

ATINER CONFERENCE PAPER SERIES No: LAW2012-0360

**Athens Institute for Education and Research**

**ATINER**



**ATINER's Conference Paper Series**

**LAW2012-0360**

**Technology and Assessment in the  
Legal Classroom:  
An Empirical Study**

**Fernando Colon-Navarro  
Associate Dean/Professor  
Texas Southern University  
USA**

Athens Institute for Education and Research  
8 Valaoritou Street, Kolonaki, 10671 Athens, Greece  
Tel: + 30 210 3634210 Fax: + 30 210 3634209  
Email: [info@atiner.gr](mailto:info@atiner.gr) URL: [www.atiner.gr](http://www.atiner.gr)  
URL Conference Papers Series: [www.atiner.gr/papers.htm](http://www.atiner.gr/papers.htm)

Printed in Athens, Greece by the Athens Institute for Education and Research.  
All rights reserved. Reproduction is allowed for non-commercial purposes if the  
source is fully acknowledged.

**ISSN 2241-2891**

22/11/2012

## An Introduction to ATINER's Conference Paper Series

ATINER started to publish this conference papers series in 2012. It includes only the papers submitted for publication after they were presented at one of the conferences organized by our Institute every year. The papers published in the series have not been refereed and are published as they were submitted by the author. The series serves two purposes. First, we want to disseminate the information as fast as possible. Second, by doing so, the authors can receive comments useful to revise their papers before they are considered for publication in one of ATINER's books, following our standard procedures of a blind review.

Dr. Gregory T. Papanikos  
President  
Athens Institute for Education and Research

This paper should be cited as follows:

**Colon-Navarro, F. (2012) “Technology and Assessment in the Legal Classroom: An Empirical Study” Athens: ATINER'S Conference Paper Series, No: LAW2012-0360.**

## **Technology and Assessment in the Legal Classroom: An Empirical Study**

**Fernando Colon-Navarro**  
**Associate Dean/Professor**  
**Texas Southern University**  
**USA**

### **Abstract**

Education has been challenged by incorporating technology into teaching over the last 20 years. This has begun having an impact even on legal education. There was a time when the Socratic Method was the primary instructional modality in law school and its preeminence was unchallenged. The idea was that the law school's educational program was a rigorous entity unto itself. Each course had one summative final exam.

In the mid 1980s the thinking about “intelligence” began to take a dramatic shift. The shift came in part due to advances in technology, including artificial intelligence. As understanding of the complexity of human intelligences became the focus of educational psychologists, its impact was felt on the science/art of education. Ensuring that teaching methods used in the classroom would reach all learners became the primary role of the teacher, as opposed to being the primary “keeper” of the knowledge to be conveyed to the student, which was the traditional primary role in the formal educational classroom. And then came the computers. What quickly became apparent was that there was a role, even a need, for various types of intelligences in the traditional classroom and in fields where alternate types of intelligence had never been viewed as contributors to success in those fields. One spectacular example came in the surprising field of surgery where surgeons began training with video games which turned out to enable them to use surgical micro robotics to perform procedures that had been impossible previously.

As psychologists became more interested in studying the various intelligences exhibited by humans, they introduced the idea of measuring students' acquisition of skills or the outcomes of learning endeavors. The idea behind assessing students' learning is making education more efficient. Educational outcomes are the product of student aptitudes, effort and the **educational** program. Maximizing student outcomes or making the educational process efficient became a real focus of educators, but not of legal educators. If students are making progress at a rate that will allow them to achieve the outcomes of the program on schedule, all is well; if they are not, adjustments in one or more of the three factors is necessary. Of course, affecting students' aptitudes is not always feasible, but targeting instructional efforts utilizing their learning modality strengths is.

New technology can provide the teacher a quick means assessment of the students' learning. It isn't enough to know whether or not the majority of students (defined as 70% or more) have grasped the concept, the teacher must then make decisions about what to do with the data. In my class, if fewer than 70% of the students have not mastered the concept, we continue instructional interventions and measure their success until 70% or more of the students have displayed mastery. We are attempting to assess whether or not this approach contributes to student outcomes, by comparing the performance of the students in my section who have been subjected to the rigors of measuring their response to instructional interventions to those of other students who have not had such formative assessments.

