding the personal development of values and ethics. The perceived gain from responding students is slightly higher this year at 57%, and we feel positive that changes implemented in our orientation and mentoring programs, as well as the addition of an upper-class "Welcome Back Week", helped contribute to development of this skill. However, when all students were asked how well the student environment encouraged the ethical practice of law, while UGA Law means were comparable to those of our peer/aspirational law schools, the means were significantly lower across all class years from last year. When asked about encouragement of the ethical practice of law, all class years responded higher than last year and higher than our peer and aspirational schools this year, with the 2L data reporting a statistically significant difference. We will discuss other programming and activities for this next academic year to help contribute to the personal development of values and ethics.

Measure Legal Ethics Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of upper level students will exhibit proficiency in legal ethics and professionalism.

Data Collected

A random sample of student work will be drawn from a rotating selection of either the Law and Ethics for Lawyering course or the Ethics in Practice Rubric applied to our clinics/externships /practicums for analysis. For this cycle, random student work was selected from the Law and Ethics of Lawyering sections taught in Spring 2018.

Analysis of Data

Student work was randomly selected from the Spring sections of the Law and Ethics of Lawyering course. Their final exams were evaluated for proficiency in issue spotting; analysis; use of counterarguments; and arguing by analogy using the Legal Ethics Reasoning Rubric. In the area of issue spotting, 9% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 91% were proficient; and none were below proficient. For analysis, 9% were found to be beyond proficient, 82% proficient, and 9% below proficient. 91% of the students were proficient in the use of counterarguments, 5% beyond proficient, and only 5% were found to be below proficient. In the skill of arguing by analogy, only 55% met the proficient mark and 45% were found to be below proficient.

Percentages	Issue spotting	Analysis	Using counter arguments	Arguing by analogy
Beyond Proficient	9%	9%	4.5%	5%
Proficient	91%	82%	91%	50%
Below Proficient	0%	9%	4.5%	45%

Files:

JD 2017-2018 rubric data

Improvement Based on Analysis

This was the first time the Legal Ethics Reasoning Rubric has been applied. It appears our students are excelling in the areas of issue spotting, analysis, and the use of counterarguments. However, the data for arguing by analogy needs to be discussed. We will have a conversation with our Ethics faculty to determine if it is a problem with this part of the rubric. whether the Ethics faculty actually test for this skill in this particular course, or if the students are truly not excelling in the area.

Outcome D1.1.2 Professionalism: Collaboration
Graduates will demonstrate competence in the core skills of professional lawyering on behalf of clients through collaboration with colleagues on assigned projects

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2018. The student response rate was 52%. Responding students self-reported on collaboration with peers and working on a legal research project outside of class with a faculty member.

Analysis of Data

In 2016, 72% of responding 3Ls reported a positive relationship with their peers with that percentage decreasing to 60% in 2017. This year, the number of responding students reporting a positive relationship with peers is 59%. Last year, 50% of responding 3Ls reported working on a legal research project outside of class with a faculty member, which was one of UGA's highest performing items as compared to our peer/aspirational group. This year, only 36% of 3L's reported working on a legal research project with a faculty member compared to 41% of 3L's in our peer and aspirational schools.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Last year, UGA's faculty excelled in collaborative projects with law students as compared to peer and aspirational schools. These are great learning opportunities for our students. This year, the number has significantly dropped to 36%. The law school will discuss the benefits of more collaborative work between peers as well as with faculty with members of the law school in an attempt to illuminate other means of engaging students in a collaborative environment. Furthermore, we will discuss why the percentage is so much lower than last year.

Outcome D1.1.1 Professionalism: Client Needs

Graduates will demonstrate competence in the core skills of professional lawyering on behalf of clients by Identifying and effectively engaging with the complexity of client needs, through clinical work, simulation courses, or other practical skills courses.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for a majority of student responses to be positive.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2018. The student response rate was 52%. Responding students were surveyed regarding advanced preparation skills development such as pro bono work, field placements, and/or clinic participation.

Analysis of Data

Of the students participating in LSSSE, 87.5% of responding 3L students and 84.8% of responding 2L's indicated they had participated or planned to participate in some form of field placement or law clinic; 65.7% of responding 3L's and 71.5% of responding 2L's had participated or planned to participate in pro bono work or public service. Such experiential opportunities assist some students in preparing for law related careers.

Improvement Based on Analysis

It is impressive that 88% of the third year students participated in a field placement or law school clinic. Last year, these percentages ranked as some of UGA Law's highest performing items relative to our peer and aspirational schools, but this does not hold true for this year. The percentage of 2L's who had already participated in a field placement or law clinic has dropped from 62.4% to 43.5%, which is slightly lower than our peer and aspirational schools in which 48% of the 2L's report they have already participated in a field placement or clinic. While the percentage of 2L and 3L students engaging in pro bono work or public service has remained consistent, this area was one of our lowest performing items relative to our peer and aspirational schools, where 58.6% of 2L students reported engagement in pro bono or public service. We continue to expand our experiential learning opportunities to increase student engagement, with the creation of a Veteran's Legal Clinic beginning Summer 2018 and the Practicum in Animal Welfare Skills beginning Fall 2018. The sharp decrease in 2L participation in field placements and clinics could be an indicator students plan to engage in such new opportunities during their 3L year. We will discuss these findings with our clinical faculty and monitor this data for next year.

Additional Narrative (if applicable) New Assessment Plan for JD program

The law school is in the second year of its new assessment plan and learning outcomes guided by new assessment standards from ABA accreditation. At this time, we continue to discuss the inclusion of new measures as well as revisions of rubrics.

Files:

Assessment Table_2017-2018 cycle

Feedback

Files:

LOA Feedback Rubric_Law â€" JD

Program Name: Law - JD

Reporting Cycle: Oct 1, 2018 to Sep 30, 2019

Academic Program Coordinator Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Randy Beck

Description of Program UGA School of Law JD program

The fundamental academic mission of the Law School is to educate and prepare law students for successful and meaningful careers within the legal profession or in positions where legal training provides an advantage. Because of the complexity of the law and the concomitant breadth of potential career paths, there is no single model for adequately preparing our students. Some students will become prosecutors, others commercial litigators, and still others transactional or international attorneys, just to name a few possibilities. A segment of our student body (4-6%) will seek jobs in which a law degree provides an advantage, but that do not require professional licensing. The particular skills required to excel in a given specialty will necessarily vary as will the mode of teaching, the outcomes desired, and the method of assessment. Accordingly, this assessment plan is built around the assessment requirements of the American Bar Association, which is the law school's outside accreditor. The ABA requires assessment of law students' knowledge, skills and professionalism. This plan uses direct and indirect measures to assess these outcomes, including rubrics, course completion and progression rates, professional licensing exams, and student self assessments.

Outcome A1.1.1 Substantive and Procedural Law 1L
Graduates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of substantive and procedural materials studied in the required first year curriculum. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome through self-assessments, successful completion of the 1L program, and successful retention of knowledge evidenced by Bar passage.

Measure LSSSE

Law School Survey of Student Engagement regarding student learning experiences.

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer and aspirational institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in spring 2019. The student response rate was 53%. Responding students were surveyed regarding 1) how much their course work emphasized analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth; 2) how much their coursework emphasized making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions; and 3) to what extent their experience at law school contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills.

Analysis of Data

In 2019, when asked how much of their course work emphasized analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth, 94.9% of responding 1Ls reported favorably. Our peer and aspirational schools' rate for responding 1Ls was 93.2%. 82.9% of our responding 1Ls perceived their course work as emphasizing making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others interpreted data and assessing the soundness of conclusions. Our peer and aspirational group for responding 1Ls was 78.3%. In regard to the extent to which law school had contributed to acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills, 73.2% of our responding 1L students indicated "quite a bit" or "very much". Among our peer and aspirational schools, the comparable figure for that cohort was 69.4% of those responding.

Improvement Based on Analysis

This measure shows our 1Ls self-assessment of their coursework in regard to this learning outcome is very positive and exceeds the self-assessment of students at our peer and aspirational institutions. However, this year our positive response percentages on these questions have somewhat decreased by 1, .8, and 2.7 (respectively) when compared to last year's LSSSE data. One area where we received low marks relative to peer and aspirational schools concerned 1L responses to the question whether they received prompt feedback (written or oral) from faculty on their academic performance. We will discuss with faculty methods they can use to incorporate more formative assessment in our 1L courses.

Measure Bar Passage

Overall Bar Passage rate for the July and February bar examination.

Threshold for success (if available)

Meeting or exceeding the American Bar Association requirement that at least 75 percent of a law school's graduates in a calendar year who sat for a bar examination must have passed a bar examination administered within two years of their date of graduation.

Data Collected

Overall bar passage rate for calendar years 2016 and 2017 graduates who ultimately passed a bar exam within 2 years post-graduation and for calendar year 2018 graduates who were first time bar takers. Data were retrieved from 22 state bars for the class of 2018.
Ultimate Bar Passage

Calendar Year of graduation	Number of graduates in calendar year	Graduates who sat for a bar examination within one year of their date of graduation.			Graduates who sat for a bar examination within two years of their date of graduation.			Number with no information	Number who did not take a bar examination	
		# of takers	# who passed	% that passed	# of takers	# who passed	% that passed		within one years of graduation	within two years of graduation
2016	197	-	-	-	189	183	96.83%	1	-	7
2017	182	173	164	94.80%	-	-	-	0	9	-

First Time Bar Passage

Calendar Year	Total Graduates in Calendar Year	# from Calendar Year NOT taking Bar Exam	# from Previous Years Taking Bar for First Time in Calendar Year	# from Calendar Year with no information	Total First Time Takers in any jurisdiction	Total who passed the bar in any jurisdiction	ABA first time weighted average pass rate	Percent who passed the bar in any jurisdiction	Law School weighted average pass rate
2018	193	12	13	1	193	162	71.43%	83.94%	83.94%

Analysis of Data

UGA Law graduates for the calendar year 2016 had an ultimate bar passage rate of 96.83%. This is the ABA bar passage outcome measurement that captures all graduates that took a bar exam within two years of graduation. 83.94% of graduates in calendar year 2018 passed their first attempted bar exam, representing data from 22 bar administering jurisdictions.

Improvement Based on Analysis

The Law School's bar passage rate is excellent objectively, and also in relation to other Georgia law schools. Nonetheless, we continue to adapt our bar study program based on prior year's feedback, and expect these changes to further improve our performance in this area. We have studied bar exam results, examining numerous variables to identify correlations that could assist in designing an effective bar study program. These statistics demonstrate a correlation between bar passage and GPA, LSAT performance, and completion rate of bar prep study material. A review of the data from the past three years indicated a student is considered to have an "at-risk indicator" of failing the bar if they had a first-year GPA less than 2.57, final GPA less than 2.94, and/or average LSAT less than 152. Most students who failed the exam had more than one at-risk indicator, and students with all three at-risk indicators failed the exam at a significantly higher rate. We have taken a number of steps in recent years to address risk factors and improve bar passage rates. For three years we have operated a program of accountability partners who encourage each other to complete bar preparation. This year, the law school experimented with providing funds for bar preparation programs and a legal writing instructor helped the students who received funding to work on bar exam drafting skills.

