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LSSSE Quick Facts

Survey
Administered to all students at participating law schools via the Internet. Supported by law school participation fees. Survey completion time is 15–20 minutes.

Objectives
Provide data to law schools to improve legal education and inform decision-making, enhance student learning, inform accreditation compliance efforts, and facilitate internal assessment and analysis.

Support
LSSSE is housed at Indiana University’s Center for Postsecondary Research. Since its inception, LSSSE has benefitted from close working relationships with the Association of American Law Schools and The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Participating Law Schools
One hundred and seventy-nine different law schools have participated in LSSSE since 2004.

Respondents and Response Rates
In 2012, 25,901 students at 81 law schools responded to the LSSSE survey. The average institutional response rate was 46%.

Audiences
Law school administrators and faculty, current and prospective law students, alumni, advisory boards, trustees, institutional researchers, accrediting organizations, and researchers studying legal education.

Data Sources
JD/LLB students from participating law schools in the United States, Canada, and Australia. Supplemental information comes from the American Bar Association and the Law School Admission Council.

Cost
Participation fees range from $3,000 to $5,000, based upon student enrollment.

Participation Agreement
Participating law schools agree that LSSSE may use the aggregated data for national reporting purposes and other legal education initiatives, including research and scholarship. Law schools may use their own data for institutional purposes, including improving legal education and policy-making, research, and compliance. Results specific to a law school and identified as such will not be made public by LSSSE except by mutual agreement between the school and LSSSE.

Figure 1 Affiliation of LSSSE 2012 U.S. Law Schools Compared with National Profile*

Figure 2 Size of LSSSE 2012 U.S. Law Schools Compared with National Profile*

* National percentages include all ABA-approved law schools in the U.S. (including LSSSE 2012 participating schools) and are based on publicly available data from the ABA and the LSAC.
Everyone involved in legal education thinks they know how law students learn and how they experience law school. We generalize from our own experiences as law students and from anecdotal information. The Law School Survey of Student Engagement is invaluable because of its comprehensiveness and its rigor. As the dean of a new law school, I have found it indispensable in providing concrete information in a vast array of areas about our students’ experiences. It has reinforced some of our conceptions, changed others, and helped identify areas for change and areas to not change. It is enormously helpful to be able to compare ourselves to peer schools, to schools of similar size, and to all law schools.

Particularly important to me are measures of experiential learning by law students. Every student of legal education, including most recently the Carnegie Commission, has said that there needs to be more emphasis on this in law schools. There is no way to learn to be a lawyer except by doing it. I often have remarked that it is unthinkable that medical schools could graduate doctors who had never seen patients or that they would declare that they just wanted to teach their students to think like doctors.

At my school, we have implemented a requirement that all students have a clinic in order to graduate, and virtually all will do so in an in-house clinic supervised by a full-time faculty member. We also encourage participation in externship programs, clinics that do not satisfy the graduation requirement, and pro bono work. The LSSSE survey provided a measure of this engagement.

I was thus very interested in the LSSSE data concerning 2012 graduates in terms of their experiential learning. LSSSE data reveals that “76% have participated in a clinical internship or field experience, and 65% have completed some form of volunteer or pro bono work, up from 68% and 55%, respectively, in 2005.” The improvement over the past seven years is notable. Yet, it is still discouraging that 35% of students graduate without having done any pro bono and about a quarter graduate without having experiential learning, such as a clinical internship or field experience.

Another area of great interest is how students report their interaction with their peers and faculty members. Without LSSSE data, there is nothing but impressions. All law schools use teaching evaluations to gather information about learning in classrooms, but rarely is there data about all of the learning that goes on outside of class, with both students and faculty members.

The new LSSSE statistics provide encouraging news. For example, “[s]ixty percent of all LSSSE respondents report that their relationships with other students are friendly and supportive (6 or 7 on a 7-point scale), compared to just 11% of all students who report negative relationships with peers (1, 2, or 3 on a 7-point scale).” I was especially pleased to see that there is no indication that women are less likely to engage in collaborative learning.

“I am more than satisfied with my law school education, and I am grateful to be so lucky to be learning from such wonderful professors and peers.”

–Comment from 2L student
learning than male law students, or that students of color are less likely to do so than white students. The LSSSE data show that female students are just as likely to engage in collaborative study, discuss ideas with classmates and have serious conversations with other students. Similarly, students of color are equally likely as others to study and discuss ideas with their classmates.

I was interested to see that students who participate in study groups are more likely to evaluate their law school experiences positively and to say that they would have chosen the same law school. The message is that I, and my law school, should do even more to encourage this.

The LSSSE recent information about student-faculty interaction provides a more mixed message. On the one hand, it reinforces the importance of student-faculty interactions as crucial in a student’s feelings about law school. I was encouraged that women and minority students report as many faculty interactions as male and white students, respectively. I often have worried that, for many reasons, women and students of color were likely to have fewer interactions with faculty outside of class.

But at the same time, the LSSSE statistics provide a sobering message about the overall level of successful student-faculty interactions. Only slightly fewer than half of students (45%) describe their instructors as highly supportive and encouraging. Only about a third of students describe their instructors as caring about them as individuals. A quarter have never talked about course issues (unrelated to a specific assignment) with a professor.

As a dean, this convinces me that law schools need to do more to facilitate positive interactions between students and faculty. As we design a new building, I want it to have an architecture conducive to such interactions. We need to provide funds for students and faculty to interact outside of class, such as for professors to have students over to their homes for seminars or small group meetings. Ensuring small sections in the first year and small class opportunities throughout are also important in facilitating student-faculty interactions.

Much is uncertain and changing in legal education. Applications are down, tuition is up, and job markets remain problematic. Now more than ever, it is essential that law schools have reliable data for making decisions. LSSSE is essential and invaluable in this regard. LSSSE does something else more subtle that is tremendously important: It is a powerful reminder that law schools exist, most of all, for our students and their legal education.