**Keywords:** Innovation, technology, research projects, etc.

**Contact Information of Corresponding author:**

## INTRODUCTION:

During the past twenty years legal educators as well as educators in other fields have been engaged in the process of making legal education more efficient and relevant. Many reasons for the changes come to mind, such as changes in the way the marketplace for attorneys accepts new law school graduates or maybe different expectations of the level of skills expected of the new attorneys. Maybe the advances in technology have created new challenges to legal education as the role of legal educators changed from being the “keepers” of the knowledge to be conveyed to students to ensuring that knowledge reached all learners. Maybe the learners themselves have changed, with technology shaping the cognitive processes used in learning. Maybe law firms starting new associates at \$130,000 per year, or more, want associates ready to hit the ground running, or at least jogging! Whatever the reason, over the past twenty years legal education institutions as well as legal educators have witnessed a significant debate as to how best to impart education in the legal classroom. Initially, the debate was focused on what type of education was to be administered in law school. Should students be taught to “think like lawyers” or should they be taught “the skills of lawyering”? Where does legal education begin in the process of education?<sup>1</sup>

Legal education has changed over the years, reflecting the state of the art of education and psychology and the zeitgeist or thinking of the times. One thing has remained constant for educators in general as well as legal educators; how to teach anything is of vital interest, and the more efficient the method of imparting the knowledge, the better the educator can be at the job. It then becomes the burden of the formal school mechanisms (the law schools) to provide the training needed for a student to become a lawyer and to make this a cost-efficient process. That is, the law school must focus on imparting the knowledge and skills required by the profession in a manner that attracts students who recognize the school's ability to provide such training. Law professors, like other educators, must take their cue from those who teach others how to teach.

Up until 1960, law schools offered only one type of legal education, emphasizing the development of analytical skills, the development of legal research skills, and the learning of substantive law. In order to teach these skills, law schools relied, for the most part, on the Socratic Method, where students are trained to reason via question and answer debate in the classroom, applying legal statutes and principles where appropriate.<sup>2</sup> This method of instruction ensured that law schools became a source of “sorting” students who were good at legal analysis from those who were poor at it without concern as to how these students, once they became lawyers, would acquire skills relevant

---

<sup>1</sup> Fernando Colon-Navarro, *Thinking Like a Lawyer: Expert-Novice Differences in Simulated Client Interviews* (1997) 21 J. Legal Prof. 107

<sup>2</sup> For an essay criticizing the traditional manner of legal education, see Duncan Kennedy, *Legal Education and the Reproduction of Hierarchy*, 32 J. LEGAL EDUC. 591 (1982).

to providing services to real clients, i.e., expertise, judgment, and problem-solving abilities that go beyond classroom legal analysis.

With the development of clinical legal education in the 1960s, that tradition began to change. In 1973, the American Bar Association's adoption of its Standards for law school approval incorporated core curriculum requirements, professional responsibility requirements and professional skills training. These requirements were later amended to include legal writing.<sup>1</sup> In 1992, the McCrate Report identified fundamental lawyering skills as essential for competent representation." The report also identified values, and this combination of skills and values is what contributors to the McCrate Report felt all lawyers need in order to be part of the "learned profession." The lawyering skills listed include problem solving, legal analysis and reasoning, legal research, factual investigation, communication, counseling, negotiation, litigation and alternative dispute resolution procedures organization and management of legal work and recognizing and resolving ethical dilemmas. The values listed include providing competent representation, striving to promote justice, fairness, and morality and striving to improve the profession and professional self-development.

Lacking, however, was the idea of measuring the student's acquisition of skill or the outcomes of learning endeavors that was being utilized in the social sciences. The idea behind assessing students' learning periodically is making education more efficient because instruction can be amended when students are not achieving "benchmarks" or interim goals towards the final outcomes on the desired schedule. Educational outcomes are the product of student aptitudes, effort and the educational program. Maximizing student outcomes or making the educational process efficient became a real focus of educators, but not of legal educators. If students are making progress at a rate that will allow them to achieve the outcomes of the program on schedule, all is well; if they are not, adjustments in one or more of the three factors is necessary. Of course, affecting students' aptitudes is not always feasible, but targeting instructional efforts utilizing their learning modality strengths is.