Files:

Bar Data Tables 2018

Measure Course Completion

Successful Course completion rate for first year law courses.

Threshold for success (if available)

1L students successfully completing first year courses with 1.90 GPA or higher, enabling them to continue to the upper level curriculum.

Data Collected

The 1L student GPAs were reviewed at the end of Spring 2019.

Analysis of Data

Out of 204 students completing their first year in law school, only one of the students had a cumulative GPA below 1.90.

Improvement Based on Analysis

All but one of the 204 students in the 1L class were able to proceed to their 2L year. We will continue our tutoring program for the at-risk students to prevent our academic attrition rate from increasing. Additionally, at-risk students whose GPA is severely below our threshold are counseled at the end of the Fall semester to determine if they should continue their legal studies.

Outcome A2.2.1 Substantive and Procedural Law UL

Graduates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of substantive and procedural law beyond that required in the first year curriculum. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome through self-assessments, successful completion of the UL coursework, and demonstrating knowledge meeting ABA and Georgia standards for professional licensing.

Measure LSSSE

Data from LSSSE regarding student learning experiences.

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2019. The student response rate was 53%. Responding students were surveyed regarding 1) how much has their course work emphasized analyzing the basic element of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth, and 2) whether their schooling helped them acquire a broad legal education.

Analysis of Data

In 2019, when asked how much course work emphasized analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth, 89.6% of surveyed 2Ls and 87.4% of surveyed 3Ls responded favorably. Our peer and aspirational schools' responses were: 88.8% of responding 2Ls and 87.9% of responding 3Ls.

On the question of whether law school helped students acquire a broad legal education, surveyed students responded using a scale of: 1 = never; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often; and 4 = very often. The reported data shows the mean of these responses. A comparison of these means showed the UGA Law means were equal to or slightly higher than those of our peer and aspirational schools. Our results for 2019 were slightly lower than for 2018, but not by a significant margin.

2019 UGA 3.33 / 2018 UGA 2L 3.37 / 2019 Peer and Aspirational 3.33
2019 UGA 3.46 / 2018 UGA 3L 3.49/ 2019 Peer and Aspirational 3.38

Improvement Based on Analysis

The Law School continues to excel at helping students meet this learning outcome. Understanding of substantive and procedural law beyond that required in the first year curriculum is critical to passage of the bar exam and to success in practice. When asked about their educational experience, students indicated the coursework at UGA Law emphasized in-depth analysis and that UGA Law helped our students acquire the type of broad legal education promoted in the upper level curriculum.

Measure Bar Passage

Threshold for success (if available)

Meeting the ABA requirement that among students who graduated from the law school within the five most recently completed calendar years: (i) 75 percent or more of those graduates who sat for the bar passed a bar examination; or (ii) in at least three of these calendar years, 75 percent of the students graduating in those years and sitting for the bar have passed a bar examination.

Data Collected

Overall bar passage rate for calendar years 2016 and 2017 graduates who ultimately passed a bar exam within 2 years post-graduation and for calendar year 2018 graduates who were first time bar takers. Data were retrieved from 22 state bars for the class of 2018.

Ultimate Bar Passage

Calendar Year of graduation	Number of graduates in calendar year	Graduates who sat for a bar examination within one year of their date of graduation.			Graduates who sat for a bar examination within two years of their date of graduation.			Number with no information	Number who did not take a bar examination	
		# of takers	# who passed	% that passed	# of takers	# who passed	% that passed		within one years of graduation	within two years of graduation
2016	197	-	-	-	189	183	96.83%	1	-	7
2017	182	173	164	94.80%	-	-	-	0	9	-

First Time Bar Passage

Total Graduates in	# from Calendar Year	# from Previous Years Taking	# from Calendar Year with	Total First Time Takers in	Total who passed the bar in	ABA first time weighted	Percent who passed	Law School weighted

Calendar Year	Calendar Year	NOT taking Bar Exam	Bar for First Time in Calendar Year	no information	any jurisdiction	any jurisdiction	average pass rate	the bar in any jurisdiction	average pass rate
2018	193	12	13	1	193	162	71.43%	83.94%	83.94%

Analysis of Data

UGA Law graduates for the calendar year 2016 had an ultimate bar passage rate of 96.83%. This is the ABA bar passage outcome measurement that captures all graduates that took a bar exam within two years of graduation. 83.94% of graduates in calendar year 2018 passed their first attempted bar exam, representing data from 22 bar administering jurisdictions.

Improvement Based on Analysis

The Law School's bar passage rate is excellent objectively, and also in relation to other Georgia law schools. Nonetheless, we continue to adapt our bar study program based on prior years feedback, and expect these changes to further improve our performance in this area. We have studied bar exam results, examining numerous variables to identify correlations that could assist in designing an effective bar study program. These statistics demonstrate a correlation between bar passage and GPA, LSAT performance, and completion rate of bar prep study material. A review of the data from the past three years indicated a student is considered to have an "at-risk indicator" of failing the bar if they had a first-year GPA less than 2.57, final GPA less than 2.94, and/or average LSAT less than 152. Most students who failed the exam had more than one at-risk indicator, and students with all three at-risk indicators failed the exam at a significantly higher rate. We have taken a number of steps in recent years to address risk factors and improve bar passage rates. For three years we have operated a program of accountability partners who encourage each other to complete bar preparation. This year, the law school experimented with providing funds for bar preparation programs and a legal writing instructor helped the students who received funding to work on bar exam drafting skills.

Files:

Bar Data Tables 2018

Measure Successful Course Completion Rates

Threshold for success (if available)

2L and 3L students passing upper level courses with 2.0 GPA or higher.

Data Collected

Review of GPAs for 2L and 3L students.

Analysis of Data

Cumulative GPAs for 2L and 3L students were reviewed at the end of Spring 2019. In the 2L class of 184, all students maintained a GPA above 2.0. In the 3L class of 187, all students maintained a GPA above 2.0.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Our course completion rate is excellent, and all of our upper level students maintained GPAs satisfying our academic standards. We continue to enhance our mentoring process to further help the very few students who experience difficulty or do not succeed in individual courses. The law school will be increasing the number of graduate assistantships awarded to incoming students. We are considering whether some of these students should be tasked with teaching assistant or academic support roles beneficial to other students.

Measure Graduation Audit

Threshold for success (if available)

Number of 3L students on track to graduate after their last semester of law school.

Data Collected

Individual degree audits were conducted for all 3L students in October 2018 to ensure they were on track to meet degree requirements by May 2019.

Analysis of Data

Student transcripts were individually assessed by the law school registrar's office to ensure students had met or would be capable of meeting degree requirements by May. All 3L students were on track to graduate as of October 2018.

Improvement Based on Analysis

While the Law School enjoys an extraordinarily high graduation rate, the process will now be more efficient for the students through the use of DegreeWorks. This program will allow students to track their progress from their first semester and eliminate human error. Additionally, the registrar's office will continue to conduct degree audits for 3L students during the Fall semester of their 3L year.

Outcome B1.1.1 Skills: Issue Spotting

Graduates will demonstrate competency in analytical and reasoning skills, spotting legal issues in factual scenarios and identifying potentially applicable legal doctrines

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in spring 2019. The student response rate was 53%. Responding students were surveyed regarding how much their course work emphasized applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations.

Analysis of Data

When asked how UGA Law has helped them apply theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations, students responded using a scale of 1 = very little to 4 = very much. The 1Ls and 2Ls at UGA Law had a mean higher than our peer and aspirational schools.
1L 2019 UGA 3.55 (1L 2018 UGA 3.18) / 2019 3.40 peer and aspirational
2L 2019 UGA 3.48 (2L 2018 UGA 3.39) / 2019 3.21 peer and aspirational
3L 2019 UGA 3.21 (3L 2018 UGA 3.34) / 2019 3.26 peer and aspirational

Improvement Based on Analysis

Spotting legal issues in factual scenarios and identifying potentially applicable legal doctrines is important in legal practice. Student survey responses in this area were higher than peer and aspirational schools for 1Ls and 2Ls. Additionally, our means were higher this year as compared to the 1Ls and 2Ls in 2018. This data suggests that our new first year curriculum is successfully developing this essential skill in the 1L year.

Measure 1L Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For no less than 80 percent of sampled 1L students to exhibit proficiency in issue spotting; analysis; the use of counterarguments; and ability to argue by analogy.

Data Collected

A random sample of student work is drawn from a rotating selection of 1L doctrinal courses for analysis. Samples this reporting cycle were drawn from all sections of 1L Torts (Fall 2018) and 1L Property (Spring 2019).

Analysis of Data

Students were randomly selected from all sections of the Fall 1L Torts course and all sections of the Spring 1L Property course. During the 2016-2017 assessment cycle, the final exams were evaluated for proficiency in Issue Spotting using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 42% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 43% were proficient; and only 15% were below proficient.

During the 2017-2018 assessment cycle, the final exams were evaluated for proficiency in Issue Spotting using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. When the data is aggregated for the entire academic year, 89% of the 1Ls were found to meet or exceed the level of proficiency with only 11% below proficient for the skill of issue spotting.

In this assessment cycle, the randomly sampled final exams were evaluated for proficiency in Issue Spotting using the Legal Reasoning Rubric in the 1L Torts and Property courses. 20% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 70% were proficient; and only 10% were below proficient.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Current 1L students are doing well in mastering the skill of issue spotting. While we have been meeting our 80% threshold of proficient or beyond in Issue Spotting, the data also indicates a steady increase in the students meeting this skill every year.

Measure Upper Level Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For at least 80 percent of upper level students to exhibit proficiency in issue spotting; analysis; the use of counterarguments; and ability to argue by analogy.

Data Collected

A rotating selection of upper level doctrinal courses are used for analysis. For this cycle, a random sample of student work was selected from the upper level Fall and Spring sections of Trusts & Estates and Criminal Procedure II.

Analysis of Data

Upper level students were randomly selected from Trusts & Estates and Criminal Procedure II. Their final exams were evaluated for proficiency in Issue Spotting using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 10% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 85% were proficient; and 5% were below proficient.

The data is comparable to last year's findings in which only 4% were below proficient.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Current upper level students are excelling with this skill. Only 5% of the sample was found to be below proficient in Issue Spotting. Moreover, the analysis of 1L and upper level students showed increased proficiency between the first year and subsequent years.

Outcome B 3.3.1 Skills: Efficient Legal Research
Graduates will demonstrate achievement of conducting efficient and effective legal research through the selection of appropriate legal research tools, including cost-effective legal technology tools, to locate relevant primary and secondary authority and the ability to distinguish and correctly use different sources of legal authority available in the American legal system, including state and federal law, constitutional, and common and statutory law.

Measure 1L Rubric

1L Research Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For at least 80 percent of 1L students to exhibit proficiency in efficient legal research.

Data Collected

A random sample of student work was reviewed from each of the 1L Legal Research sections.