Erwin Chemerinsky
Dean and Distinguished Professor of Law
University of California, Irvine School of Law

“I’ve had a tremendous learning experience [in law school] and feel educationally enriched.”
--Comment from 3L student
U.S. law schools might look back on the 2011–2012 academic year as their *annus horribilis*. Law schools have been under siege on various fronts, from criticisms for what they teach and fail to teach, to challenges to the accuracy and completeness of reporting employment and application statistics, and critiques of their financial structures. Adding to the uncertainty surrounding the future of law schools has been news of declining applications, reductions in class sizes, and the growing disparity between rising tuition and decreasing job opportunities. Taken together, one might well conclude that law schools are failing in much of what they attempt, including educating their students.

But all news is not bad, at least from the perspective of recent graduates. A *National Law Journal* article sounded a positive—if somewhat surprised—note in reporting on results of a Kaplan Bar Review survey of law graduates of the class of 2012 regarding their assessment of the quality of their legal education. Kaplan administered its survey just after the July 2012 bar exam and received responses from 705 graduates. In response to a question about the “quality of their overall legal education,” 90% of respondents rated their law schools in the A to B range, based on a scale of A to F. More specifically, the responses were arrayed as follows:

- A: 37%
- B: 53%
- C: 9%
- D: 1%

None of the respondents failed their law school on quality, according to Kaplan. The Kaplan results echo the findings of the *After-the-JD* study of lawyers who graduated and passed the bar in 2000. That study found that approximately three quarters of respondents indicated that they are moderately or extremely satisfied with their decision to become a lawyer. Similar levels of satisfaction were reported three years after graduation, too.

Is it possible to align these disparate messages? How can recent graduates be so positive about the quality of their legal education if law schools are floundering in so many ways? In part, the dissonance between the two extremes may be explained merely by the constraints and norms of the popular media, including attention-grabbing headlines and limited space for analysis. But aligning the conflicting messages also requires context. This is sometimes absent in reporting, requires a deeper investigation of issues, takes more time and space to present, and often leads to a more nuanced story that may not grab headline attention.

The issue of student satisfaction, addressed in Kaplan’s survey, is one that screams for context. Are law students less satisfied today than they were before the 2008 financial crisis and its reverberations were felt by the profession and market for new law graduates? Given the rhetoric of doom about law schools in the press, one might assume that satisfaction has decreased proportionately. And regardless of longitudinal trends, what explains student satisfaction? Can law schools do more to increase satisfaction while also staying true to their educational missions?

Data from the Law School Survey of Student Engagement provides some answers, offering an historical and analytical context for interpreting the question of law student satisfaction. LSSSE’s data on satisfaction is generally consistent with the Kaplan survey, although slightly less positive than Kaplan’s. Two questions address overall satisfaction. The first asks, “How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at your law school?” Possible answers are “excellent,” “good,” “fair,” and “poor.” The second question asks students, “If you could start over again, would you go to the same law school you are now attending?” Answer choices are: “definitely yes,” “probably yes,” “probably no,” and “definitely no.” Figures 3 and 4 set out the results for third- and fourth-year students who responded to the LSSSE survey in 2012.
For each of these questions, approximately three-quarters of students—and sometimes more—responded positively (combining the top two response options). While not quite as positive as Kaplan’s 90%, these LSSSE data provide a similarly positive counterweight to the negative popular message regarding legal education carried in other discussions over the past year or so. To provide more context, Table 1 sets out responses for first- and second-year students to these same questions; it includes the third- and fourth-year group for comparison. While there are modest variations among classes, the overall message of satisfaction is quite consistent.

LSSSE data also contradict the assumption that students are less satisfied today than they were before the 2008 financial crisis, when the market for their services was more robust. Despite a growing chorus of crisis and disaster in the press, students’ evaluation of their legal education as well as their likelihood of attending the same school if they could begin anew have been remarkably stable over the years. Figures 5 and 6 show LSSSE survey results for each year beginning in 2004, when LSSSE first surveyed a similar number of law schools. Generally, slightly more than 80% of respondents consistently have been satisfied with their overall law school experience, while slightly more than three-quarters of all respondents indicated they were likely to attend the same law school if they could start anew.

Given that students’ assessments appear to be insensitive to changes in the marketplace and costs of legal education, despite increases in tuition of more than 80% for public law schools and approximately 45% for private law schools, what explains their satisfaction—or lack thereof? Analysis of LSSSE data reveals that several aspects of student engagement relate positively to

---

**Table 1** Responses to Two Satisfaction Questions, 2012, All Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at your law school?</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1L</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2L</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3L + 4L</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you could start over again, would you go to the same law school you are now attending?</th>
<th>Definitely yes</th>
<th>Probably yes</th>
<th>Probably no</th>
<th>Definitely no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1L</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2L</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3L + 4L</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
overall satisfaction. These include students’ perceptions of the law school environment and its advisory and support services, the quality of relationships with classmates and interactions with faculty, and the academic emphasis of courses. To more fully understand the recipe for student satisfaction, therefore, it is instructive to investigate the factors that affect student engagement in these and other areas.

Two factors relevant to student satisfaction are highlighted in these LSSSE Annual Survey Results. First, student-faculty interaction—which includes discussions in class and about class-related matters as well as communication in the form of prompt feedback on academic work, collaboration on issues unrelated to class, and conversations about career plans—is discussed in Investigating Student-Faculty Interaction. In addition to relating positively to student satisfaction, faculty interaction also relates to students’ perceptions of their own development academically and personally. The same connection is present in the relationship between satisfaction and peer interaction, discussed in Connecting with Classmates: students who report positive relationships with peers are more likely to choose the same law school again. They also are more likely to report making strides in their ability to think critically and analytically, among other things.

Satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not particularly illuminated with a single-lens view; rather, satisfaction is a function of its component parts. By exploring the factors that affect students’ judgments, it becomes clear that satisfaction relates to the substance of what law schools do as well as to the environment in which that substance is offered. The data generated by LSSSE begin to explain these relationships, and for law schools that participate in LSSSE, school-level data offer a foundation for understanding the ways in which students experience their schools.

Helping law schools become more effective in educating students is the mission of LSSSE. Regardless of whether the climate for law schools is positive or negative, our focus is on supporting schools in learning about what they are doing well, where there is room for improvement, and what they can do to improve. While it may be difficult to design a thoughtful response to headlines, responding to the lessons presented by LSSSE data offers a pragmatic and focused way forward.