In 2008, The American Bar Association, the accreditation body of law schools, criticized law schools for "not approaching teaching goals at a cohesive institutional level."<sup>2</sup> In support for the criticism, the ABA cited two influential reports, the Carnegie Report and the Best Practices for Legal education.<sup>3</sup> In its report the ABA identifies "three issues that are critical to any discussion of the use of outcome measures in law school": (1) What outcomes may be regarded as central to the legal education field as a whole? (2) How

---

<sup>1</sup> See ABA Section of Legal Edu. And Admission to the Bar, *Legal Education and the Professional Development-An Educational Continuum* 3(1992) [hereinafter McCrate Report] at 233.

<sup>2</sup> American Bar Association Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar: Report of the Outcome Measures Committee.

<sup>3</sup> William M. Sullivan, Anne Colby, Judith Welch Wegner, Lloyd Bond & Lee Shulman, *Educating Lawyers: Preparation for the Profession of Law* (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), and Roy Stuckey and Others, *Best Practices for Legal Education: A vision and a Road Map* (Clinical Legal Education Association 2007).



effective are the existing measures for assessing these outcomes? And (3) what other outcomes measures might be developed? Further the ABA in its report, again citing Carnegie, identifies six tasks that are involved in preparing lawyers: developing in students an academic knowledge base; providing the students with the capacity to engage in complex practice; enabling students to learn to make judgments; teaching students how to learn from experience; introducing students to disciplines of creating and participating in the professional community; and forming students able and willing to join an enterprise of public service.

The ABA continues its criticism of legal education by finding that legal education focuses disproportionately on developing “the academic knowledge base (content) to the exclusion of developing necessary practical skills” resulting in an “unbalanced learning experience for the students.”<sup>1</sup> Citing from the Carnegie Report, the ABA suggest three specific claims for improvement: “law schools should incorporate ongoing assessments and other formative techniques to encourage and evaluate student’s development of the skills; law schools should shift in assessment from the conceptual knowledge accumulated by student to the assessment of practical competencies and the development of professional identity; and law school need to engage in a cohesive and unified set of teaching goals, rather than an ad hoc goal setting by individual faculty members.”<sup>2</sup>

## **Assessment**

If it was desired, as suggested by the ABA, that law schools should incorporate assessment to “encourage and evaluate student development of skills and to assess practical competencies,”<sup>3</sup> what is the ABA referring to as assessment? Professor Gregory Munro gives a suggestion of what the term “assessment” means and how its use may improve legal education.<sup>4</sup> According to Professor Munro “the assessment movement is knocking at the door of American legal education” generating excitement and creating accountability by law schools to “state their mission and outcomes, explain how their curricula is designed to achieve those outcomes, and identify their methods for assessing student performance and institutional outcomes.”<sup>5</sup>

Generally, in law school, the learning of a student is measured by exams. The number of exams vary, of course, depending on the law school and how much the law school values the importance of quantifying outcomes. In most law schools the process is what Professor Munro calls “summative,” meaning exams are used to “measure what students learned after the fact but

---

<sup>1</sup> id at 145

<sup>2</sup> id at 62-63, 231

<sup>3</sup> Id at 231

<sup>4</sup> Gregory S. Munro, Outcome Assessment for Law Schools: Institute for Law School Teaching Gonzaga University School of Law (2000)

<sup>5</sup> id at 13

are seldom used as a diagnostic tool or instructional device for student learning.”<sup>1</sup> The latter use is what educators deem “formative assesment.” The law school final examination, according to Professor Munro, is not the only formal and sole source for a student’s grade, but rarely is it used as a learning tool.<sup>2</sup>