Analysis of Data

1L students were evaluated on three areas of research: ability to select appropriate resources; ability to locate primary and secondary sources; and ability to analyze, interpret, and judge legal authority. In selecting appropriate resources, 100% scored at or above the proficient level. In the ability to locate primary and secondary sources, 96% scored at or above proficient. Regarding the ability to analyze, interpret, and judge legal authority, 93% met the proficient or beyond proficient level.

Improvement Based on Analysis

As in the past assessment cycle, our students have continued to excel in legal research. Our 1L Legal Research course was revised 2 years ago to only be taught in the Fall semester, rather than over an entire academic year, and it appears this course revision has been successful.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2019. The student response rate was 53%. Responding students were surveyed regarding the extent to which their legal education has contributed to the development of legal research skills and to effective use of computing and information technology for legal research.

Analysis of Data

In this data, the means of the 2019 results are compared with peer/aspirational schools and UGA's 2018 and 2017 means. Students responded using a scale of 1 = very little to 4 = very much. In the area of legal research skills, UGA's 1L and 2L students scored higher this year than last year in the 1L and 2L classes, but all three class years scored lower than our peer/aspirational schools.
1L UGA 3.23 / (2018) 1L UGA 3.19 / (2017) UGA 1L 3.19/ Peer/Aspirational 3.32
2L UGA 3.09 / (2018) 2L UGA 3.07 / (2017) UGA 2L 3.00/ Peer/Aspirational 3.16
3L UGA 3.12 / (2018) 3L UGA 3.19 / (2017) UGA 3L 3.06/ Peer/Aspirational 3.18
We also participate in the LSSSE "library module" which focuses on library resources and services. Our 1L students reported significantly higher results than other schools answering the library-focused survey on gaining an awareness of the cost of research (3.20 v. 2.84), developing the ability to select appropriate sources for obtaining required information (3.29 v. 3.08), and developing the ability to design and implement efficient, cost-effective search strategies (2.93 v. 2.65).

Improvement Based on Analysis

Graduates of UGA Law have the capacity to conduct efficient and effective legal research through utilization of computer and information technology. LSSSE data found the 1L and 2L students were reporting competency in this skill higher than last year's report, but all three class years were less than peer and aspirational schools.
There have been ongoing curricular changes (such as separate writing and research courses in the first year curriculum) and the addition of a writing/drafting requirement during law students' second year in the 2017-2018 academic year. Reviewing responses from 2017 to 2019, the data indicates an improvement in legal research skills among 1Ls and 2Ls. The 3Ls reported slightly lower satisfaction compared to last year. The 1L and 2L findings could be a positive indication that our curriculum changes have been successful. We will continue to follow this learning outcome and see if there is additional improvement next year. One concern expressed by students in recent years has been the level of coordination between the legal research and legal writing classes. We have held a series of joint meetings among legal research and legal writing instructors to respond to this issue.

Outcome B1.1.2 Skills: Analysis
Graduates will demonstrate competency in analytical and reasoning skills. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome by critically reading and analyzing applicable case law and enacted law,

including identifying key facts, rules, and reasoning within each authority, and synthesizing relevant rules of law into a logical and accurate framework for analysis.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2019. The student response rate was 53%. Responding students were surveyed regarding the extent to which law school has taught them to think critically and analytically.

Analysis of Data

The means for UGA Law students were compared with peer/aspirational schools regarding the extent to which their law school experience contributed to their ability to think critically and analytically. UGA Law means were higher than our peer/aspirational schools, and the differences were statistically significant for the 1Ls and 2Ls.
1L UGA 3.72 / Peer/Aspirational 3.46
2L UGA 3.61 / Peer/Aspirational 3.39
3L UGA 3.55 / Peer/Aspirational 3.44

Improvement Based on Analysis

UGA's mean scores are significantly higher than peer and aspirational schools, and especially so for the 1L and 2L classes. Development of critical and analytical thinking appears to be an area where our program excels compared to other schools.

Measure 1L Rubric

1L Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For at least 80 percent of 1L students to exhibit proficiency in legal analysis.

Data Collected

A random sample will be drawn of student work product from a rotating selection of 1L doctrinal courses. For this cycle, student work product was selected from all 1L sections of Torts and Property.

Analysis of Data

Students were randomly selected from all 1L sections of Torts and Property, and their final exams were evaluated for proficiency in analysis using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 89% of the students were found to be proficient or beyond proficient; and 11% were below proficient. This is better than last year's assessment where 82% of the students were found to be proficient or beyond proficient in this area and 18% were below proficient.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Current 1L students are doing well in mastering this skill. Only 11% of the sample was found to be below proficient in analysis.

Measure UL Rubric

Upper Level Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of upper level students will exhibit proficiency in legal analysis.

Data Collected

A sample will be drawn of student work product from a rotating selection of upper level doctrinal courses. For this cycle, random samples were selected from the Fall and Spring upper level sections of Trusts & Estates and Criminal Procedure II.

Analysis of Data

Student final exams were evaluated for proficiency in analysis using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. The data for this assessment cycle demonstrates positive increases in the percentage crossing the proficiency threshold with 13% of the students scoring above proficient; 79% of the students proficient; and 8% of the students below proficient. The number of students at or above the level of proficiency was higher than last year where 41% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 41% were proficient; and 18% were below proficient.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Our revised curriculum appears to have increased the percentage of the student body achieving proficiency on this skill though fewer were rated "beyond proficient" this year. After review of the data, student performance increased from 75% in 2016-2017 to 82% 2017-2018 of the sample meeting or exceeding the proficient level. This assessment cycle the level of proficiency or beyond was 92%.

Outcome B1.1.3 Skills: Use of Counterarguments

Graduates will demonstrate competency in analytical and reasoning skills. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome through application of the applicable rules to the legally significant facts, including weighing the relative merits of any potential counterarguments to determine the likely outcome of the case.

Measure UL Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of upper level students will exhibit proficiency in the use of counterarguments.

Data Collected

A sample will be drawn of student work product from a rotating selection of upper level doctrinal courses. For this cycle, random samples were selected from the Fall and Spring upper level sections of Trust & Estates and Criminal Procedure II.

Analysis of Data

Students were randomly selected from upper level sections of Trusts & Estates and Criminal Procedure II. The random sample of final exams was evaluated for proficiency in the use of counterarguments using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 8% of the students were found to be beyond proficient; 79% were proficient; and 13% were below proficient. This is compared to last year's findings in which 6% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 71% were proficient; and 24% were below proficient.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Last year 2017-2018, we did not meet or exceed our 80% threshold as 77% were found to be proficient or beyond proficient in the use of counterarguments. This year we have exceeded our threshold with 87% of the sample meeting or exceeding the proficient level.

Measure 1L Rubric

1L Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For at least 80 percent of 1L students to exhibit proficiency in the use of counterarguments.

Data Collected

A random sample will be drawn of student work product from a rotating selection of 1L doctrinal courses for analysis. For this reporting cycle, student work was selected from all 1L sections of Torts and Property.

Analysis of Data

Students were randomly selected from all 1L sections of Torts and Property. Their final exams were reviewed for proficiency in the use of counter arguments using the Legal Reasoning Rubric.

Assessment of this year's random sample found 19% to be beyond proficient; 71% proficient; and 10% below proficient.

In the 2016-2017 assessment 17% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 60% were proficient; and 24% were below proficient. Assessment of the 2017-2018 random sample found 8% to be beyond proficient; 68% proficient; and 24% below proficient.

Improvement Based on Analysis

There was a positive increase this year as 90% of the students were found to be proficient or beyond proficient at using counterarguments. This is compared to only 76% last year, suggesting we are improving in meeting this outcome with our 1L class.

Outcome B1.1.4 Skills: Arguing by Analogy

Graduates will demonstrate competency in analytical and reasoning skills. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome through, when appropriate, articulating meaningful analogies and distinctions between the precedent cases and the factual scenario presented.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in spring 2019. The student response rate was 53%. Responding students were surveyed regarding how much the course work has emphasized synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships.

Analysis of Data

82% of responding 3Ls, 88% of 2Ls, and 92% of 1Ls indicated the course work at UGA Law has emphasized synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships. This was compared to 83% of 3Ls, 83% of 2Ls, and 89% of 1Ls at our peer and aspirational schools.

Improvement Based on Analysis

While percentages this year are slightly below last year's, there was no statistical difference between UGA Law and our peer and aspirational schools. This student self-assessment indicates UGA Law continues to perform well in this area.

Measure 1L Rubric

1L Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For at least 80 percent of 1L students to exhibit proficiency in the ability to argue by analogy.

Data Collected

A random sample of student work product will be drawn from a rotating selection of 1L doctrinal courses for analysis. Student work was selected from all 1L sections of Torts and Property.

Analysis of Data

Final exams from all 1L sections of Torts and Property were evaluated for proficiency in arguing by analogy using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 8% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 80% were proficient; and 12% were below proficient. This data compared to last year's assessment in which 13% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 63% were proficient; and 25% were below proficient.

Improvement Based on Analysis

For the first time, we have met our 80% threshold with 88% of students found to be proficient or beyond proficient at arguing by analogy. We will review this next year to ensure we continue to meet or exceed the 80% threshold.

Measure UL Rubric

Upper Level Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of upper level students will exhibit proficiency in the ability to argue by analogy.

Data Collected

A sample will be drawn of student work product from a rotating selection of upper level doctrinal courses. For this cycle, random samples were selected from the Fall and Spring upper level sections of Trusts & Estates and Criminal Procedure II.

Analysis of Data

Student work was randomly selected from Trust & Estates and Criminal Procedure II. Their final exams were evaluated for proficiency in arguing by analogy using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 8% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 74% were proficient; and 18% were below proficient.

Improvement Based on Analysis

During the last assessment cycle, 76% of students were found to be proficient or beyond proficient at arguing by analogy and 24% scored below proficient. During the 2018-2019 cycle, we have exceeded the 80% threshold with 82% of students meeting or exceeding the proficient level and 18% scoring below proficient.

Outcome B2.2.1 Skills: Communication

Graduates will communicate effectively and efficiently to individuals and groups. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this learning outcome by writing legal documents that are clear, precise, concise, well-reasoned, well-supported, professional in tone, and appropriate to the audience and the circumstances and which, when appropriate, contain proper citation to authority.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2019. The student response rate was 53%. Responding students were surveyed regarding the extent to which their legal education has contributed to their competency in writing clearly and effectively.

