

UNM School of Law
Faculty Meeting
April 4, 1977
4:00 p.m., Conference Room

MINUTES

Present: Desiderio, DuMars, J. Ellis, Fink, Flickinger,
Goldberg, Gonzales, Hart, Kovnat, MacPherson,
Minzner, Montez, Muir, Norwood, Ragsdale,
J. Romero, Sanchez, Schwartz, Simson, Teitelbaum,
Utton; Students Hernandez, Kraemer, Noland;
Visitor Herb Kraus

The meeting was called to order by Dean Hart, and the minutes of the meeting of March 28 were approved.

The faculty voted to place Eric Morrison on probation.

Dean Hart announced that Jim Beard and Alice Cooper are still available to assist faculty members with regard to the questionnaire on student evaluation of instruction.

Professor Minzner continued the discussion on the proposal of the Honors and Awards Committee for grading clinical courses. Professor Simson distributed a proposal on Standards for Evaluating Clinical Students as a guide for clinical personnel in placing information in the students' files and on record cards.

Motions on the following were approved:

a) Clinical in-house courses will be graded Credit, D, or F. An F grade denotes the unsuccessful completion of the graduation requirement. D

b) Superior performance will be noted on the student's permanent record card, determined by a committee of the clinical faculty.

c) Beginning in the fall of 1977, written evaluations on each of the clinical students will be made a part of the student's file; these evaluations will be sent to the students, and the students will have the right to have them sent to employers or others. -ch. h. o. s. 6
L. R. Camp
D. P.

The faculty was asked for suggestions for the outstanding senior students and for awards in each class as to the students making the most outstanding contribution to legal scholarship.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Louise R. Camp

Louise R. Camp
Sec'y

4/1/77

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

DATE: 31 March 1977

TO: Faculty, Department Chairmen, and Academic Deans

FROM: Jim Beard and Alice Cooper

SUBJECT: Student Evaluation of Instruction

This office will once again coordinate the administration of the questionnaire entitled "Student Reactions to Instruction and Courses" to the classes of those faculty who would like to use this method of obtaining feedback from their students. The instrument and procedures associated with it will be the same as employed since 1973-74 when it was first used. It consists of a questionnaire for students which takes about 20 minutes of class time, and a brief faculty information form which specifies the objectives of the course. The latter is used in the scoring process and attempts to make the questionnaire applicable to different types of courses. Space is provided for extra questions devised by the instructor and for comments by the student.

We will send the needed materials to any instructor who requests and specifies, for each class with more than five students, the course and section number and the number of students. When we receive the completed forms, we will coordinate the machine processing and return the forms and two copies of the summarized results to the instructor. A guide to the interpretation of the results will also be provided, if requested. We will keep the raw data for use in establishing UNM norms, but all the originals and all the results will be the property of the instructor and will not be divulged by this office except at the request of the instructor.

We will be glad to answer questions and supply additional information. If you would like to participate you may telephone your request to us at 5115, or you may send us a list of instructors, course and section numbers, and class sizes.

JB:alc

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

DATE:

March 28, 1977

TO: Law School Faculty Meeting

FROM: Committee on Honors and Awards

SUBJECT: Proposal for Grading of Clinical [and Seminars and Other Paper] Courses

The Committee on Honors and Awards has been charged with the question of grading in the Clinical Law Program and in small seminars. We have considered the charge to include grading in paper courses other than seminars.

In discussing the question with interested members of the Law School community, we think we can identify several functions which grading the clinical courses might serve. Since grading seminars and other paper courses presents some of the same issues that grading clinical courses involves, we propose to look at that problem also. We would like to have the faculty consider the issues and recommend resolution with respect to clinical before we consider in depth the question of treating seminar and other paper courses consistently with clinical courses.

At present, clinical courses are graded on a credit/no credit/fail basis. The committee assumes that any proposal we make can affect only the in-house programs. The functions which grading clinical might serve are as follows:

1. Providing better evaluation of student performance for the purpose of improving the students' learning experience.
2. Providing better evaluation of student performance for the purpose of providing prospective employers with better data.
3. Providing some data with respect to which the faculty can reward superior effort by considering such effort in recommending students for scholarships, in awarding prizes, and in considering COIF and graduation with honors.
4. Providing greater incentive to students to give superior effort in their clinical experience.
5. Providing the clinical faculty with some alternative to "no credit" for recognizing unsatisfactory performance.

These purposes might be divided in two categories: evaluation for teaching purposes and evaluation for recognition or reward purposes. The former purposes might be met by personal, non-graded evaluations by letter or conference. The reward or recognition functions probably can be obtained best by some objective, reasonably consistent, recorded

evaluation. The committee thought that the present proposal pending in clinical to prepare informal, unofficial written evaluations to each clinical student met the need for better feedback to each student. The proposal we make deals solely with the need to recognize, reward, and encourage outstanding clinical performance.

The committee therefore makes the following recommendation to the faculty:

- A. (1) That all in-house clinical programs be graded on a credit, D or F basis
- (2) That superior performance in one's clinical courses be recognized by graduation "with honors in Clinical Practice". This recognition would appear on the graduate's diploma.
- (3) That extraordinary performance in Clinical be recognized by a designation of "Honors in Clinical Practice - Junior Year" on one's transcript at the end of the second year and graduation as described above.

B. Alternatively,

That all in-house clinical programs be graded on an A, B, C, D, and F basis.

STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING CLINICAL STUDENTS

Professional Development and Demeanor

1. Ability to develop with clients a relationship of trust and realistic expectations.
2. Awareness of personal biases and prejudices (cultural, racial, ideological, etc.)
3. Recognition of and sensitivity to ethical problems and questions.
4. Tolerance for ambiguity and lack of performance by others.
5. Efficiency and devotion to central problems.
6. Thoroughness and attention to detail.
7. Dependability and faithfulness to deadlines.
8. Ability to function productively when there is no imminent deadline or when personal motivation is diminished.
9. Knowledge of and sensitivity to working relationships, division of labor, and office procedure.
10. Positive acceptance of criticism.
11. Courtesy and grace in dealing with other professionals, especially other attorneys and judges.

Lawyering Competence

A. Performance with Client

1. Creation of attorney-client relationship.
2. Assessment and achieving client's understanding of problems, issues, methods and alternatives.

B. Fact Sensitivity and Development

1. Ability to develop facts - from all sources (i.e., clients, witnesses, documents, agencies, adversary)
2. File building and maintenance; utilizing office systems.

C. Research, Analysis and Strategy

1. Ability to do substantive legal research and memo drafting.
2. Ability to do procedural research and memo drafting.
3. Ability to draft necessary pleadings.
4. Evaluation of available remedies.
5. Evaluation of available forums.
6. Tailoring advocacy to chosen forum.

D. Performance with or before third parties

1. Ability to draft and persuade through correspondence.
2. Ability to speak and persuade orally.
3. Ability to negotiate successfully.
4. Ability to prove facts, sustain burden of proof, prepare and handle physical evidence, and conduct direct and cross-examination.

E. Evaluation and Review

1. Ability to keep time and expense records.
2. Ability to evaluate self-performance and result for client.