According to the Carnegie Report, “assessing students’ competence performs several important educational functions.”<sup>3</sup> In its familiar summative form, assessment “sorts and selects students” not only during their law school careers but from the beginning of their law school career, serving as “a filter” to help identify which student is likely to succeed. The report states that “summative assessments are useful devices to protect the public, for they can ensure basic levels of competence.” On the other hand formative assessment “focuses on supporting students in learning rather than ranking, sorting and filtering them.”<sup>4</sup>

It appears then that legal education may be at a crossroad between the maintenance of legal traditional educational methods and an exciting use of the methods developed from the science of education that have been proven successful in non-law educational settings. The excitement is not limited to assessing the law school’s performance as a tool for institutional as well as overall accountability, but as legal educators, through the use of formative assessment tools, become aware of the real learning occurring in the classroom, they they are more likely to resort to new teaching methods to bring new life to the legal classroom.

One seemingly controversial way to bring together the concept of assessment and excitement is the use of technology. To some in the legal profession, the use of technology, like laptops, is an obstacle rather than a tool to increase participation. Contrary to this view, the use of technology has contributed to the increase of active learning in the classroom. According to professors Paul Caron and Rafael Gely, active learning is “based on two premises: learning by its nature is an active process, and different people learn in different ways.”<sup>5</sup> When a student is engaged in learning, meaning participating in ways beyond passive listening, students “undertake higher-order thinking, forcing them to engage in analysis, synthesis and evaluation.”<sup>6</sup> One way that educators have used technology to foster active learning is through the use of handheld transmitters which provide immediate feedback to the professor as students respond to questions presented to them and

---

<sup>1</sup> id at 45

<sup>2</sup> Phillip C. Kissam, *Law School Examinations*, 42 *Vand. L. Rev.* 433, 436 (1989)

<sup>3</sup>William M. Sullivan, Anne Colby, Judith Welch Wegner, Lloyd Bond & Lee Shulman, *Educating Lawyers: Preparation for the Profession of Law* (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching) at p. 5

<sup>4</sup> Id

<sup>5</sup> Paul Caron and Rafael Gely, *Taking Back the Law School Classroom: Using Technology to Foster Active Student Learning* (2003)

<sup>6</sup> Id page 4

automatically “tracks the individual student’s performance throughout the semester”<sup>1</sup>

## **Methodology**

To enhance student learning, tutorial sessions were implemented to allow for repetition, explanation and discussion of first year Real Property in law school. Knowledge of Real Property, a required course and an area assessed on the bar exam, was selected as the content area with the idea of enhancing student performance on the comprehensive exam at the end of the first year and ultimately on the bar exam. The tutors used Student Response Systems (clickers) to test the students’ knowledge of the material by using pre-examination questions about material that was covered during the tutorial session, which coincided with class materials. During the pre-examination, student responses were revealed, but not the correct answers. Tutorials were then conducted. Students also answered workbook questions and participated in group exercises that were followed by peer evaluations. The tutor then lead group discussions to comment and further analyze the questions.

At the conclusion of the session, the students were given post-tutorial examinations, repeating the questions from the pre-examination. The post results were revealed and compared with the pre results. Finally, the correct answers were revealed and the students had the opportunity to have an open floor discussion reviewing each individual question.

Using ‘clickers,’ students could answer questions in tutorial and direct group discussions. Research has shown that clickers increase engagement, motivation and achievement in students. We used clickers to support our school’s assessment process. In class and tutorials, clickers support both teaching and learning by providing immediate feedback, actively engaging students, increasing motivation, and providing a variety of interactive assessment opportunities. Already, Thurgood Marshall School of Law, with preliminary use with one section (about one fourth of the class) had evidence from a previous study conducted by the author that this format resulted in the section’s higher achievement on the comprehensive exam (compared to the other sections) and another group with whom it was used had higher bar exam passage rates.

First, each participant received classroom instruction. The instruction consisted of three fifty-minute weekly lectures provided by the professor. Second, the lectures were followed by weekly class tutorial sessions instructed by the tutors. The tutorial sessions consisted of abbreviated lectures that targeted problem areas. Third, the class tutorial was followed by additional tutoring sessions consisting mainly consists of upper-level students targeting individual or small groups of students. All three stages of learning were directed by the feedback generated by the clicker tests and exam.