Analysis of Data

Students were asked if they had worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources. UGA Law means from responding students were comparable to those of our peer and aspirational schools.
UGA 1L 3.13 / (2018) UGA 1L 3.27 / peer/aspirational 3.30
UGA 2L 3.32 / (2018) UGA 2L 3.00 / peer/aspirational 3.26
UGA 3L 3.30 / (2018) UGA 3L 3.00 / peer/aspirational 3.23

Students also were asked how many written papers they would produce within a year of 20 or more pages. A large majority of 1Ls, 2Ls, and 3Ls said 1-3 papers. The reported production of longer papers for our 1L students is significantly higher than our peer and aspirational schools. Lastly, students were asked to what extent law school had contributed to their development in regard to writing clearly and effectively. This was compared to our peer and aspirational schools.
UGA 1L 3.25 / (2018) UGA 1L 3.18 / (2017) 3.22 / peer/aspirational 3.20

UGA 2L 3.21 / (2018) UGA 2L 3.11 / (2017) 2.96 / peer/aspirational 3.19
UGA 3L 3.26 / (2018) UGA 3L 3.09 / (2017) 3.06 / peer/aspirational 3.22

Improvement Based on Analysis

There was no significant difference with peer and aspirational schools when students were asked how they felt law school contributed to their development in writing clearly and effectively. However, the trends in the data were encouraging compared to prior years. UGA Law has recently revised Legal Writing in our 1L curriculum as well as adding a mandatory document drafting course in the 2L year which impacted the surveyed 2L and 3L students. All students must successfully complete both the 2L Writing Requirement and the Capstone Writing Requirement. The revisions seem to have had a positive impact as the means for UGA have continued to increase for the 2L and 3L students. We will continue to monitor the data in this area.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2019. The student response rate was 53%. Responding students were surveyed regarding the extent to which their legal education has contributed to their competency in speaking clearly and effectively.

Analysis of Data

The responding students perceived UGA Law as contributing to their competency in speaking clearly and effectively. Surveyed students responded using a scale of: 1 = never; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often; and 4 = very often. The reported data shows the mean of these responses. The means were compared to peer/aspirational law schools, the 2016-2017 UGA Law data, and the 2017-2018 UGA Law data. There was no statistical significance in the mean difference in any class year between UGA Law and peer/aspirational schools.
UGA 1L 2.82 / (2018) UGA 1L 3.03/(2017)2.92/ (2016)UGA 1L 3.06/Peer/Aspirational 2.70
UGA 2L 2.88 / (2018) UGA 2L 2.90/(2017) 2.92/(2016) UGA 2L 2.89/Peer/Aspirational 2.91
UGA 3L 2.83 / (2018) UGA 3L 2.86/(2017) 2.79/(2016) UGA 3L 2.98/Peer/Aspirational 2.98

Improvement Based on Analysis

Graduates are expected to speak effectively and efficiently to individuals and group in an articulate and professional manner. This year while the LSSSE data showed a higher 1L mean for UGA Law than peer and aspirational schools, the difference was not statistically significant. We will continue to monitor data in this area.

Measure UL Capstone Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of upper level students will exhibit proficiency in the ability to communicate effectively in writing. Since this was the first time the rubric has been applied to a capstone course, we chose a smaller random sample to test the rubric and collect feedback.

Data Collected

Random student work was selected from 10 of our Spring capstone writing courses.

Analysis of Data

Sampled student work was assessed for professional style, research, creative analytical thinking, and responsiveness to faculty input at both the development and revision stages of the paper. 100% of the students met the proficient level for professional style; 87% showed proficiency for research; 87% showed proficiency for creative analytical thinking; 94% showed proficiency in responsiveness to faculty input in the development stage; and 93% showed proficiency in responsiveness to faculty input in the revision stage.

Improvement Based on Analysis

The Capstone Writing Requirement requires each student, prior to graduation, to complete an analytical writing project of at least 20 double-spaced pages. The project, which may consist of a single writing or a series of shorter writings on related topics, must meet the following criteria: 1) be written in a professional style; 2) require that the student engage in research and creative analytical thinking; and 3) be developed and revised based on faculty input and comments. Our students are meeting this skill through the satisfactory completion of the analytical writing project.

Measure 1L Legal Writing Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of 1L students to exhibit proficiency in efficient legal writing.

Data Collected

A random sample of student work was reviewed from each of the 1L Legal Writing sections.

Analysis of Data

Sampled student work was assessed for rule synthesis, rule application, appropriate research, correct use of authority, thesis development, organization, professional style, appropriate tone, and technical compliance. 98% of the students met the proficient level for rule synthesis; 88% for rule application; 88% for appropriate research; 95% for correct use of authority; 100% for thesis development; 95% for organization, 95% for professional style; 97% for appropriate tone; and 93% for technical compliance.

Improvement Based on Analysis

The sampled work met our 80% threshold for proficiency in all 9 areas. The restructured legal writing courses appear to be successful in teaching the 1L students these skills.

Outcome C1.1.1 Professionalism: Ethics

Graduates will understand a lawyer's professional, ethical, and legal duties to clients, courts, opposing parties, the legal system, and society. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome by applying professional disciplinary rules, common law rules, and constitutional rules that govern lawyers, and showing an appreciation of the historical and contemporary role of lawyers as agents for maintaining the rule of law, promoting fairness, and meeting the legal needs of the indigent.

Measure Course Completion Rate

The completion rate of The Law and Ethics of Lawyering course. Successful completion of this course prior to graduation is an ABA accreditation requirement and is essential to our students' success and our program of legal education.

Threshold for success (if available)

All law students successfully completing JURI 4300, The Law and Ethics of Lawyering.

Data Collected

The final grades for all sections of JURI 4300 in Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 were reviewed.

Analysis of Data

All students earned a passing grade of C or better.

Improvement Based on Analysis

The reported grades are indicative of all students gaining an understanding of the course material. This will be the second year we also use a Legal Ethics Rubric as an additional means to evaluate this skill.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2019. The student response rate was 53%. Responding students were surveyed regarding their perceived gain in professional values and ethics.

Analysis of Data

59% of the responding 3L students indicated a perceived gain with respect to development of a personal code of values and ethics. The entire student body was asked how much they felt the law school environment contributed to the development of a personal code of values and ethics. Surveyed students responded using a scale of: 1 = never; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often; and 4 = very often. The reported data shows the mean of these responses. These means were compared to our peer/aspirational schools:
1L UGA 2.67 / peer/aspirational 2.65
2L UGA 2.70 / peer/aspirational 2.64
3L UGA 2.76 / peer/aspirational 2.64
The 1L and 3L means were up from last year's data:
1L 2018 UGA 2.62 / 1L 2017 UGA 2.70
2L 2018 UGA 2.76 / 2L 2017 UGA 2.64
3L 2018 UGA 2.73 / 3L 2017 UGA 2.54

Students were also asked to what extent their law school encouraged the ethical practice of law. These means were compared to our peer/aspirational schools:
1L UGA 3.19 / peer/aspirational 3.22
2L UGA 3.11 / peer/aspirational 3.17
3L UGA 3.28 / peer/aspirational 3.19
The results were lower than last year (2018):
1L 2018 UGA 3.30 / 1L 2017 UGA 3.22
2L 2018 UGA 3.36 / 2L 2017 UGA 3.18
3L 2018 UGA 3.31 / 3L 2017 UGA 3.21

Improvement Based on Analysis

Last year, data indicated 57% of students who participated in this survey perceived a gain regarding the personal development of values and ethics. The perceived gain from responding students is slightly higher again this year at 59%. Changes implemented in our orientation and mentoring programs may have helped contribute to development in this area.

Measure Legal Ethics Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of upper level students will exhibit proficiency in legal ethics and professionalism.

Data Collected

A random sample of student work will be drawn from a rotating selection of either the Law and Ethics for Lawyering course or the Ethics in Practice Rubric applied to our clinics/externships /practicums for analysis. For this cycle, random student work was selected from the Law and Ethics of Lawyering sections taught in Fall 2018 and Spring 2019.

Analysis of Data

Student work was randomly selected from the Fall and Spring sections of the Law and Ethics of Lawyering course. Their final exams were evaluated for proficiency in issue spotting; analysis; use of counterarguments; and arguing by analogy using the Legal Ethics Reasoning Rubric. In the area of issue spotting, 5% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 95% were proficient; and none were below proficient. For analysis, 5% were found to be beyond proficient, 91% proficient, and 4% below proficient. 95% of the students were proficient in the use of counterarguments, 2% beyond proficient, and only 3% were found to be below proficient. In the skill of arguing by analogy, only 75% met or exceeded the proficient mark and 25% were found to be below proficient.

Improvement Based on Analysis

This is the second time the Legal Ethics Reasoning Rubric has been applied. Like last year, it appears our students are excelling in the areas of issue spotting, analysis, and the use of counterarguments. The data for arguing by analogy once again does not meet our 80% threshold. We will ask our Ethics faculty to determine whether they actually test for this skill in this particular course. It could be that this particular skill is less relevant to Legal Ethics than other doctrinal courses.

Measure MPRE scores

Threshold for success (if available)

All graduates planning to sit for a bar exam will successfully pass the MPRE exam.

Data Collected

The number of applicants submitting a passing MPRE score of 75 or above who applied to take the Georgia Bar.

Analysis of Data

2018 (Feb and July combined): 188 UGA graduates applied to take the GA bar exam and 184 submitted an MPRE score of 75 or better.
February 2019: 39 applied and 37 submitted an MPRE score of 75 or higher.
July 2019: 169 applied and 164 submitted an MPRE score of 75 or higher.

Improvement Based on Analysis

The purpose of the MPRE is to measure examinees' knowledge and understanding of established standards related to the professional conduct of lawyers. MPRE scores are sent directly to the students, but we are now able to gather some of this data from the Georgia Bar. We will continue to gather this data to get a sense of how our graduates are doing on this professional licensing exam.

Outcome D1.1.2 Professionalism: Collaboration
Graduates will demonstrate competence in the core skills of professional lawyering on behalf of clients through collaboration with colleagues on assigned projects

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2019. The student response rate was 53%. Responding students self-reported on collaboration with peers and working on a legal research project outside of class with a faculty member.

Analysis of Data

Only 53.8% of our 3L students chose a 6 or 7 when rating the quality of relationships with other students on a 7 point scale. While our average rating on this measure exceeded that of peer and aspirational schools, it is still disappointing compared to 2016, when 71.6% of our 3Ls chose a 6 or 7 on this question. There was evidence of positive development in peer relationships among our 1L class. 62% of our 1Ls chose a 6 or 7 to rate peer relationships in 2019, up from 54.3% the prior year. Our students reported less frequent work with other students on projects during class and on collaboration outside of class to prepare class assignments. The differences were statistically significant with respect to 3Ls and with respect to collaboration outside class among 1Ls. In 2017, 51.20% of responding 3Ls reported either working on or planning to work on a legal research project outside of class with a faculty member, which was one of UGA's highest performing items as compared to our peer/aspirational group. Last year, only 37% of 3L's reported either working on or planning to work on a legal research project with a faculty member. This year, 53.2% of 3Ls reported research collaboration with faculty.

Improvement Based on Analysis

In 2016, UGA's faculty excelled in collaborative projects with law students as compared to peer and aspirational schools. These are great learning opportunities for our students. Last year, the number significantly dropped to 37%. This year, the percentage is 53.2%, which might indicate last year's data was an outlier. We will continue to monitor this next year. This year, we will discuss with the faculty the data on collaboration among students and discuss whether we should offer more opportunities for this sort of educational experience.