Carole Silver
LSSSE Director
Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research
Professor of Law
Indiana University Maurer School of Law
The Law School Survey of Student Engagement focuses on activities that affect learning in law school. The results show how law students use their time, what they think about their experience in law school, and what schools can do to improve engagement and learning.

The selected results reported in this section are based on responses from 25,901 law students at 81 law schools who completed LSSSE in Spring 2012. We also draw upon responses to a set of experimental questions appended to the survey and given to a subset of the 2012 respondents. We feature selected results that explore similarities and differences within populations of law school students.

These results represent just a small sampling of the information LSSSE collects each year. In addition to the three themes featured on the following pages, LSSSE data let us learn more about how certain law school programs, practices, and curricular efforts relate to student success and student engagement; changes in the law school experience from year to year; how various types of students experience law school; and much more. These findings can yield important lessons about the law school experience writ large and, at the school-level, about experiences of students in the classroom. Below, we highlight just a few results to provide a better idea of the breadth of issues that LSSSE data can inform:

- Nearly a quarter of students (23%) prefer to work in government settings following law school, while 49% list private law practice as their preferred setting.
- Nearly one in three third-year students (31%) has worked with a faculty member on a research project outside of course programs or requirements during the course of law school.
- Twelve percent of students report that they never receive prompt feedback, either written or oral, on their academic performance from faculty.
- Seventy percent of students agree strongly (6 or 7 on a 7-point scale) that their end-of-course exams challenge them to do their very best work.
- The average 1L student spends 21 hours per week reading assigned material, compared to 17 and 13 hours per week for average 2L and 3L students, respectively.
- Twenty percent of first-year students do not plan to participate in law journal. While more than half of 1Ls (53%) do intend to join a law journal, only 40% of students have done so by their third year.
- Three out of four students (75%) report that their law school places a substantial emphasis on encouraging the ethical practice of law.
- Among those students who use law school-provided personal counseling and support services, 64% are satisfied with these services.
- Fifty-nine percent of students report that their law school experience contributes substantially to their understanding of themselves. Thirteen percent of students report that their law school experience contributes very little to self-understanding.
- Five percent of 3Ls are pursuing joint degrees. Among those students, more than a third (37%) are enrolled in JD/MBA programs.

“I am mostly satisfied with [my law school experience], but I would advise the law school to consider its strategic objectives in light of the changing legal education market.”
—Comment from 3L student
Law school faculty play many roles. They help shape the culture of a school. Their scholarship plays a critical role in forming their school’s academic reputation. Their service to the profession can further a law school’s educational mission. And, of course, they also are teachers, and one of their crucial tasks is educating students.

LSSSE data suggest that students benefit tremendously from their relationships with professors. Our analysis reveals that interaction with faculty relates significantly to students’ perceptions of their own gains in both academic and personal dimensions. Student-faculty interaction influences students’ assessment of their writing, speaking, and legal research skills; job- or work-related knowledge and skills; and critical and analytical thinking, among other factors. In terms of personal development, student-faculty interaction positively relates to students’ understanding of themselves and others, and to their development of a personal code of values and ethics and a sense of contribution to the welfare of the community. Finally, interaction with faculty also relates positively to students’ report of their grades.

Interaction with faculty not only affects students’ sense of development, it also affects their overall level of satisfaction with law school. LSSSE data show that student-faculty interaction is strongly related to students’ likelihood of choosing the same law school again and of their evaluation of their entire educational experience (Table 2). Similarly, student-faculty interaction also relates positively to students’ sense of the supportiveness of the law school environment and to their perception of the emphasis their coursework places on higher order learning activities.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of Student-Faculty Interaction on Student Satisfaction and Gains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction with entire law school experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likelihood of attending the same law school again</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic gains</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal gains</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student-reported grades</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Investigating Student-Faculty Interaction

“[My] professors are always available and do not hesitate to provide anything needed by their students. Many professors make themselves available for additional office hours even before students ask them for extra help.”

—Comment from 1L student
Clearly, faculty matter to students. Given the strong benefit to students of these interactions with faculty, it is reassuring to note that LSSSE data do not show significant differences among different groups of students in levels of student-faculty interaction. No significant differences with regard to the amount of interaction with faculty are evident based on students’ race, ethnicity, or gender. While students with lower LSAT scores are slightly less likely to interact with faculty, and students who report higher grades in law school are slightly more likely to interact with faculty, these relationships were small but significant. More influential in terms of faculty interaction are student behaviors (asking questions in class) and activities ( moot court and law journal participation, and leading a law school organization), suggesting that students who are more inclined to speak up in class also are more likely to seek out professors to discuss assignments and issues, and those who involve themselves in co-curricular activities may have more opportunities to work with faculty who are advisors.

Generally, law students report positive relationships with faculty. Nearly half of students (45%) report that their instructors are highly supportive and encouraging. More than a third of students (38%) feel that their professors care about them as individuals. Fifty-seven percent report feeling strongly that faculty respect students.13

Despite these positive results, LSSSE data also suggest that students’ interactions with professors are limited in scope. While half of students frequently discuss assignments with faculty, 25% have never talked with them outside of class about course issues or readings. Nineteen percent of students have never talked to an instructor about an issue unrelated to coursework. One-third of students have never talked to a professor about which courses to take in law school, and one-quarter of students have never talked to a faculty member about career plans or career advice (Table 3).

Table 3  Percent of Students Who Report Never Talking with a Professor About Select Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talked with faculty outside of class about topics unrelated to coursework</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked with faculty about which courses to take in law school</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked with faculty about career plans or career advice</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data underscore the impact that faculty can have on student growth, student outcomes—even student satisfaction with the law school experience as a whole. While our findings aver the importance of student-faculty interaction, they also suggest that additional opportunities exist for more meaningful interaction. Law schools may draw on these findings in considering strategies to promote and facilitate such interaction.

“I feel like the faculty is disconnected from the student body. I think [this] would improve if the law school implemented a mentoring program between professors and third-year students.”