---

<sup>1</sup> Id at page 21

This case-study report provides a view of the impact of using this technology in the legal classroom along with formative assessment to guide the intervention. Specifically, this study was conducted to determine how technology in the formative assessment of law students could be used in the classroom to affect learning outcomes. The study is intended to demonstrate whether integrating technology in the legal classroom can provide useful information in developing strategies to enhance teaching, learning, and achievement in the legal community. In addition, the study will show whether or not the use of formative assessment aids could assist in improving the educational achievement of students. The central question of this case-study is:

*Did the students participating in the study that used formative assessment aids perform better on the year-end comprehensive exam than students who did not because they are receiving more tailored instruction and intervention?*

This study includes data collected from two sections (Sections 1 and 2) of Thurgood Marshall School of Law's incoming class. The study compares the two sections with the performance of the rest of the first year class (two other sections) in the subject of Real Property. The study also highlights how individual intervention affected performance. The outcome was measured by the results of the year-end comprehensive exam in Real Property. At Thurgood Marshall School of Law, each first year course is tested with a uniform comprehensive exam designed with input from professors of all other sections. The comprehensive exam is summative and provides half of the grade the student will achieve in the class. The professor in the section provides the other fifty percent of the grade. Additionally, a tutor is assigned for each section for every first year subject and the tutor holds weekly meetings with the students.

At the beginning of the school year, students are provided a syllabus that describes the objectives and methodology of the course. The syllabus also informs the students how they will be graded. The syllabus for Sections 1 and 2, the participants in this study, identified nine areas of Real Property law (units) that are taught by all first year professors and are tested on the comprehensive exam. Student outcomes are identified for each area and relevant exams, exercises, practice quizzes and drafting exercises are also included.

The students from Sections 1 and 2 received instruction through a three-tiered approach: 1) classroom instruction; 2) class tutorials; and 3) additional tutorials (small group or individual tutorials). To determine the level of instruction at each tier, the students participated in taking pre and post-tests ("Clicker tests") in addition to traditional midterm and end-of-semester exams. The clicker tests provided immediate feedback, allowing students to self-evaluate their performance while simultaneously allowing the professor and tutors to tailor classroom and tutorial instruction.

The tool used to administer the clicker tests was the use of a personal response system in which the students responded to a multiple-choice exam with handheld devices: clickers, computers, or smart phones. When a question was projected in the classroom and on students' devices, student answers are

received and both the students and the instructor can immediately see the distribution of results.

Students were administered a pre-test before each unit. The results show the students' general preparation for the unit by testing general rules of law. The feedback helped the professor plan the course of each unit's instruction. Any pre-test question that received a correct response from seventy per cent or more of the class required less instruction; any question that received less than seventy per cent received more. Throughout the classroom instruction, the professor administered benchmark clicker tests to gauge the progress of student learning. Using this process the professor was able to target difficult concepts in a more strategic manner before proceeding to the next unit.

A post-test was given at the conclusion of each unit. The questions tested the students' ability to identify the legal issue, apply the pertinent rule of law, analyse the facts based on that rule, and reach the appropriate conclusion. Any question that received a correct response from seventy per cent of the class was considered successful while any question that received less prompted the professor to continue teaching the subject or to delegate to the tutors responsibility to spend more time on the subject.

The students also took traditional, comprehensive, multiple choice midterm and end-of-semester exams in the Fall and Spring. As the year progressed and more units were taught, each exam had more questions and had greater weight. The results provided feedback on general student performance. Following the Fall end-of-semester exam, the bottom 20% of students were identified for additional tutoring.

Additionally, the professor shared the feedback from the clicker tests and exams with the tutors so that the weekly tutorials could be strategically focused on problem areas. While other tutors may use a variety of assessment tools to measure the level of success of individual tutoring sessions, Section 1 and 2 tutors used the data to identify instructional weak points, and target struggling students that needed additional tutoring. This process allowed the professor and tutors to collaboratively identify points of weakness and strength to improve the curriculum and boost academic performance.

### **Class Tutoring**

In order to enhance student learning, weekly class tutorial sessions were formulated to allow for repetition and discussion of particular concepts so that students had a more thorough understanding of the material.