Outcome D1.1.1 Professionalism: Client Needs

Graduates will demonstrate competence in the core skills of professional lawyering on behalf of clients by Identifying and effectively engaging with the complexity of client needs, through clinical work, simulation courses, or other practical skills courses.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for a majority of student responses to be positive.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2019. The student response rate was 53%. Responding students were surveyed regarding advanced preparation skills development such as pro bono work, field placements, and/or clinic participation.

Analysis of Data

Of the students participating in LSSSE, 84.8% of responding 3L students and 84.7% of responding 2L's indicated they had participated or planned to participate in some form of field placement or law clinic; 63.3% of responding 3L's and 63.1% of responding 2L's had participated or planned to participate in pro bono work or public service. Such experiential opportunities assist students in preparing for law related careers.

Improvement Based on Analysis

It is impressive that 84.8% of the third year students participated in a field placement or law school clinic. This year, these percentages ranked as some of UGA Law's highest performing metrics relative to our peer and aspirational schools. Once again, the percentage of 2L and 3L students engaging in pro bono work or public service has declined. We will continue to monitor this data for next year.

Additional Narrative (if applicable) New Assessment Plan for JD program

The law school is in the third year of its new assessment plan and learning outcomes guided by new assessment standards from ABA accreditation. At this time, we continue to discuss the inclusion of new measures, such as graduates passing the MPRE exam.

Files:

JD 2018-2019 rubric data

Feedback

Files:

LOA Feedback Rubric_Law â€" JD

Program Name: Law - JD

Reporting Cycle: Oct 1, 2019 to Sep 30, 2020

Academic Program Coordinator Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Randy Beck

Description of Program UGA School of Law JD program

The fundamental academic mission of the Law School is to educate and prepare law students for successful and meaningful careers within the legal profession or in positions where legal training provides an advantage. Because of the complexity of the law and the concomitant breadth of potential career paths, there is no single model for adequately preparing our students. Some students will become prosecutors, others commercial litigators, and still others transactional or international attorneys, just to name a few possibilities. A segment of our student body (4-6%) will seek jobs in which a law degree provides an advantage, but that do not require professional licensing. The particular skills required to excel in a given specialty will necessarily vary as will the mode of teaching, the outcomes desired, and the method of assessment. Accordingly, this assessment plan is built around the assessment requirements of the American Bar Association, which is the law school's outside accreditor. The ABA requires assessment of law students' knowledge, skills and professionalism. This plan uses direct and indirect measures to assess these outcomes, including rubrics, course completion and progression rates, professional licensing exams, and student self assessments.

Outcome A1.1.1 Substantive and Procedural Law 1L
Graduates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of substantive and procedural materials studied in the required first year curriculum. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome through self-assessments, successful completion of the 1L program, and successful retention of knowledge evidenced by Bar passage.

Measure LSSSE

Law School Survey of Student Engagement regarding student learning experiences.

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer and aspirational institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2020 in the midst of the transition to online instruction. The student response rate was 43.6%, less than our 50% goal, but acceptable given that the survey was conducted during a pandemic. Responding students were surveyed regarding 1) how much their course work emphasized analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth; 2) how much their coursework emphasized making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions; and 3) to what extent their experience at law school contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills.

Analysis of Data

In 2020, when asked how much of their course work emphasized analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth, 92.4% of responding 1Ls reported favorably. Our peer and aspirational schools' rate for responding 1Ls was 92%. 82.5% of our responding 1Ls perceived their course work as emphasizing making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others interpreted data and assessing the soundness of conclusions. Our peer and aspirational group for responding 1Ls was 77.5%. In regard to the extent to which law school had contributed to acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills, 68.6% of our responding 1L students indicated "quite a bit" or "very much". Among our peer and aspirational schools, the comparable figure for that cohort was 66.9% of those responding.

Improvement Based on Analysis

This measure shows our 1Ls self-assessment of their coursework in regard to this learning outcome is very positive and exceeds the self-assessment of students at our peer and aspirational institutions. Our percentages remained fairly stable with one noticeable decrease in students' perception of gaining work-related skills during their first year. One area where we continue to receive low marks relative to peer and aspirational schools concerned 1L responses to the question whether they received prompt feedback (written or oral) from faculty on their academic performance. We will discuss methods of formative assessment with faculty and the value of incorporating more formative assessment in our 1L courses.

Measure Bar Passage

Overall Bar Passage rate for the July and February bar examination.

Threshold for success (if available)

Meeting or exceeding the American Bar Association requirement that at least 75 percent of a law school's graduates in a calendar year who sat for a bar examination must have passed a bar examination administered within two years of their date of graduation.

Data Collected

Overall bar passage rate for calendar years 2017 and 2018 graduates who ultimately passed a bar exam within 2 years post-graduation and for calendar year 2019 graduates who were first time bar takers. Data were retrieved from 18 state bars for the class of 2019.

Ultimate Bar Passage

	A	B			C			D	E	
Calendar Year of graduation	Number of graduates in calendar year	Graduates who sat for a bar examination within one year of their date of graduation.			Graduates who sat for a bar examination within two years of their date of graduation.			Number with no information	Number who did not take a bar examination	
		# of takers	# who passed	% that passed	# of takers	# who passed	% that passed		within one years of graduation	within two years of graduation
2017	182	-	-	-	177	169	95.48%	0	-	5
2018	193	186	171	91.94%	-	-	-	0	7	-

First Time Bar Passage

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Calendar Year	Total Graduates in Calendar Year*	# from Calendar Year NOT taking Bar Exam	# from Previous Years Taking Bar for First Time in Calendar Year	Number of Early Takers	# from Calendar Year with no information	Total First Time Takers in any jurisdiction	Total who passed the bar in any jurisdiction	Law School weighted average pass rate	ABA first time weighted average pass rate	Difference In Weighted Average
2019	185	11	8	0	0	182	168	92.31%	77.79%	14.52%

Analysis of Data

UGA Law graduates for the calendar year 2017 had an ultimate bar passage rate of 95.48%. This is the ABA bar passage outcome measurement that captures all graduates that took a bar exam within two years of graduation. 92.31% of graduates in calendar year 2019 passed their first attempted bar exam, representing data from 18 bar administering jurisdictions.

Improvement Based on Analysis

The Law School's bar passage rate is excellent objectively, and also in relation to other Georgia law schools. We have examined numerous variables to identify correlations that could assist in designing an effective bar study program. These statistics demonstrate a correlation between bar passage and GPA, LSAT performance, and completion rate of bar prep study material. A review of the data from the past three years indicated a student has an "at-risk indicator" for failing the bar if they had a first-year GPA less than 2.57, final GPA less than 2.94, and/or average LSAT less than 152. Most students who failed the exam had more than one at-risk indicator, and students with all three at-risk indicators failed the exam at a significantly higher rate.

The law school is in the midst of a multi-year effort to improve bar passage rates. For three years, the law school has operated the BEST accountability program, which enlists students to work in pairs to promote completion of bar preparation studies. Last year, we established a pilot project to award bar preparation stipends, through which the law school paid for a student's bar preparation course. The awards generally prioritized applicants with known bar exam risk factors. A legal writing instructor worked with a number of stipend recipients to prepare for the essay portion of the bar exam and other efforts were taken to encourage completion of bar preparation studies.

Convinced that the bar stipend program contributed to improvement in the law school's already high bar passage rate, we expanded the program this year to award 30 bar stipends, 23 to JD graduates and 7 to LLM graduates. A legal writing instructor again worked with approximately 10 students to provide individualized writing assistance. We also had 104 graduates this summer participate in the BEST accountability program.

Measure Course Completion

Successful Course completion rate for first year law courses.

Threshold for success (if available)

1L students successfully completing first year courses with 1.90 GPA or higher, enabling them to continue to the upper level curriculum.

Data Collected

The 1L student GPAs were reviewed at the end of Spring 2020.

Analysis of Data

Out of 194 students completing their first year in law school, only one of the students had a cumulative GPA below 1.90.

Improvement Based on Analysis

All but one of the 194 students in the 1L class were able to proceed to their 2L year. We will continue our tutoring program for the at-risk students to prevent our academic attrition rate from increasing. Additionally, at-risk students whose GPA is significantly below our threshold are counseled at the end of the Fall semester to determine if they should continue their legal studies.

Outcome A2.2.1 Substantive and Procedural Law UL

Graduates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of substantive and procedural law beyond that required in the first year curriculum. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome through self-assessments, successful completion of the UL coursework, and demonstrating knowledge meeting ABA and Georgia standards for professional licensing.

Measure LSSSE

Data from LSSSE regarding student learning experiences.

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2020 in the midst of the transition to online instruction. The student response rate was 43.6%, less than our 50% goal, but acceptable given that the survey was conducted during a pandemic. Responding students were surveyed regarding 1) how much their course work emphasized analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth, and 2) whether their schooling helped them acquire a broad legal education.

Analysis of Data

In 2020, when asked how much course work emphasized analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth, 95% of surveyed 2Ls and 92.7% of surveyed 3Ls responded favorably. Our peer and aspirational schools' responses were: 86.7% of responding 2Ls and 83.8% of responding 3Ls.
On the question of whether law school helped students acquire a broad legal education, surveyed students responded using a scale of: 1 = never; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often; and 4 = very often. The reported data shows the mean of these responses. A comparison of these means showed the UGA Law means were equal to or slightly higher than those of our peer and aspirational schools. Our results for 2020 were slightly higher than for 2019, but not by a significant margin.
2L 2020 UGA 3.44 / 2019 UGA 2L 3.33/ 2020 Peer and Aspirational 3.28
3L 2020 UGA 3.54 / 2019 UGA 3L 3.46/ 2020 Peer and Aspirational 3.32

Improvement Based on Analysis

The Law School continues to excel at helping students meet this learning outcome. Understanding of substantive and procedural law beyond that required in the first year curriculum is critical to passage of the bar exam and to success in practice. When asked about their educational experience, students indicated the coursework at UGA Law emphasized in-depth analysis and that UGA Law helped our students acquire the type of broad legal education promoted in the upper level curriculum.

Measure Bar Passage

Threshold for success (if available)

Meeting the ABA requirement that among students who graduated from the law school within the five most recently completed calendar years: (i) 75 percent or more of those graduates who sat for the bar passed a bar examination; or (ii) in at least three of these calendar years, 75 percent of the students graduating in those years and sitting for the bar have passed a bar examination.