–Comment from 3L student
The environment for learning in law school is determined by a variety of factors, including the relationships students develop with one another. Peer interaction may affect not only whether students enjoy law school, but also activities that impact student learning.

Although the popular image of law school is one of intense competition among students, data reveal a more nuanced picture. Most students have positive attitudes toward their classmates. Sixty percent of all LSSSE respondents report that their relationships with other students are friendly and supportive (6 or 7 on a 7-point scale), compared to just 11% of all students who report negative relationships with peers (1, 2, or 3 on a 7-point scale).

These findings are promising, not only in terms of the climate of law school, but also in terms of their impact on student learning. Students who report positive relationships with their classmates are more likely than other students to engage with them in discussions about ideas or course issues outside of class, have serious conversations with students who differ from them in substantive ways (political opinions, religious beliefs, or personal values), and study collaboratively. Each of these types of interactions relate positively to student growth and development.

Our analysis of LSSSE 2012 data reveals that students benefit from peer interaction in both academic and personal dimensions. Interaction with classmates relates significantly to students’ development in writing, speaking, and legal research skills, job- or work-related knowledge and skills, and critical and analytical thinking, among other factors. Similarly, students’ level of peer interaction positively influences their ability to understand themselves and others, their development of a personal code of values and ethics, and their sense of contribution to the welfare of the community.

While research has suggested that female law students suffer from an inhospitable climate that impedes their ability to flourish academically, LSSSE data do not reveal significant differences by gender in overall levels of peer interaction (a combined measurement of interaction that includes collaborative study, discussing ideas with classmates, and having serious conversations with other students who differ from them), nor are there any significant differences in these various aspects of peer interaction when measured individually. That is, female students report that they engage in such activities with the same frequency as male students. Similarly, female and male students are equally as likely to report that their relationships with other students are friendly and supportive. With regard to possible differences among students based on their race or ethnicity, our analysis revealed that students of color were just as likely as white students to work with classmates outside of class and to discuss ideas from their readings or courses with other students. However, students of color are less likely than white students to report that their relationships with classmates are positive, and students of color are more likely than white students to have serious conversations with students who differ from them in terms of race or ethnicity. These differences may offer law schools starting points for investigating their own student populations and addressing disparities.

Law school provides a variety of opportunities for peer interaction—from participation in law student organizations to discussions that occur in social settings—each of which provides a path for students to connect with classmates in ways that can enhance learning and engagement. Study groups are a common avenue of connection. Seventy-seven percent of all students and 86% of 1Ls report taking part in a study group at least once during the current academic year. While participation in a study group has no correlation to higher law school grades as reported by students, it does relate positively to students’ perception of their academic and personal development (including gains with regard to writing, speaking, research, and job-related skills; developing a personal code of values; and understanding themselves). Further, students who participate in a study group report higher levels of satisfaction with their overall law school experience and are more likely to choose the same law school again. These findings suggest that while study group participation may not guarantee an exceptional performance on the end-of-course exam, such interactions can deepen a student’s sense of learning and belonging in law school.

Despite the high proportion of students who have participated in a study group, regular collaborative study is less common. Seventeen percent of students report meeting with a study group on a regular basis, 26% of students regularly study together with one other classmate, and 20% of students regularly meet
up with a classmate to study individually, but at a specified time and place. Nearly a third of students (31%) regularly share notes or outlines with classmates. Each of these activities relates positively to student gains across several dimensions, and especially in terms of students’ ability to work effectively with others, to understand people of other backgrounds, to contribute to community welfare, and to develop a personal code of ethics. Studying together also positively relates to student gains in terms of developing clearer career goals. As one might expect, sharing notes or outlines has less of an impact on student gains than other types of collaboration, however.

Given the positive effect of peer interaction on students’ development, it is promising to note that a majority of students engage in the type of intellectual, issue-based discussion that can really benefit their learning. Two thirds (65%) of law students report that they frequently discuss ideas from their courses with others outside of class, and the same proportion of students frequently discuss serious issues with students who differ from them in terms of beliefs, opinions, or values. Seventy-five percent of students participate in a law school organization, where interaction with other students likely occurs.

At the same time, research on teaching and learning underscores that students benefit from working together on assignments and in-class projects, but law schools have yet to emphasize these opportunities. Only 18% of students report that they frequently work together on projects or assignments during class, while close to one-third (31%) frequently work with classmates to complete assignments outside of class. As with study groups, these group activities relate positively to students’ sense of growth in multiple dimensions, especially their ability to work effectively with others, understand people of other backgrounds, contribute to community welfare, and solve complex real-world problems.

These findings confirm that students benefit from opportunities to learn collaboratively. Whether studying one-on-one with another student to prepare for an exam or working with a group during class on a project, these interactions allow students to develop competencies that are essential to practice. Increasingly, law firms look for evidence of an ability to work well with others in hiring, compensation, and advancement decisions. To prepare students fully for future practice, law schools may wish to structure opportunities that allow students to learn from one another, and to encourage students to interact with classmates. By drawing on this rich resource—one another—students can enhance the value of their law school experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Impact of Study Group Participation on Student Satisfaction, Grades and Gains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>1L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with entire law school experience</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of choosing the same law school again</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law school grades (self-reported)</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal gains¹</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic gains²</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹. Institution-level controls include size and affiliation of the law school; student-level controls include gender, race, enrollment status, self-reported grades, and law school class.
². Personal gains include: to what degree did your experience at this law school during the current academic year contribute to your development in terms of understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds, a personal code of values and ethics, contributing to the welfare of the community, and understanding yourself.
³. Academic gains include: to what degree did your experience at this law school during the current academic year contribute to your sense of development in terms of clear and effective writing and speaking skills, critical and analytical thinking, legal research skills, the ability to learn effectively on your own, acquiring job-related knowledge and skills, and acquiring a broad legal education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Percent of Students Who Frequently Engage in Select Activities by Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>1L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with other students on projects during class</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare assignments</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes response options “very often” and “often.”
Examining Experiential Learning

Law schools are investing in experiential learning opportunities, but are all experiential opportunities alike? In this section, we explore several differences that emerge from analyzing LSSSE 2012 data on experiential legal education.