Tutorial classroom sessions began with the tutors meeting with the professor. After the professor administered a pre and post-test for a particular unit, he met with the tutors to assess the progress of the students by evaluating the clicker test and exam results. These data were used to prepare and administer a pre-tutorial examination using Turning Technologies for the purpose of testing the students' knowledge of the subject. The pre-examination consisted of questions from material that followed the curriculum. When the

pre-examination was completed, the students' responses were revealed, but the actual answers were not. Following the students' responses, a brief tutorial was conducted to cover the material designated to be taught for that session and coinciding with what was being taught by the professor during the class sessions.

Additionally, as a supplemental teaching tool, the tutors provided the students with questions from workbooks via clicker tests that are designed to correspond with the class syllabus. During this time, the students work through questions in groups and then peer evaluate their classmates' responses. The students are encouraged to defend and advocate their position and understanding of the law to other students in their group.

At the termination of the teaching and peer evaluation session, the students were given the post-tutorial examination, a repeat of the questions given during the pre-tutorial examination but without the correct answers revealed. The responses were again revealed and compared with the previous responses given from the pre-tutorial examination. Finally, the answers to the questions were revealed and the students then had the opportunity to have an open floor discussion reviewing each individual question.

At the conclusion of the tutorial session the results of the students' responses were compiled for latter analysis. The students who scored less than seventy percent (70%) were identified and targeted for additional individualized tutoring. To facilitate these students in their development of knowledge of the law, we provided small group lectures, case synthesis, additional quizzes, sample problems, one-on-one specially tailored reviews and illustrations of relevant topics.

### **Individualized Tutoring**

After the completion of the Fall semester, the professor and tutors created a "watch" list of students comprised of the students receiving the lowest 20% on the exam to target after the Spring midterm. The professor also requested all students to submit a copy of their most current Real Property outline. After the outlines were submitted, the tutors carefully examined the outlines of the students on the watch list. During a regular tutorial session, the tutors discussed the quality of the submitted outlines. Specifically targeting the watch list students, the tutors wrote individual comments on their outlines. After the spring midterm, the bottom ten students from both sections were randomly divided between two tutors assigned to each section, each tutor taking five students.

Each tutor contacted the five students assigned to them, explained their place in the class ranking at that time, and offered individualized assistance. Collectively the tutors report that their individual efforts included reviewing and correcting the student's outline, completing practice questions, and discussing property concepts not quickly understood in class such as easements, covenants, and landlord tenant issues.

Of the twenty students who were targeted for individualized assistance, the tutors report that on average only three of the five targeted students in each group were receptive to the efforts and scheduled time every week with the tutor. The other students sporadically scheduled meetings, and only one student outright refused the assistance. Described below is a snap shot of the individual tutoring sessions between the five targeted students and their tutors. (See Table 1)

Overall, the target students who committed to the individualized tutoring sessions and followed through with tutor recommendations showed an increase in subject knowledge and test taking skills with increased scores from his/her initial ranking in the bottom 20% of the group. Following the Spring midterm, six of the twenty target students or 30% of the students scored at or above the class average. At the end of the Fall final, eleven of the twenty target students or 55% of the students scored at or above the class average. This indicated an increase of 25% of the students' scoring at or above average after consistent tutoring.

For example, as a result of Mr. Morales's (one of the tutors) individual work with student 4102, the student scored an above average score on both the midterm examination and final examination of the Spring Semester. This student also managed to achieve a higher letter grade than students who were not designated for additional tutoring.

On average, the students who resisted the individualized tutoring (i.e., did not meet weekly with the tutors) saw a slower rate of improvement. In fact, the most resistant target students received the lowest overall grade. For instance, student 4384 showed minimal improvement on the Spring final and eventually received a D in the course. This student was extremely hesitant to attend tutoring, and only reached out after a poor showing on the midterm. Student 4607 refused assistance and received a D in the course.

Despite the initial resistance, the data demonstrates a notable increase in student achievement as a result of individualized tutoring sessions. As a result of these efforts, 90% or 18/20 of the target students achieved a letter grade of C or higher in Real Property.