Data Collected

Overall bar passage rate for calendar years 2017 and 2019 graduates who ultimately passed a bar exam within 2 years post-graduation and for calendar year 2019 graduates who were first time bar takers. Data were retrieved from 18 state bars for the class of 2019.
Ultimate Bar Passage

	A	B			C			D	E	
Calendar Year of graduation	Number of graduates in calendar year	Graduates who sat for a bar examination within one year of their date of graduation.			Graduates who sat for a bar examination within two years of their date of graduation.			Number with no information	Number who did not take a bar examination	
		# of takers	# who passed	% that passed	# of takers	# who passed	% that passed		within one years of graduation	within two years of graduation
2017	182	-	-	-	177	169	95.48%	0	-	5
2018	193	186	171	91.94%	-	-	-	0	7	-

First Time Bar Passage

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Calendar Year	Total Graduates in Calendar Year*	# from Calendar Year NOT taking Bar Exam	# from Previous Years Taking Bar for First Time in Calendar Year	Number of Early Takers	# from Calendar Year with no information	Total First Time Takers in any jurisdiction	Total who passed the bar in any jurisdiction	Law School weighted average pass rate	ABA first time weighted average pass rate	Difference In Weighted Average
2019	185	11	8	0	0	182	168	92.31%	77.79%	14.52%

Analysis of Data

UGA Law graduates for the calendar year 2017 had an ultimate bar passage rate of 95.48%. This is the ABA bar passage outcome measurement that captures all graduates that took a bar exam within two years of graduation. 92.31% of graduates in calendar year 2019 passed their first attempted bar exam, representing data from 18 bar administering jurisdictions.

Improvement Based on Analysis

The Law School's bar passage rate is excellent objectively, and also in relation to other Georgia law schools. We have examined numerous variables to identify correlations that could assist in designing an effective bar study program. These statistics demonstrate a correlation between bar passage and GPA, LSAT performance, and completion rate of bar prep study material. A review of the data from the past three years indicated a student has an "at-risk indicator" for failing the bar if they had a first-year GPA less than 2.57, final GPA less than 2.94, and/or average LSAT less than 152. Most students who failed the exam had more than one at-risk indicator, and students with all three at-risk indicators failed the exam at a significantly higher rate.

The law school is in the midst of a multi-year effort to improve bar passage rates. For three years, the law school has operated the BEST accountability program, which enlists students to work in pairs to promote completion of bar preparation studies. Last year, we established a pilot project to award bar preparation stipends, through which the law school paid for a student's bar preparation course. The awards generally prioritized applicants with known bar exam risk factors. A legal writing instructor worked with a number of stipend recipients to prepare for the essay portion of the bar exam and other efforts were taken to encourage completion of bar preparation studies.

Convinced that the bar stipend program contributed to improvement in the law school's already high bar passage rate, we expanded the program this year to award 30 bar stipends, 23 to JD graduates and 7 to LLM graduates. A legal writing instructor again worked with approximately 10 students to provide individualized writing assistance. We also had 104 graduates this summer participate in the BEST accountability program.

Measure Successful Course Completion Rates

Threshold for success (if available)

2L and 3L students passing upper level courses with 2.0 GPA or higher.

Data Collected

Review of GPAs for 2L and 3L students.

Analysis of Data

Cumulative GPAs for 2L and 3L students were reviewed at the end of Spring 2020. In the 2L class of 204, all students maintained a GPA above 2.0. In the 3L class of 190, all students maintained a GPA above 2.0.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Our course completion rate is excellent, and all of our upper level students maintained GPAs satisfying our academic standards. We continue to enhance our mentoring process to further help the very few students who experience difficulty or do not succeed in individual courses. The law school has increased the number of graduate assistantships awarded to incoming students. Some of these students will be tasked with teaching assistant or academic support roles beneficial to other students.

Measure Graduation Audit

Threshold for success (if available)

Number of 3L students on track to graduate after their last semester of law school.

Data Collected

Individual degree audits were conducted for all 3L students in October 2019 to ensure they were on track to meet degree requirements by May 2020.

Analysis of Data

Student transcripts were individually assessed by the law school registrar's office to ensure students had met or would be capable of meeting degree requirements by May. All 3L students were on track to graduate as of October 2019.

Improvement Based on Analysis

While the Law School enjoys an extraordinarily high graduation rate, the process will now be more efficient for the students through the use of DegreeWorks. This program will allow students to track their progress from their first semester and eliminate human error. Additionally, the registrar's office will continue to conduct degree audits for 3L students during the Fall semester of their 3L year. While we had three 3Ls who did not graduate, they were on track in October. They did not graduate due to personal circumstances, and they are currently working to complete their coursework.

Outcome B1.1.1 Skills: Issue Spotting
Graduates will demonstrate competency in analytical and reasoning skills, spotting legal issues in factual scenarios and identifying potentially applicable legal doctrines

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2020 in the midst of the transition to online instruction. The student response rate was 43.6%, less than our 50% goal, but acceptable given that the survey was conducted during a pandemic. Responding students were surveyed regarding how much their course work emphasized applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations.

Analysis of Data

When asked how UGA Law has helped them apply theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations, students responded using a scale of 1 = very little to 4 = very much. All classes at UGA Law had a mean higher than our peer and aspirational schools with the 2L mean being significantly higher.
1L 2020 UGA 3.50 (1L 2019 UGA 3.55) / 2020 peer and aspirational 3.41
2L 2020 UGA 3.54 (2L 2019 UGA 3.48) / 2020 peer and aspirational 3.24
3L 2020 UGA 3.44 (3L 2019 UGA 3.21) / 2020 peer and aspirational 3.23

Improvement Based on Analysis

Spotting legal issues in factual scenarios and identifying potentially applicable legal doctrines is important in legal practice. Student survey responses in this area were higher than peer and

aspirational schools for all classes. Additionally, our means were higher this year as compared to the 2Ls and 3Ls in 2019. This data suggests that our new first year curriculum is successfully developing this essential skill in the 1L year.

Measure 1L Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For no less than 80 percent of sampled 1L students to exhibit proficiency in issue spotting; analysis; the use of counterarguments; and ability to argue by analogy.

Data Collected

A random sample of student work is drawn from a rotating selection of 1L doctrinal courses for analysis. Samples this reporting cycle were drawn from all sections of 1L Civil Procedure (Fall 2019) and 1L Constitutional Law I (Spring 2020).

Analysis of Data

In the 2019-2020 assessment cycle, the randomly sampled final exams were evaluated for proficiency in Issue Spotting using the Legal Reasoning Rubric in the 1L Civil Procedure and Constitutional Law I courses. 24% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 59% were proficient; and only 16% were below proficient.
In the 2018-2019 assessment cycle, the randomly sampled final exams were evaluated for proficiency in Issue Spotting using the Legal Reasoning Rubric in the 1L Torts and Property courses. 20% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 70% were proficient; and only 10% were below proficient. During the 2017-2018 assessment cycle, the final exams were evaluated for proficiency in Issue Spotting using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. When the data is aggregated for the entire academic year, 89% of the 1Ls were found to meet or exceed the level of proficiency with only 11% below proficient for the skill of issue spotting.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Current 1L students are doing well in mastering the skill of issue spotting. While we have been meeting our 80% threshold of proficient or beyond in Issue Spotting, the percentage of students satisfying the proficiency standard was slightly lower than last year. The decrease could be attributable to COVID-19 and the pivot to online learning during the Spring semester.

Measure Upper Level Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For at least 80 percent of upper level students to exhibit proficiency in issue spotting; analysis; the use of counterarguments; and ability to argue by analogy.

Data Collected

A rotating selection of upper level doctrinal courses are used for analysis. For this cycle, a random sample of student work was selected from the upper level Fall and Spring sections of Corporations and Criminal Procedure I.

Analysis of Data

Upper level students were randomly selected from Corporations and Criminal Procedure I. Their final exams were evaluated for proficiency in Issue Spotting using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 97% were either proficient or beyond proficient; and 3% were below proficient.
The data is comparable to last year's findings.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Current upper level students are excelling with this skill. Only 3% of the sample was found to be below proficient in Issue Spotting. Moreover, the analysis of 1L and upper level students continue to show increased proficiency between the first year and subsequent years.

Outcome B 3.3.1 Skills: Efficient Legal Research

Graduates will demonstrate achievement of conducting efficient and effective legal research through the selection of appropriate legal research tools, including cost-effective legal technology tools, to locate relevant primary and secondary authority and the ability to distinguish and correctly use different sources of

legal authority available in the American legal system, including state and federal law, constitutional, and common and statutory law.

Measure 1L Rubric

1L Research Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For at least 80 percent of 1L students to exhibit proficiency in efficient legal research.

Data Collected

A random sample of student work was reviewed from each of the 1L Legal Research sections.

Analysis of Data

1L students were evaluated on three areas of research: ability to select appropriate resources; ability to locate primary and secondary sources; and ability to analyze, interpret, and judge legal authority. In selecting appropriate resources, 91% scored at or above the proficient level. In the ability to locate primary and secondary sources, 86% scored at or above proficient. Regarding the ability to analyze, interpret, and judge legal authority, 89% met the proficient or beyond proficient level.

Improvement Based on Analysis

As in the past assessment cycle, our students have continued to excel in legal research. Our 1L Legal Research course was revised 2 years ago to only be taught in the Fall semester, rather than over an entire academic year, and it appears this course revision has been successful.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2020 in the midst of the transition to online instruction. The student response rate was 43.6%, less than our 50% goal, but acceptable given that the survey was conducted during a pandemic. Responding students were surveyed regarding the extent to which their legal education has contributed to the development of legal research skills.

Analysis of Data

We compared our 2020 means on this question with peer/aspirational schools and UGA's 2019, 2018, and 2017 means. Students responded using a scale of 1 = very little to 4 = very much. In the area of legal research skills, UGA's students scored higher this year than in the past three years. Only the 1L class scored lower than our peer/aspirational schools.
1L UGA 3.26 / (2019) 3.23 / (2018) 1L UGA 3.19 / (2017) UGA 1L 3.19/ Peer/Aspirational 3.33
2L UGA 3.29 / (2019) 3.09 / (2018) 2L UGA 3.07 / (2017) UGA 2L 3.00/ Peer/Aspirational 3.19
3L UGA 3.20 / (2019) 3.12 / (2018) 3L UGA 3.19 / (2017) UGA 3L 3.06/ Peer/Aspirational 3.16
We also participate in the LSSSE "library module" which focuses on library resources and services. Our 1L students reported significantly higher results than other schools answering the library-focused survey on gaining an awareness of the cost of research (3.06 v. 2.89), developing the ability to select appropriate sources for obtaining required information (3.29 v. 3.12), and developing the ability to design and implement efficient, cost-effective search strategies (2.88 v. 2.67).

Improvement Based on Analysis

Graduates of UGA Law have the capacity to conduct efficient and effective legal research through utilization of computer and information technology. LSSSE data showed all students were reporting competency in this skill higher than last year's report. Only the 1L class gave answers lower than peer and aspirational schools.
These data help us to evaluate curricular changes made in the 2017-2018 academic year, including separate writing and research courses in the first year curriculum and the addition of a 2L drafting

course requirement. Reviewing responses from 2017 to 2020, the data indicates an improvement in legal research skills among 1Ls, 2Ls, and 3Ls, suggesting that our curriculum changes have been successful. We will continue to follow this learning outcome and see if there is additional improvement next year. The legal research and legal writing instructors have had meetings to discuss greater coordination between the legal research and legal writing classes.