Experiential education is on the rise in law school, whether through skills-based curricula or practice-oriented programs. A greater proportion of students surveyed by LSSSE are participating in clinics, externships, and skills courses. According to 2012 LSSSE data from third-year students, for example, 76% have participated in a clinical internship or field experience, and 65% have completed some form of volunteer or pro bono work, up from 68% and 55%, respectively, in 2005.

Analysis of LSSSE 2012 data reveals that participation in experiential learning activities (such as for-credit clinical courses, field placements or internships, and pro bono work) positively relates to students’ perception that their law school classes emphasize higher order learning activities, including analysis and synthesis of ideas and information, making judgments about the value of information, and applying theories and concepts to practical problems or in new situations (Table 6). Higher order learning, in turn, is associated with students’ sense of acquiring a broad legal education. Data also show that participation in experiential learning activities significantly and positively affects students’ perception that they are developing in personal and academic dimensions (Table 7), including writing, speaking, research, and job-related skills. Such findings suggest that clinical projects for credit, pro bono work, and field experiences offer students opportunities to fine-tune their thinking, to sift, sort, and analyze information in ways that likely will benefit them in future law practice. Taken together, they suggest that experiential education not only is accomplishing one of its primary goals of “develop[ing] competence,” but also helping students develop the “attributes of effective lawyers.”

According to clinical faculty, “self-reflection, intellectual and analytical skills, and professional skills” should be key outcomes of legal education. One way experiential course faculty may achieve these goals is by broadening the focus on substantive law to include ethical and professional considerations. In this regard, findings from a set of experimental items administered as part of LSSSE 2012 to a subset of nine schools suggest that experiential learning opportunities differ dramatically in terms of the opportunities they offer to satisfy these goals. These experimental items attempt to delve further into the differences among three types of experiential activities: field placement externships or internships, live-client clinical courses, and skills and simulation courses. While clinical courses appear to emphasize ethical discussions among faculty and students, other types of experiential courses do so much less consistently (see Table 8). For example, 43% of students enrolled in a field placement externship or internship never discuss ethical

### Table 6  Relationship of Experiential Learning Activities to Higher Order Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Experiential Activities</th>
<th>1L</th>
<th>2L</th>
<th>3L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical or pro bono project as part of a course or for academic credit</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical internship or field experience</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer or pro bono work</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. “Higher order learning” includes students’ report of the degree to which coursework emphasized the following activities during the current academic school year: memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from courses and readings; analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory; such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components; synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships; 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 applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations.

b. Continuous variables were standardized before entry into regression models. Controls included gender, race or ethnicity, LSAT, self-reported law school grades, enrollment status, law school size, and law school affiliation.

c. p<.001, ++p<.001 and unstandardized B>.1, +++p<.001 and unstandardized B>.2.
issues with their peers, and one-third (31%) never discuss ethical issues with their professors, compared to just 19% and 11%, respectively, of students enrolled in live-client clinical courses. These findings reveal opportunities for improvement.

For all types of experiential courses, the emphasis on substantive law and procedure seems to outweigh an emphasis on the ethical matters. While half of students enrolled in field placements and nearly half of those in skills or simulation courses report never looking up ethical rules, far fewer (19% of those in field placement externships or internships and 16% of students in skills courses) report never looking up relevant substantive law or procedure. Similar disparities exist among students in clinical courses (Table 8).

Summer activities provide another method for law students to gain important experiences that may act as a formal or informal complement to doctrinal and experiential coursework done during the academic year. However, analysis of responses to a subset of 22 schools revealed summer experiences to be relatively insignificant in terms of student development. Regardless of the nature of the activity—working (paid or unpaid) in a legal setting, summer courses at their own or another law school, externships, independent studies, or study abroad—our analysis showed no relationship between the summer experience and higher order learning activities or students’ academic gains, including critical and analytical thinking; writing, speaking, and research; and other job-related skills.

The disconnection between summer experiences and academic learning appears quite substantial. For example, students reported that generally they are not motivated by their summer work to pursue particular activities or courses during the academic year. Thirty-eight percent of students said that their summer experience did nothing at all to encourage them to enroll in a substantive course on a topic they might not otherwise have considered taking, and 70% said their summer experience did nothing to motivate them to participate in an activity such as journal or moot court. Half of students (51%) said their summer experience in no way encouraged them to take a clinical or skills course. Some differences did occur in the impact of students’ summer experiences according to the type of program. For example, while 38% of students who worked for pay in a law-related setting indicated that their summer experience had no influence on their selection of substantive courses, only 21% of those students who took classes for credit over the summer said the same. These differences may be more attributable to differences among students than influence of the summer program, however. For example, students who are less decided in terms of their career or legal specialty and, in turn, less directed in terms of a course of substantive study may also be more inclined to take summer courses. This analysis does not address these possibilities, and additional research is necessary to fully understand these variations and the impact of summer experiences. Overall, the findings suggest that greater effort to integrate lessons from summer activities into the academic focus of law school may be necessary to help students understand the ways in which summer activities relate to learning in law school.

### Table 8
Percentage of Students Who Never Engage in Select Activities by Type of Experiential Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Course:</th>
<th>Skills or simulation course</th>
<th>Field placement (externship or internship)</th>
<th>Live-client clinical course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ethical rules or related ethical issues with other students during this course</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ethical rules or related ethical issues with faculty during this course</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked up ethical rules to inform your understanding of an ethical issue related to your work for this course</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked up the law or procedure related to the client matter as part of this course</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We highlight here several ways in which law schools use their LSSSE data, from providing a basis for a broad and continuing discussion about how to improve the law school, to supporting a focused investigation into a single area of interest.

**Take the Temperature of the Law School**

Although the University of South Carolina School of Law had collected several years’ worth of LSSSE data, the results were largely unmined when the new dean came on board in 2012. Exploring existing data offered the new administration an opportunity to take the temperature of the School of Law, and it also serves as an excellent baseline from which to consider the effects of new programs and initiatives.