### **Comprehensive Exam**

To further explore the impact of these techniques, the performance of Section 1 and 2 students on the comprehensive exam was compared to those of the other two sections. In 2012, Thurgood Marshall distributed letter grades for Real Property accordingly: (See Table 2)

Comparing the achievement among the students in Section 1 and 2 and those of Section 3 and 4, the data illustrates that there are some notable differences. First, the results indicate that more students in Section 1 and 2 were more likely to receive a B- or above as opposed to the other sections. Out of 94 students in that range, the breakdown is as follows: Section 1 with 30

students, Section 2 with 28 students, Section 3 with 24 students, and Section 4 with 14 students.

While these results are encouraging as far as representing improvement of the student's performance they do not overwhelmingly point to the use of this study's design as a road for student achievement. Section 2 performed somewhat better than Section 1, under the same treatment, for example. Also, the mean on the comprehensive Exam by each section was as follows: Section 1=33, Section 2=34, Section 3=35, and section 4=33. The initial goal of increasing the mean for Sections 1 and 2 was not realized (the goal was 38). There are a couple of factors felt to be germane and worthy of further investigation. The first is the composition of the comprehensive exam. For this year, the questions were selected from a pool of questions by the professor from section 3, which may have inadvertently affected the result. A possible solution may be to have each section's professor select a corresponding "share" of the questions from the pool to comprise the exam.

Also, the differences in the role of the tutors and research assistants conducting the additional tutoring between Section 1 and 2 may have contributed to differences between Section 1 and 2 regarding performance. Section 1's additional tutorials were primarily conducted by highly qualified research assistants (both had A in Property in their first year of law) but who were not involved in the tutorials as the same level of the tutors.

However, the number of B's and higher grades were more frequent in Sections 1 and 2, and the number of low performing students was decreased in these two sections, which may signal the need to expand the efforts of formative assessments and targeted instruction beyond the lowest 20% of students.



**Table 1**

<b>Final Grades of Target Students</b>				
<b>Student ID #</b>	<b>Spring Midterm Grade/Class Average</b>	<b>Spring Final Grade/Class Average</b>	<b>Comprehensive Exam Grade/Average</b>	<b>Overall Course Grade</b>
<b>Tutor: Rodolfo Morales III</b>				
4102	25/21	25.67/20.85	34/	C+
4123	20/21	22.17/20.85	28/	C
4033	20/21	18.67/20.85	31/	C
4617	17/21	19.83/20.85	31/	C
4322	20/21	31.50/20.85	33/	C+
<b>Tutor: Patricia Wagner</b>				
4632	21/21	26.83/20.85	31/	C
4602	13/21	24.50/20.85	40/	C
4796	20/21	22.17/20.85	40/	C+
4732	16/21	18.67/20.85	32/	C
4620	21/21	18.67/20.85	32/	C
<b>Tutor: Jason Oxner</b>				
4990	15/22	17.50/19.74	36/	C+
4905	20/22	22.17/19.74	30/	C
4569	22/22	18.67/19.74	27/	C
4596	21/22	22.17/19.74	29/	C
4989	19/22	19.83/19.74	23/	C
<b>Tutor: Hillary Larsen</b>				
4585	22/22	18.67/19.74	28/	C
4625	21/22	19.83/19.74	32/	C
4463	22/22	22.17/19.74	25/	C
4384	14/22	18.67/19.74	26/	D
4607*	15/22	17.50/19.74	24/	D

\*Declined individual tutoring.

**Table 2**

<b>Grade:</b>	<b>Total:</b>
A	11
A-	8
B+	18
B	10
B-	29
C+	47
C	60
D+	1
D	4
D-	2
F	1

<b>Final Grade By Section</b>				
Grade:	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Section 4
A	1	6	4	0
A-	2	3	2	1
B+	5	4	5	4
B	10	8	5	5
B-	12	5	8	4
C+	9	8	10	20
C	13	17	13	17
D+	0	0	1	1
D	2	1	0	0
D-	1	0	0	1
F	0	1	0	0

**Final Grade Assigned By Section**