Outcome B1.1.2 Skills: Analysis

Graduates will demonstrate competency in analytical and reasoning skills. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome by critically reading and analyzing applicable case law and enacted law, including identifying key facts, rules, and reasoning within each authority, and synthesizing relevant rules of law into a logical and accurate framework for analysis.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2020 in the midst of the transition to online instruction. The student response rate was 43.6%, less than our 50% goal, but acceptable given that the survey was conducted during a pandemic. Responding students were surveyed regarding the extent to which law school has taught them to think critically and analytically.

Analysis of Data

The means for UGA Law students were compared with peer/aspirational schools regarding the extent to which their law school experience contributed to their ability to think critically and analytically. While the 1L and 2L means were lower than last year, UGA Law means continued to be higher than our peer/aspirational schools, and the differences were statistically significant for the 1Ls and 3Ls.
1L UGA 3.62 / (2019) 3.72 / Peer/Aspirational 3.42
2L UGA 3.49 / (2019) 3.61 / Peer/Aspirational 3.38
3L UGA 3.61 / (2019) 3.55 / Peer/Aspirational 3.32

Improvement Based on Analysis

UGA's mean scores are higher than peer and aspirational schools, and significantly so for the 1L and 3L classes. Development of critical and analytical thinking appears to be an area where our program excels compared to other schools.

Measure 1L Rubric

1L Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For at least 80 percent of 1L students to exhibit proficiency in legal analysis.

Data Collected

A random sample will be drawn of student work product from a rotating selection of 1L doctrinal courses. For this cycle, student work product was selected from all 1L sections of Civil Procedure and Constitutional Law I.

Analysis of Data

This year, students were randomly selected from all 1L sections of Civil Procedure and Constitutional Law I, and their final exams were evaluated for proficiency in analysis using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 81% of the students were found to be proficient or beyond proficient; and 19% were below proficient. This is less than last year's assessment where 89% of the students were found to be proficient or beyond proficient in this area and 11% were below proficient.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Current 1L students are doing well in mastering this skill and are met our benchmark goal of 80% proficiency in the 1L class. While 19% of the sample was found to be below proficient in analysis, higher than the 11% figure in the last assessment cycle, this could be attributable to the need to pivot to online teaching due to COVID-19.

Measure UL Rubric

Upper Level Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of upper level students will exhibit proficiency in legal analysis.

Data Collected

A sample will be drawn of student work product from a rotating selection of upper level doctrinal courses. For this cycle, random samples were selected from the Fall and Spring upper level sections of Corporations and Criminal Procedure I.

Analysis of Data

Student final exams were evaluated for proficiency in analysis using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. The data for this assessment cycle shows increases in the percentage crossing the proficiency threshold, with 13% of the students scoring above proficient; 76% of the students proficient; and 8% of the students below proficient. The number of students at or above the level of proficiency was comparable to last year where 10% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 85% were proficient; and 5% were below proficient.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Our revised curriculum appears to have increased the percentage of the student body achieving proficiency on this skill though fewer were rated "beyond proficient" this year. After review of the data, student performance increased from 75% in 2016-2017 to 82% 2017-2018 of the sample meeting or exceeding the proficient level. For the 2018-2019 cycle the level of proficiency or beyond was 92%. During this cycle, 89% either met or exceeded the proficient level.

Outcome B1.1.3 Skills: Use of Counterarguments

Graduates will demonstrate competency in analytical and reasoning skills. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome through application of the applicable rules to the legally significant facts, including weighing the relative merits of any potential counterarguments to determine the likely outcome of the case.

Measure UL Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of upper level students will exhibit proficiency in the use of counterarguments.

Data Collected

A sample will be drawn of student work product from a rotating selection of upper level doctrinal courses. For this cycle, random samples were selected from the Fall and Spring upper level sections of Corporations and Criminal Procedure I.

Analysis of Data

Students were randomly selected from upper level sections of Corporations and Criminal Procedure I. The random sample of final exams was evaluated for proficiency in the use of counterarguments using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 11% of the students were found to be beyond proficient; 47% were proficient; and 42% were below proficient. This is compared to last year's findings in which 8% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 79% were proficient; and 13% were below proficient.

Improvement Based on Analysis

In the 2017-2018 cycle, we did not meet or exceed our 80% threshold as 77% were found to be proficient or beyond proficient in the use of counterarguments. In the 2018-2019 cycle, we exceeded

our threshold with 87% of the sample meeting or exceeding the proficient level. This year, only 58% of the sample either met or exceeding the proficient level with 42% scoring below proficient. We will discuss with the faculty to see if the use of counterarguments is highlighted in these courses.

Measure 1L Rubric

1L Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For at least 80 percent of 1L students to exhibit proficiency in the use of counterarguments.

Data Collected

A random sample will be drawn of student work product from a rotating selection of 1L doctrinal courses for analysis. For this reporting cycle, student work was selected from all 1L sections of Civil Procedure and Constitutional Law I.

Analysis of Data

Students were randomly selected from all 1L sections of Civil Procedure and Constitutional Law I. Their final exams were reviewed for proficiency in the use of counter arguments using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 22% were found to be beyond proficient, 58% were proficient, and 20% were below proficient.
In the 2016-2017 assessment 17% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 60% were proficient; and 24% were below proficient. Assessment of the 2017-2018 random sample found 8% to be beyond proficient; 68% proficient; and 24% below proficient. Assessment of the 2018-2019 random sample found 19% to be beyond proficient; 71% proficient; and 10% below proficient.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Last year, there was a positive increase as 90% of the students were found to be proficient or beyond proficient at using counterarguments. This year, 80% met the proficient or beyond level in this skill. Since the lower number might be a result of the pivot to online learning due to COVID-19, we will monitor this data next year.

Outcome B1.1.4 Skills: Arguing by Analogy

Graduates will demonstrate competency in analytical and reasoning skills. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome through, when appropriate, articulating meaningful analogies and distinctions between the precedent cases and the factual scenario presented.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2020 in the midst of the transition to online instruction. The student response rate was 43.6%, less than our 50% goal, but acceptable given that the survey was conducted during a pandemic. Responding students were surveyed regarding how much the course work has emphasized synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships.

Analysis of Data

Students were asked to rate how much their coursework emphasized synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships, on a scale from 1 (very little) to 4 (very much). Our mean scores were higher than at peer and aspirational schools, and the differences were statistically significant in the 2L and 3L classes.
1L UGA 3.52 / peer/aspirational 3.39
2L UGA 3.49 / peer/aspirational 3.17
3L UGA 3.41 / peer/aspirational 3.11

Improvement Based on Analysis

The student self-assessment indicates UGA Law continues to perform well in this area compared to other law schools.

Measure 1L Rubric

1L Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

For at least 80 percent of 1L students to exhibit proficiency in the ability to argue by analogy.

Data Collected

A random sample of student work product will be drawn from a rotating selection of 1L doctrinal courses for analysis. Student work was selected from all 1L sections of Civil Procedure and Constitutional Law I.

Analysis of Data

This year, final exams from all 1L sections of Civil Procedure and Constitutional Law I were evaluated for proficiency in arguing by analogy using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 28% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 56% were proficient; and 16% were below proficient.
Last year, final exams from all 1L sections of Torts and Property were evaluated for proficiency in arguing by analogy using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 8% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 80% were proficient; and 12% were below proficient.

Improvement Based on Analysis

Last year was the first time we met our 80% threshold with 88% of students found to be proficient or beyond proficient at arguing by analogy. This year, we continue to meet the 80% threshold.

Measure UL Rubric

Upper Level Legal Reasoning Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of upper level students will exhibit proficiency in the ability to argue by analogy.

Data Collected

A sample will be drawn of student work product from a rotating selection of upper level doctrinal courses. For this cycle, random samples were selected from the Fall and Spring upper level sections of Corporations and Criminal Procedure I.

Analysis of Data

Student work was randomly selected from Corporations and Criminal Procedure I. Their final exams were evaluated for proficiency in arguing by analogy using the Legal Reasoning Rubric. 11% of the students were found to be beyond proficient in this area; 66% were proficient; and 24% were below proficient.

Improvement Based on Analysis

During the 2018-2019 cycle, we exceeded the 80% threshold with 82% of students meeting or exceeding the proficient level and 18% scoring below proficient. This year, only 77% of students either met or exceeded the proficient level. 24% scored below proficient. We will discuss with faculty whether there may be instructional lessons to be drawn from the 5% lower score on proficiency on this skill.

Outcome B2.2.1 Skills: Communication

Graduates will communicate effectively and efficiently to individuals and groups. Graduates will

demonstrate achievement of this learning outcome by writing legal documents that are clear, precise, concise, well-reasoned, well-supported, professional in tone, and appropriate to the audience and the circumstances and which, when appropriate, contain proper citation to authority.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2020 in the midst of the transition to online instruction. The student response rate was 43.6%, less than our 50% goal, but acceptable given that the survey was conducted during a pandemic. Responding students were surveyed regarding the extent to which their legal education has contributed to their competency in writing clearly and effectively.

Analysis of Data

Students were asked if they had worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources. UGA Law means from responding 1L students were comparable to those of our peer and aspirational schools, while responses from 2Ls and 3Ls were significantly higher.
UGA 1L 3.26 / (2019) 3.13 / (2018) UGA 1L 3.27 / peer/aspirational 3.25
UGA 2L 3.39 / (2019) 3.32 / (2018) UGA 2L 3.00 / peer/aspirational 3.08
UGA 3L 3.38 / (2019) 3.30 / (2018) UGA 3L 3.00 / peer/aspirational 3.12

Students were also asked to what extent law school had contributed to their development in regard to writing clearly and effectively. This was compared to our peer and aspirational schools.
UGA 1L 3.33 / (2019) 3.25 / (2018) UGA 1L 3.18 / (2017) 3.22 / peer/aspirational 3.17
UGA 2L 3.27 / (2019) 3.21 / (2018) UGA 2L 3.11 / (2017) 2.96 / peer/aspirational 3.12
UGA 3L 3.49 (2019) 3.26 / (2018) UGA 3L 3.09 / (2017) 3.06 / peer/aspirational 3.10

Improvement Based on Analysis

Our 3Ls reported a significantly higher mean than peer and aspirational schools on the extent to which law school contributed to their development in writing clearly and effectively. When asked about writing a paper integrating ideas or information from various sources, all classes were higher than last year and higher than our peer and aspirational schools, with the 2L and 3Ls differences being statistically significant. The trends in the data remain encouraging. The revisions to Legal Writing in our 1L curriculum, adding a mandatory document drafting course in the 2L year and continuing to require a Capstone Writing project before graduation appear to have had a positive impact. We will continue to monitor the data in this area.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2020 in the midst of the transition to online instruction. The student response rate was 43.6%, less than our 50% goal, but acceptable given that the survey was conducted during a pandemic. Responding students were surveyed regarding the extent to which their legal education has contributed to their competency in speaking clearly and effectively.