A recent regional accreditation review spurred faculty-wide discussion about the insights available from LSSSE data. Accreditors were interested in the types of empirical process measures and outcomes-related measures that LSSSE collects. Many in the School of Law were conditioned to think of outcomes-based assessment as primarily reliant on bar pass. Accreditors also asked the School of Law for evidence of the educational experience from the students’ perspective. LSSSE facilitates faculty exploration of those activities and behaviors that are related to bar pass and other desirable learning outcomes, such as grades and employment rates. Unlike bar pass, administrators and faculty can have an immediate impact on these processes related to learning. The focus on learning processes provided a new perspective that was eye-opening and exciting at the School of Law.

**Create a Culture of Engagement**

At the University of Missouri–Kansas City School of Law, student engagement is at the forefront. Associate deans review results from LSSSE annually, and the findings are the focus of discussion at an annual faculty meeting. Because UMKC collects LSSSE data each year, administrators are able to respond nimbly to changes in student attitudes, behaviors, or needs. Data from LSSSE have proved especially helpful in developing student services and support in ways that UMKC considers beneficial to students.

UMKC knows that maintaining student enthusiasm for this type of research is important, especially since LSSSE invites all students to respond to the survey each year. To keep response rates high, UMKC creates a little friendly competition between classes, rewarding the class with the highest response rate. Most importantly, administrators communicate to students that their voices matter and that the school pays attention to responses. They do so by sharing a few facts and figures from LSSSE data with the students each year and involving students in a school-wide discussion about educational improvement.

**Chart the Effect of New Programs**

Students at Washington and Lee University School of Law have been part of a new initiative that completely re-images the third-year curriculum. Beginning in 2009, 3L students at W&L selected a full credit-load from a menu of experiential course options, including live-client clinics, externships for credit, simulation-based practicums, and extended immersions in practice settings. The goal of the new curriculum is to offer experiential learning opportunities that allow students to cultivate the skills essential for professional success.

The results have been striking. Using LSSSE data collected at three strategic intervals (a baseline measurement in 2004, a “before” picture gathered in 2008, and a follow-up look in 2012), W&L is charting the effects of the new curriculum. Administrators analyzed the results with particular attention to those areas of engagement in which they expected—indeed, desired—change, and those areas in which no change was expected. Results indicate that the new curriculum has been effective in meeting these expectations.

As administrators anticipated, 3Ls surveyed in 2012 reported that they were much more likely to work with peers to complete assignments, participate in pro bono or volunteer work, talk with professors about future career plans, and acquire work-related knowledge and skills when compared to data from previous years. In addition, W&L also observed changes related to other aspects of engagement (3Ls surveyed in 2012 were less likely to come to class unprepared than 3Ls surveyed in 2008, for example). The results are promising and suggest that the new curriculum is effectively engaging 3Ls.

**Establish a Baseline for Future Comparisons**

As a new law school, the University of California, Irvine School of Law was particularly interested in learning how the experiences of its students compared to those of students attending other law schools in California and beyond.

UC Irvine plans to share its LSSSE results with students and, in doing so, ask for even more input about their classroom learning, out of class experiences, and student support. A newly
formed student life committee will consider engagement data. Information from LSSSE will help start the discussion, and at this small school, administrators and faculty hope to build a culture of continuous improvement in which students really feel that their input is valued.

Going forward, UC Irvine plans to administer LSSSE several years in a row to establish a reliable baseline, and then to move toward periodic administrations that will allow the school to measure progress and change in key areas.

Set Goals

*Louisiana State University, Paul M. Herbert Law Center* used LSSSE data to prepare its self-study, drawing specifically on those survey questions that relate to their strategic plan. As it developed its strategic plan several years ago, LSU identified several items from LSSSE that spoke to school-specific goals. Data from subsequent LSSSE administrations allowed them to measure progress toward those goals.

With the self-study now behind them, LSU is ready to use LSSSE data to identify those factors that relate to student satisfaction. By controlling for student characteristics in the analysis, administrators at LSU can begin to drill down on the aspects of the student experience—how students spend their time, how often they interact with peers and faculty, and their participation in experiential learning opportunities—that impact students’ view of their legal education. Knowing more about the factors that affect student satisfaction can help law schools efficiently direct resources and know where to concentrate improvement efforts.

Outreach Services

LSSSE staff members are available to visit individual law schools to conduct workshops and to facilitate school-specific interpretation and analyses.

**LSSSE User Workshops**

User workshops allow faculty and administrators an opportunity to learn more about how they can use LSSSE results at their law school. Workshop participants gain insight into student engagement data at their law school, including what students do, how they perceive their experiences, and how they perceive their personal and academic development. In addition, LSSSE analysts share strategies for interpreting and analyzing the data. Participants work through their customized data reports and several sample analyses to give them ideas and models to use with their own results. Presentations from previous user workshops are posted to the LSSSE Web site, lssse.iub.edu/pastpresentations.cfm.

School Visits and Consultations

Schools ready to probe more deeply into their results may wish to plan a strategy session or one-on-one training at their law school. LSSSE staff members are available to visit participating law schools to discuss the data in detail. Often such conversations lead to discoveries about differences in the legal education experience for various populations of students (e.g., full-time versus part-time students, or older students versus traditional-aged students), changes in results over time, or important areas of focus for further inquiry.

User Resources

LSSSE has developed several print resources to help participating law schools use their data most effectively.

**Guide to the LSSSE Survey Items**

This LSSSE instrument was developed to investigate each aspect of student engagement in multiple ways. The guide offers several groupings of items that schools can use to organize their analyses.

**Working with LSSSE Data**

This guide provides a detailed description of each analyzed data section of the *Law School Report* received by participating law schools, along with definitions of key statistical terms. This Report accompanies the school’s data.

**Predict LSSSE Results Worksheets**

These worksheets can be used as part of a LSSSE presentation to generate interest in the findings. The worksheets ask participants to contemplate their own assumptions about student behaviors, and then to compare those assumptions to their school’s actual results. Two different versions are available, tailored for faculty and administrators.

