

Argosy University
Name of College: Western State College of Law
Name of Program: Juris Doctorate (JD) Program
Assessment Year: 2016-2017

To support program quality and integrity, Argosy University’s Western State College of Law program undergoes annual assessment reviews. Below are some statistics, findings, interventions and outcomes related to those reviews for the JD program. For further details, contact Dean Susan Keller, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at Western State College of Law.

NOTE:

The Juris Doctorate program is fully approved by the American Bar Association (ABA).

- For enrollment data, see the ABA report that Western State is required to post on its website (<https://www.wsulaw.edu/prospective-students/aba-required-disclosures>). The enrollment data is included in the link to the Standard 509 Information Report. The ABA does not collect graduation rate data, but it does collect attrition data, which is included in the 509 report.
- Job Placement data is included in the Employment Summary Reports near the bottom of the same page.

Achievement of Program Outcomes (each programmatic learning outcome is assessed at various points along the law school curriculum (Introductory, Reinforcement, & Mastery); the results below reflect assessments done at the Mastery level.):

Program Benchmark: 80% of students will achieve proficient or exemplary on their designated assignment.

Table 1:
AY2016-2017 Program Outcomes Assessment Results:

Program Outcomes	Results % of students who scored “Proficient” or “Exemplary”
<u>Outcome One: Advocacy of Legal Argument:</u> Students will demonstrate the ability, in both oral and written formats, to evaluate the legal, economic and social strengths and weaknesses of a case and use case and statutory authority as well as public policy to persuade others. Making policy-based arguments includes the ability to identify and evaluate the public policies of a precedent case or rule and their implications, and be able to assert such appropriate arguments to support a particular application or distinction of a	100%

precedent case to a legal controversy or a particular resolution of the application of a rule to the legal controversy.	
<u>Outcome Two: Legal Ethics:</u> Students will demonstrate the ability to identify ethical issues in law practice contexts and make appropriate decisions to resolve such issues.	98%
<u>Outcome Three: Client Sensitivity and Cultural Competence:</u> Students will demonstrate an awareness of clients' needs and goals, including a sensitivity to clients' background and circumstances (including, but not limited to, socio-economic, gender, race, ethnicity, educational, disability and/or religious background(s)), the ability to make decisions that reflect an appropriate focus on those needs and goals, and awareness that cultural issues may affect the relevance of facts and application of the law.	100%
<u>Outcome Four: Legal Analysis:</u> Students will demonstrate the ability to identify the factual and legal issues implicated by a fact pattern and to appropriately use cases (including identifying the salient features of an appropriate precedent case, identifying legally significant similarities or differences between the precedent case and a fact pattern and explaining why those are legally significant) and rules (including the ability to connect legally significant facts in a fact pattern to the rule) to predict how a court would decide the issue. Students will also demonstrate the ability to identify and evaluate the public policies of a precedent case or rule, and be able to evaluate how public policy can impact the application of a rule to the legal issue.	77%

Action Plan in response to results of AY2016-17 Assessment Results

	PLANNED ACTION AND RATIONALE	ACTION TAKEN	RESULTS
4	Outcome four: When assessed on ability to identify and evaluate public policies underlying a legal rule, and ability to use policy to support a particular resolution to a legal controversy, results were mixed, pulling down the overall assessment results for Outcome Four, Legal Analysis. Plans were made to improve instruction relating to this skill and shift assessment methodology in an effort to	Faculty will create additional instruction and practice opportunities with respect to this skill. Additionally, because this skill may be more difficult to assess in the context of time pressure final exams, assessment of this skill will be done in connection with untimed homework assignments.	To be determined.

	more accurately assess this skill.		
--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Closing the Loop:
Results of AY2015-2016 Action Plan**

	PLANNED ACTION AND RATIONALE	ACTION TAKEN	RESULTS
1	Instruction of Client Sensitivity and Cultural Competence at the Introductory level needed to be improved, and the assessment point within the course needed to be changed to account for the usual means by which students are able to demonstrate their competence of this outcome.	The quality of instruction regarding Client Sensitivity and Cultural Competence at the Introductory level was improved by providing additional materials to all instructors teaching LWR; the assessment point within the course was changed from an assessment in the students' written brief to an assessment in the students oral argument, to account for the usual means by which students are able to demonstrate their competence of this outcome.	Results improved from 23% demonstrating competence or excellence the prior year to 54% demonstrating competence or excellence in Spring 2018. That level meets the appropriate benchmark for the Introductory level of this skill.
2	Students need additional opportunities to practice Advocacy of Legal Argument at the Introductory level.	A second opportunity for practice (via an additional homework exercise) was added to the Torts class.	Student performance remained at a similar level, with 50% achieving competence or excellence on the final examination. That level meets the appropriate benchmark for the Introductory level of this skill.