Analysis of Data

The responding students perceived UGA Law as contributing to their competency in speaking clearly and effectively. Surveyed students responded using a scale of: 1 = never; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often; and 4 = very often. The reported data shows the mean of these responses. The means were compared to peer/aspirational law schools, the 2018-2019 UGA Law data, and the 2017-2018 UGA Law data. While our students reported higher means than peer and aspirational schools in all three classes and the difference in the 1L responses was statistically significant.
UGA 1L 2.89 / (2019) UGA 1L 2.82/(2018)3.03/ Peer/Aspirational 2.69
UGA 2L 2.90 / (2019) UGA 2L 2.88/(2018) 2.90/Peer/Aspirational 2.83
UGA 3L 3.10 / (2019) UGA 3L 2.83/(2018) 2.86/Peer/Aspirational 2.86

Improvement Based on Analysis

Graduates are expected to speak effectively and in an articulate and professional manner. This year the LSSSE data showed higher means for UGA Law than peer and aspirational schools, with a statistically significant difference in the 1L year. This tends to validate the extent to which UGA's 1L professors continue to use the traditional Socratic method, which helps students develop speaking skills as they respond to questions from the instructor.

Measure UL Capstone Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of upper level students will exhibit proficiency in the ability to communicate effectively in writing.

Data Collected

Random student work was selected from 5 of our Spring capstone writing courses.

Analysis of Data

Sampled student work was assessed for professional style, research, creative analytical thinking, and responsiveness to faculty input at both the development and revision stages of the paper. 100% of the students met the proficient level for professional style; 95% showed proficiency for research; 100% showed proficiency for creative analytical thinking; 89% showed proficiency in responsiveness to faculty input in the development stage; and 89% showed proficiency in responsiveness to faculty input in the revision stage.
This was compared to last year's data when 100% of the students met the proficient level for professional style; 87% showed proficiency for research; 87% showed proficiency for creative analytical thinking; 94% showed proficiency in responsiveness to faculty input in the development stage; and 93% showed proficiency in responsiveness to faculty input in the revision stage.

Improvement Based on Analysis

The Capstone Writing Requirement requires each student, prior to graduation, to complete an analytical writing project of at least 20 double-spaced pages. The project, which may consist of a single writing or a series of shorter writings on related topics, must meet the following criteria: 1) be written in a professional style; 2) require that the student engage in research and creative analytical thinking; and 3) be developed and revised based on faculty input and comments. Our students are meeting this skill through the satisfactory completion of the analytical writing project and are satisfying our benchmarks for proficiency in the skills the Capstone project is designed to develop.

Measure 1L Legal Writing Rubric

Threshold for success (if available)

At least 80 percent of 1L students to exhibit proficiency in efficient legal writing.

Data Collected

A random sample of student work was reviewed from each of the 1L Legal Writing sections.

Analysis of Data

Sampled student work was assessed for rule synthesis, rule application, appropriate research, correct use of authority, thesis development, organization, professional style, appropriate tone, and technical compliance. 100% of the students met the proficient level for rule synthesis; 100% for rule

application; 100% for appropriate research; 94% for correct use of authority; 97% for thesis development; 94% for organization, 97% for professional style; 100% for appropriate tone; and 91% for technical compliance.

Improvement Based on Analysis

The sampled work met our 80% threshold for proficiency in all 9 areas. There were positive increases over last year in rule application and appropriate research, with 100% scoring at proficient or beyond. The restructured legal writing courses appear to be successful in teaching the 1L students these skills.

Outcome C1.1.1 Professionalism: Ethics

Graduates will understand a lawyer's professional, ethical, and legal duties to clients, courts, opposing parties, the legal system, and society. Graduates will demonstrate achievement of this outcome by applying professional disciplinary rules, common law rules, and constitutional rules that govern lawyers, and showing an appreciation of the historical and contemporary role of lawyers as agents for maintaining the rule of law, promoting fairness, and meeting the legal needs of the indigent.

Measure Course Completion Rate

The completion rate of The Law and Ethics of Lawyering course. Successful completion of this course prior to graduation is an ABA accreditation requirement and is essential to our students' success and our program of legal education.

Threshold for success (if available)

All law students successfully completing JURI 4300, The Law and Ethics of Lawyering.

Data Collected

The final grades for all sections of JURI 4300 in Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 were reviewed.

Analysis of Data

All students earned a passing grade of C+ or better.

Improvement Based on Analysis

The reported grades are indicative of all students gaining an understanding of the course material in this required course.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2020 in the midst of the transition to online instruction. The student response rate was 43.6%, less than our 50% goal, but acceptable given that the survey was conducted during a pandemic. Responding students were surveyed regarding their perceived gain in professional values and ethics. They were also asked to what extent the law school encouraged the ethical practice of law.

Analysis of Data

54% of the responding 3L students indicated a perceived gain with respect to development of a personal code of values and ethics. The entire student body was asked how much they felt the law school environment contributed to the development of a personal code of values and ethics. Surveyed students responded using a scale of: 1 = never; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often; and 4 = very often. The reported data shows the mean of these responses. These means were compared to our peer/aspirational schools:
1L UGA 2.87 / peer/aspirational 2.59
2L UGA 2.87 / peer/aspirational 2.52
3L UGA 2.66 / peer/aspirational 2.46
The 1L and 2L means were up from last year's data:
1L 2019 2.67 /2018 UGA 2.62 / 1L 2017 UGA 2.70

2L 2019 2.70 / 2018 UGA 2.76 / 2L 2017 UGA 2.64
3L 2019 2.76 /2018 UGA 2.73 / 3L 2017 UGA 2.54

Students were also asked to what extent their law school encouraged the ethical practice of law. These means were compared to our peer/aspirational schools and the UGA advantage was statistically significant in the 1L and 2L classes:
1L UGA 3.36 / peer/aspirational 3.10
2L UGA 3.42 / peer/aspirational 3.00
3L UGA 3.12 / peer/aspirational 2.95
The results were lower among the 3Ls than last year but higher among the 1Ls and 2Ls:
1L 2019 3.19 / 2018 UGA 3.30 / 1L 2017 UGA 3.22
2L 2019 3.11 / 2018 UGA 3.36 / 2L 2017 UGA 3.18
3L 2019 3.28 / 2018 UGA 3.31 / 3L 2017 UGA 3.21

Improvement Based on Analysis

Last year, data indicated 59% of students who participated in this survey perceived a gain regarding the personal development of values and ethics. The perceived gain from responding students is slightly lower this year at 54%. However, it was encouraging that our 1Ls and 2Ls perceived the law school as promoting the ethical practice of law to a greater extent than their counterparts at peer and aspirational schools.

Outcome D1.1.2 Professionalism: Collaboration

Graduates will demonstrate competence in the core skills of professional lawyering on behalf of clients through collaboration with colleagues on assigned projects

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for student responses to meet or exceed those reported by our peer institutions.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2020 in the midst of the transition to online instruction. The student response rate was 43.6%, less than our 50% goal, but acceptable given that the survey was conducted during a pandemic. Responding students self-reported on working effectively with others, working with faculty outside of classes and quality of relationships with faculty and other students.

Analysis of Data

Our students reported higher scores for working effectively with others than students at peer /aspirational schools, and the differences were statistically significant among 2Ls and 3Ls:
1L UGA 2.57 / peer/aspirational 2.44
2L UGA 2.87 / peer/aspirational 2.48
3L UGA 2.93 / peer/aspirational 2.47

This year, 63.4% of our 3L students chose a 6 or 7 when rating the quality of relationships with other students on a 7 point scale, up from last year's 53.8% There was evidence of positive development in peer relationships among our 1L class. 70.5% of our 1Ls chose a 6 or 7 to rate peer relationships in 2020, up from 62% the prior year.
In 2017, 51.20% of responding 3Ls reported either working on or planning to work on a legal research project outside of class with a faculty member, which was one of UGA's highest performing items as compared to our peer/aspirational group. In 2018, only 37% of 3L's reported either working on or planning to work on a legal research project with a faculty member. Last year, 53.2% of 3Ls reported research collaboration with faculty. This year, 42.9% of 3Ls reported research collaboration with faculty.
Reported quality of relationships with faculty were higher for all three classes than at peer /aspirational schools by statistically significant margins:

1L UGA 5.85 / peer/aspirational 5.48
2L UGA 5.91 / peer/aspirational 5.17
3L UGA 5.73 / peer/aspirational 5.11

Improvement Based on Analysis

We were encouraged by the significantly higher scores on working effectively with others in the 2L and 3L classes, as well as the high marks on relationships with faculty and the improvements on relationships with other students. A likely driver of the high collaboration figures among upper level students is the number of high quality clinical programs available to UGA 2Ls and 3Ls. These programs generally involve students working collaboratively with other students and professors on representing clinic clients. This year, we are adding a new First Amendment Clinic, which we hope will contribute to our strength in teaching collaboration skills.

Outcome D1.1.1 Professionalism: Client Needs

Graduates will demonstrate competence in the core skills of professional lawyering on behalf of clients by Identifying and effectively engaging with the complexity of client needs, through clinical work, simulation courses, or other practical skills courses.

Measure LSSSE

Threshold for success (if available)

For the UGA law student response to be at least 50% of the student population and for a majority of student responses to be positive.

Data Collected

LSSSE collected data from the student body in Spring 2020 in the midst of the transition to online instruction. The student response rate was 43.6%, less than our 50% goal, but acceptable given that the survey was conducted during a pandemic. Responding students were surveyed regarding advanced preparation skills development such as pro bono work, field placements, and/or clinic participation.

Analysis of Data

Law schools generally give students opportunities to work with clients either in the context of for-credit clinics and field placements or through non-credit pro bono opportunities. The LSSSE data showed that UGA Law is doing better than peer and aspirational schools in providing clinical and and field placement opportunities, but lags behind somewhat in the opportunity for pro bono work.
One question asked students whether they had done or planned to do a field placement or law clinic:
1L UGA 93% / peer/aspirational 86%
2L UGA 94% / peer/aspirational 80%
3L UGA 83% / peer/aspirational 74%
The differences were statistically significant for the 1L and 2L students.
Students were also asked whether they had done or planned to do pro bono work or public service:
1L UGA 84% / peer/aspirational 90%
2L UGA 72% / peer/aspirational 82%
3L UGA 60% / peer/aspirational 74%
While the reported figures for pro bono and public service work were higher at peer and aspirational schools, only the 2L results met tests for statistical significance.

Improvement Based on Analysis

It is impressive that 83% of the third year respondents reported participation in a field placement or law school clinic, and encouraging that 94% of 2Ls and 93% of 1Ls had done so or planned to do so before they graduate.
While we would like to see higher rates of pro bono work among our students, we think it makes sense to prioritize the for credit client service opportunities offered by clinics and field placement programs. We are hopeful that the addition of a new First Amendment Clinic this year will help our clinical and externship programs to remain a strength of our program of legal education.

Additional Narrative (if applicable) New Assessment Plan for JD program

The law school is in the third year of its new assessment plan and learning outcomes guided by new assessment standards from ABA accreditation. At this time, we continue to discuss the inclusion of new measures, such as graduates passing the MPRE exam.

Files:

JD 2019-2020 rubric data

Feedback

Files:

Law - JD

End of report