**LSSSE PowerPoint Template**

To facilitate presentations to faculty groups and administrators using results from your own law school, customize LSSSE’s sample PowerPoint template. The template outlines some of the important aspects of student engagement and provides talking points along with space to drop in data from your school.
As we prepare for LSSSE’s ten-year anniversary in the spring of 2013, it is a nice opportunity to consider the project’s growth. Beginning with a pilot administration at 11 law schools, the survey has been administered over the course of these ten years at 179 different law schools in three countries. Our aggregated database includes responses from more than 238,000 law students. As more schools participate, the contextual data that LSSSE provides also grows and allows for more representative and meaningful comparisons. But apart from its scope, the measure of LSSSE’s value is in its ability to provide law schools with valid, reliable information about the student experience.

Despite changes in the landscape of legal education over the past ten years, or changes that will almost inevitably occur in future years, LSSSE’s focus remains on students. The survey allows us to learn about what students do during law school—how often they ask questions in class, how often they receive feedback from faculty, how much time they devote to reading and briefing cases—and what they feel they gain—intellectually, personally, and academically. Schools may use the data generated by their students’ responses to understand what aspects of the educational experience are working well and to learn more about those aspects that may deserve more attention. Our work is to collect, analyze, and report these data annually. When viewed longitudinally, the data offer law schools insight into the effects of new programs and curricular innovations; they can help schools with specific, articulated goals to track progress and document improvement. The value of such longitudinal analyses grows with each annual LSSSE administration.

Looking ahead, we reaffirm our commitment to law schools to provide the highest quality information about the student experience. Over the next ten years, we anticipate new innovations in terms of survey methodology through advances in technology, among other things. Identifying ways to make use of new technologies while also safeguarding student responses is a significant concern. Technology also almost certainly will continue to affect how students interact with peers and professors. We look forward to responding to these changes in ways that deliver valid, reliable data. To that end, we undertake research that investigates validity; in the coming year, this will take the form of follow-up research with non-respondents to the survey to learn whether their experiences are somehow different from students who responded. In addition, we continue our collaboration with law schools to further their analysis and interpretation of LSSSE data, both directly and by adding additional sources to enhance their data. In order to facilitate schools’ use of the data generated by LSSSE, we are preparing a new analytical report that aggregates survey questions based on their statistical and conceptual qualities. As always and above all, we look forward to sustaining our partnership with law schools in their ongoing efforts to improve the quality of legal education.

“i feel as though I have received a quality legal education at this school.”
–Comment from 3L student
“Likely” here is derived by combining responses of “definitely yes” and “probably yes.”

“Satisfied” here is derived by combining responses of “excellent” and “good.”

Each finding is based on students’ level of agreement with a statement based on a 7-point scale, and the level of agreement indicated here is a 6 or 7.

To assess students’ level of interaction with faculty, we compiled a measure that included the following individual survey items: during the current academic year, about how often did you: discuss assignments with a faculty member; talk about career plans or job search activities with a faculty member or advisor; discuss ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class; use e-mail to communicate with a faculty member; work with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.); receive prompt feedback (written or oral) from faculty on your academic performance.

The measure of supportive law school environment includes the items related to the degree to which the law school emphasized: providing support you need to thrive socially; helping you cope with non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.); encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, sexual orientation, and racial or ethnic backgrounds; attending campus events and activities (special speakers, cultural events, symposia, etc.); providing the support you need to help you succeed academically; and providing the financial counseling you need to afford your education. Higher order learning activities include the following items: about how often have you put together ideas or concepts from different courses; and during the current academic year, to what degree has your coursework emphasized analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory; synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, and experiences; making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods; and applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations.

Each finding is based on students’ level of agreement with a statement based on a 7-point scale, and the level of agreement indicated here is a 6 or 7.


See Neil W. Hamilton, Verna Monson and Jerome M. Organ, Encouraging Each Student’s Personal Responsibility for Core Competencies Including Professionalism, 21 The Professional Lawyer 3, 10 (2012), available at: http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/legal_education_and_admissions_to_the_bar/statistics/fs_tuition.authcheckdam.pdf (synthesizing research from several scholars on the core competencies for legal practice, and noting effective teamwork and team building, building strong client rapport, and listening, among other essential skills).
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### Participating Law Schools: 2004–2012

**ALABAMA**
- Faulkner University, Thomas Goode Jones School of Law
- Montgomery
- Samford University, Cumberland School of Law
- Birmingham
- The University of Alabama
- School of Law
- Tuscaloosa

**ARIZONA**
- Arizona State University,
- Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law
- Tempe
- Phoenix School of Law
- Phoenix

**ARKANSAS**
- University of Arkansas at Little Rock,
- William H. Bowen School of Law
- Little Rock
- University of Arkansas School of Law
- Fayetteville

**CALIFORNIA**
- California Western School of Law
- San Diego
- Chapman University School of Law
- Orange
- Concord Law School
- Los Angeles
- Golden Gate University School of Law
- San Francisco
- Humphreys College Laurence Drizov
- School of Law
- Stockton
- Loyola Law School
- Los Angeles
- Pepperdine University School of Law
- Malibu
- Santa Clara University School of Law
- Santa Clara
- Southwestern School Law
- Los Angeles
- Thomas Jefferson School of Law
- San Diego
- University of California at Davis
- School of Law
- Davis
- University of California Hastings
- College of the Law
- San Francisco
- University of California,
- Irvine School of Law
- Irvine
- University of California at Los Angeles
- School of Law
- Los Angeles
- University of the Pacific,
- McGeorge School of Law
- Sacramento
- University of San Diego School of Law
- San Diego
- University of San Francisco
- School of Law
- San Francisco
- University of Southern California
- Gould School of Law
- Los Angeles
- Western State University
- College of Law
- Fullerton
- Whittier Law School
- Costa Mesa

**COLORADO**
- University of Colorado Law School
- Boulder
- University of Denver
- Sturm College of Law
- Denver

**CONNECTICUT**
- Quinnipiac University School of Law
- Hamden
- University of Connecticut
- School of Law
- Hartford

**DELAWARE**
- Widener University School of Law
- Wilmington

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**
- American University
- Washington College of Law
- The Catholic University of America –
- Columbus School of Law
- The George Washington University
- Law School
- Georgetown University
- Law Center
- The University of the
- District of Columbia,
- David A. Clarke School of Law

