

OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY
2006 ANNUAL REPORT ON THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Academic Program: Law _____
Department: NA _____
College: Law _____
Submitted by/Date: John Christoff—December 8, 2006 _____

The Annual Report on the Assessment of Student Learning consists of three parts.

Part I provides the learning objectives and measures as previously identified.
Part II requests information about assessment activities for the previous academic year.
Part III requests information about programmatic or operational changes occurring or being proposed as a result of assessment activities.

Reports must be submitted by department chairs to the Office of Institutional Research by **December 1, 2006**. Each annual report will be evaluated by the University Assessment Committee and returned to the department chair and the respective Dean by **March 1, 2007**.

I. ASSESSMENT PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Instructions: Please review the following and make changes as needed.

A. Learning Objectives

1. To obtain a foundation in legal reasoning, analysis and writing.
2. To obtain a thorough understanding of the structures and policies of the law.
3. To gain a broad and general understanding of how the law and legal institutions evolve and operate.
4. To gain an awareness of the limits of law and how lawyers can contribute beyond the boundaries of the profession.

B. Measurements

- Bar Exam
- Evaluation of writing portfolio
- Law School Survey of Student Engagement
- Placement Rates

II. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES FOR 2005-06 (ACADEMIC YEAR)

Instructions: Please complete the following sections.

A. Describe the *measures* used to collect the data? Bar Exam

(Which measures did you use during the past year? Which learning objectives does each measure address? How and when did you administer the measures?)

- Bar Exam. The Bar Exam measures all of the learning objectives. The Bar Exam is administered two times per year in each state.
- Evaluation of writing portfolio- The Writing Portfolio measures all objectives. Two writing samples are collected during the first year of law school. A third is collected during the last year of law school.
- Law School Survey of Student Engagement—used as an indirect measure of all objectives. Annual.
- Placement Rates—are indicators of the success of the College of Law in all objectives. The Career Services Office

B. Present the *results* of the data collection and analysis for each measure listed above.

(Present the data resulting from 2005-06 assessment activities. What are the standards and expectations for performance? Did the students meet the standards? What gaps were found between the standards for student learning and the actual results?)

Bar Exam -- The class of 2006 was very successful in the bar. The bar pass rate in Ohio was 81%. The available data from other states showed a pass rate of 87%. See Attachment I -- Memo of Dean Crago.

Writing Portfolio – The first complete set of writing samples became available at the end of spring semester, 2006. Professor Allison Mittendorf is in the process of assessing the complete portfolios. This assessment is not complete, but preliminary results indicate that there is clear improvement in writing skills over the three year period of the assessment. More specific findings will be available at a later time.

Law School Survey of Student Engagement In reviewing the responses of the graduating class of 2006, the LSSSE survey indicates that the results of the College of Law were higher than national satisfaction level in 33 categories and lower in 36 categories.

1. Academic and Intellectual Experience -- 20 areas of inquiry.
 - a. Significantly Higher: 3
 - b. Higher: 10
 - c. Lower: 8
 - d. Significantly lower: 0
2. Examinations—One area of inquiry.
 - a. Higher
3. Mental Activities—5 areas of inquiry
 - a. Significantly Higher: 1
 - b. Lower: 4
4. Writing—3 areas of inquiry
 - a. Higher: 3

5. Enriching Educational Experiences—9 areas of inquiry.
 - a. Higher: 6
 - b. Lower: 3

6. Student Satisfaction—7 areas of inquiry
 - a. Significantly Higher: 2
 - b. Lower: 2
 - c. Significantly Lower: 3

7. Law School Environment—10 areas of inquiry
 - a. Higher: 1
 - b. Lower: 7
 - c. Significantly Lower: 2

8. Quality of Relationships—3 areas of inquiry
 - a. Other Students—Higher
 - b. Faculty—Lower
 - c. Administrative Staff and offices—Lower

9. Educational and Personal Growth—15 areas of inquiry.
 - a. Higher: 6
using computing and information technology;
speaking clearly and effectively;
working effectively with others;
developing legal research skills;
learning effectively on your own;
developing a deepened sense of spirituality

 - b. Lower: 7. viz.:
writing clearly and effectively;
thinking critically and analytically;
understanding self;
understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds;
solving complex real-world problems;
developing a personal code of values and ethics;
contributing to the welfare of the community.

 - c. Significantly Lower: 3
acquiring a broad legal education;
acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills;
developing clearer career goals;

10. Overall Satisfaction—2 areas of inquiry
 - a. Entire Educational Experience at your law school: Lower
 - b. Would you go to the same law school again: Significantly Lower

Placement Rates – Placement statistics are based on employment 9 months after graduation. The Career Services Office is now compiling statistics for the class of 2006. The class of 2005 employment rate is 88%. See Attachment II.

III. PROGRAMMATIC /OPERATIONAL ADJUSTMENTS

Instructions: Please complete the following sections.

A. Describe the *adjustments*, if any, to the program or the program’s operations (including budgetary) which are either being proposed or have already been made in order to narrow the gaps identified between learning objectives and actual outcomes.

(What changes in curriculum, instructional strategies, course content, personnel, facilities, equipment, resource allocation, etc. are recommended to address the gaps between expected performance and actual results?)

1. Continued attempt to increase the qualifications of entering students—LSAT, UGPA. The statistics of the 2006 entering class were essentially the same as the 2005 entering class. See Attachment III -- Memo of Assistant Dean English.
2. Held a faculty development session to discuss the 2005 LSSSE report. Although the report was highly favorable to the College of Law, the following steps were taken to increase the levels of student satisfaction:
 - a. The Orientation Program was modified to include a session in which each first year professor met with his class for introductions and a preview of the course material and expectations.
 - b. Faculty, administrators and staff were encouraged by the Administration to maintain both access and affirmation in dealing with the students.
 - c. New upper level electives were added in the 2006-2007 academic year, viz., Oil & Gas Law, Patent Law, Antitrust, Law of War Seminar, International Protection of Human Rights Seminar, Global Governance and the Law. Advanced Trial Advocacy and Immigration Law had been added the previous academic year. J.D. students were also permitted to take some of the new LLM courses, viz. Comparative Constitutional Law, Comparative Administrative Law, Competitiveness and Corruption, and Legal Issues in Transitional Democracies.
3. Two full-time tenure track positions were filled. The addition of these professors and two visiting professors in the LLM program allowed the expansion of courses identified in number 2 above.
4. Further analysis of the 2006 LSSSE report will be made, findings presented to the faculty and a plan to address the concerns therein will be developed.

B. Describe the *changes* that need to be made to the assessment plan and practices for the future?

(Have questions been raised about the effectiveness of the assessment plan? If so, what changes are needed? Are different objectives, measures, analysis, etc. needed?)

None.