**FLORIDA**
- Ave Maria School of Law
- Naples
- Florida Coastal School of Law
- Jacksonville
- Florida International University
- College of Law
- Miami
- Nova Southeastern University,
- Shepard Broad Law Center
- Ft. Lauderdale
- St. Thomas University School of Law
- Miami
- Stetson University College of Law
- Gulfport
- University of Florida,
- Levin College of Law
- Gainesville
- University of Miami School of Law
- Coral Gables

**GEORGIA**
- Emory University School of Law
- Atlanta
- Georgia State University
- College of Law
- Atlanta
- John Marshall Law School, Atlanta
- Atlanta
- Mercer University
- Walter F. George School of Law
- Macon

**HAWAII**
- University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
- William S. Richardson School of Law
- Honolulu

**IDAHO**
- University of Idaho College of Law
- Moscow

**ILLINOIS**
- The John Marshall Law School
- Chicago
- Loyola University
- Chicago School of Law
- Chicago
- Southern Illinois University
- School of Law
- Carbondale
- University of Illinois College of Law
- Champaign

**INDIANA**
- Indiana University
- Maurer School of Law
- Bloomington
- Indiana University
- Robert H. McKinney School of Law
- Indianapolis
- Valparaso University School of Law
- Valparaso

**IOWA**
- Drake University Law School
- Des Moines
- The University of Iowa
- College of Law
- Iowa City

**KANSAS**
- The University of Kansas
- School of Law
- Lawrence
- Washburn University School of Law
- Topeka

**KENTUCKY**
- Northern Kentucky University,
- Salmon P. Chase College of Law
- Highland Heights
- University of Kentucky College of Law
- Lexington
- University of Louisville,
- Louis D. Brandeis School of Law
- Louisville

**LOUISIANA**
- Louisiana State University,
- Paul M. Hebert Law Center
- Baton Rouge
- Loyola University
- New Orleans College of Law
- New Orleans
- Southern University Law Center
- Baton Rouge
- Tulane University School Law
- New Orleans

**MAINE**
- University of Maine School of Law
- Portland

**MARYLAND**
- University of Baltimore School of Law
- Baltimore
- University of Maryland
- Francis King Carey School of Law
- Baltimore

**MASSACHUSETTS**
- Harvard University School Law
- Cambridge
- Northeastern University
- School of Law
- Boston
- Suffolk University Law School
- Boston
- Western New England College
- School of Law
- Springfield

**MICHIGAN**
- Michigan State University
- College of Law
- East Lansing
- Thomas M. Cooley Law School
- Lansing
- University of Detroit
- Mercy School of Law
- Detroit
- Wayne State University Law School
- Detroit

**MINNESOTA**
- Hamline University School of Law
- Saint Paul
- University of Minnesota Law School
- Minneapolis
- University of St. Thomas
- School of Law
- Minneapolis
- William Mitchell College of Law
- St. Paul

**MISSISSIPPI**
- Mississippi College School of Law
- Jackson
- The University of Mississippi
- School of Law
- Oxford

**MISSOURI**
- Saint Louis University School of Law
- St. Louis
- University of Missouri – School of Law
- Columbia
- University of Missouri –
- Kansas City School of Law
- Kansas City
- Washington University School of Law
- St. Louis

**MONTANA**
- The University of Montana
- School of Law
- Missoula
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>University and School of Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEBRASKA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creighton University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Nebraska College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEVADA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Nevada, Las Vegas, William S. Boyd School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW HAMPSHIRE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of New Hampshire School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW JERSEY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seton Hall University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW YORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albany Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brooklyn Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City University of New York School of Law at Queens College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fordham University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hofstra University, Maurice A. Deane School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hempstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pace University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. John's University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY Buffalo Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syracuse University College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Touro College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacob D. Fuchsgberg Law Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Islip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yeshiva University, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH CAROLINA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campbell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norman Adrian Wiggins School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charlotte School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duke University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elon University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greensboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina Central University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of North Carolina School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wake Forest University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winston-Salem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OHIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital University Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Western Reserve University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland-Marshall College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Northern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claude W. Pettit College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael E. Moritz College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Akron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Dayton School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OKLAHOMA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma City University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Tulsa College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tulsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OREGON</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewis &amp; Clark Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Oregon School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eugene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willamette University College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PENNSYLVANIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earl Mack School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drexel University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temple University – James E. Beasley School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RHODE ISLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roger Williams University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH CAROLINA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charleston School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of South Carolina School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH DAKOTA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vermillion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TENNESSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln Memorial University – Duncan School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knoxville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Tennessee – College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knoxville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanderbilt School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nashville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEXAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baylor University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Mary’s University of San Antonio School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Texas College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Methodist University – Dedman School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas Southern University – Thurgood Marshall School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas Tech University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lubbock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas Wesleyan University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Houston Law Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Texas School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTAH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brigham Young University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Reuben Clark Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.J. Quinney College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERMONT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Royalton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIRGINIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regent University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Richmond School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington and Lee University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lexington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William &amp; Mary Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Williamsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASHINGTON</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gonzaga University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spokane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WISCONSIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marquette University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Wisconsin School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WYOMING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Wyoming College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laramie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUSTRALIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of New South Wales – Faculty of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sydney, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CANADA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Alberta – Faculty of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmonton, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Calgary – Faculty of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calgary, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of British Columbia – Faculty of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Manitoba – Faculty of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winnipeg, MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of New Brunswick – Faculty of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fredericton, NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dalhousie University, Schulich School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halifax, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McGill University – Faculty of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montreal, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osgoode Hall Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queen’s University – Faculty of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingston, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Université d’Ottawa – Faculté de droit, Section de droit civil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ottawa, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Ottawa – Faculty of Law, Common Law Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ottawa, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Toronto – Faculty of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Western Ontario – Faculty of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Windsor – Faculty of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Windsor, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Université de Montréal – Faculté de droit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montréal, QC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Saskatchewan – College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saskatoon, SK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>