### Course SLOs 1 and ctu.unitid = 721

**ECC: LAW 11 - Introduction to Legal Research - SLO #1 Legal Memoranda and Forms - Draft pleadings/memoranda including court forms in a manner sufficient for submission to the applicable court.**

**Course SLO Assessment Cycle:**

- **2014-15 (Fall 2014)**

**Input Date:**

- 11/08/2013

**Course SLO Status:**

- Active

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Methods &amp; Standard and Target for Success / Tasks</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Action &amp; Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Method Description:</strong> Written assignment designed to assess students’ research and writing ability.</td>
<td><strong>02/02/2015</strong> - A total of 35 students from the Fall 2014 sections of Law 11 participated in and completed the assessment with 72% average. 70% reflects acceptable achievement level. This data suggests that students were able to absorb the material, analyze the fact patterns, perform necessary research and draft effective memorandums to communicate the results of their research. Student success is based on the fact that faculty is teaching to the course outline and the proper course objectives are being stressed. No adjustments to the SLO are necessary at this time. <strong>Standard Met? :</strong> Yes</td>
<td><strong>08/03/2015</strong> - Law faculty need to re-evaluate course material to ensure compliance with current court requirements. <strong>Action Category:</strong> Curriculum Changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Assignment:**

**LAW 11 – LEGAL MEMORANDUM ASSIGNMENT “D”**

To: Paralegal  
From: Henry R. James, Partner  
Our client, Jason Nelson (“Nelson”), has been charged with manslaughter. Nelson is mentally ill and is currently confined in a mental institution. Because of his mental illness, Nelson cannot assist in his defense and thus is not competent to stand trial. The prosecutor in this case will make a motion asking the court to forcibly administer antipsychotic drugs to Nelson to render him able to stand trial. Medical experts have determined that Nelson has an approximately twenty percent (20%) chance of being rendered competent if he receives the medication the state intends to administer. Nelson is vehemently opposed to receiving such drugs, primarily because he has suffered significant and debilitating side effects from the drugs when he has taken them in the past. The side effects include drowsiness, lethargy, and confusion. Nelson has never been a danger to himself or others. Please research this issue and find authorities that both support our point of view and what you anticipate the prosecutor will raise. We intend to vigorously oppose this motion. Our state has no cases or statutes regarding this issue. Therefore, do not restrict your research to the law of any one jurisdiction. 

**Note:** Your boss wants a four-page, typed, double-spaced memorandum. You are to observe proper citation format as set forth in the most current edition of the Bluebook: A Uniform System of Citation in preparing this memorandum. Follow the format set forth in the Legal Memo Sample posted on the Law 11 website.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course SLOs 1 and ctu.unitid = 721</th>
<th>Assessment Methods &amp; Standard and Target for Success / Tasks</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Action &amp; Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Method:</strong> Essay/Written Assignment <strong>Standard and Target for Success:</strong> It is expected that students will average scores of 70% or above on this SLO.</td>
<td><strong>Assessment Method Description:</strong> The final exam in the course was a case study involving giving the students a fact pattern and requiring them to produce, in connection with the case study described in the fact pattern, a basic probate form, the California probate petition known as an “DE111” form. <strong>Assessment Method:</strong> Case Study <strong>Standard and Target for Success:</strong> The assessment is graded subjectively, after continuing consultation with the students (inspecting drafts they present to the instructor). The assignment was given letter grades, for purposes of calculating the course grade, using the traditional A-F scale. Grades on all components of the course were assigned numbers based on the traditional 0-4.0 scale (3.5 out of 4, A; 2.5-3.4, B; 1.5-2.4, C; .5-1.4, D; .4 and below, F). The traditional A-F rubric was used for this SLO (A Excellent, B Very Good, C Satisfactory, D Barely Satisfactory, F Failing). In the completion of a court form such as this, accuracy, both secretarial and substantive, is a requirement in assessing where the rubric is entered. It is anticipated that the majority of students will achieve either an A or a B on this assignment. The final, as described, counted for 50% of the course grade. Other components of the course grade were assessed under SLO 2.</td>
<td>02/06/2014 - A total of 21 students participated in and completed the assessment with 19 students achieving an A/B on this assessment, a level of 90%. 70% reflects acceptable achievement level. This data suggests that students were able to comprehend the material and understand the probate process. Student success was based on the fact that faculty are teaching to the course outline and the proper course objectives are being stressed. No adjustments to the SLO are necessary at this time. <strong>Standard Met? :</strong> Yes <strong>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</strong> 2013-14 (Fall 2013) <strong>Faculty Assessment Leader:</strong> Vi Pham <strong>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</strong> Douglas Carnahan</td>
<td>08/25/2014 - Needed changes to teaching strategies to improve student learning. More focus should be had on document preparation. The final exam tests this to some extent regarding a basic probate-related document (petition for probate), but the strategies for assessment could be expanded in this area. <strong>Action Category:</strong> Teaching Strategies <strong>Follow-Up:</strong> 08/25/2014 - There has been a change in the text since the last SLO. The course now uses Nolo Press, &quot;How to Probate an Estate in California.&quot; This is a user-friendly book that is both fact-rich, full of examples, and introduces the students to many of the forms and other pleadings necessary to successfully conduct a probate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/19/2014 - A total of 25 students from the Fall 2014 section of Law 12 – Probate Procedures participated in and completed the assessment; of those, 12 received “A’s”, 6 received “B’s”, 6 received “C’s” and 1 received an “F” for an average of 3.12. A “C” or 2.0 reflects acceptable achievement level. This data suggests that students were able to absorb the material, analyze the fact patterns, and prepare the appropriate court forms. Student success is based on the fact that faculty is teaching to the course outline and the proper course objectives are being stressed. No adjustments to the SLO are necessary at this time. <strong>Standard Met? :</strong> Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
appoints Jones’s son, William T. Jones, as executor. David Jones’s estate, per the will, is divided equally between his two sons, William T. Jones and David T. Jones, Jr. William T. Jones and David T. Jones, Jr., each has a minor child. William T. Jones’s child is Susan J. Jones. David T. Jones, Jr.’s child is David T. Jones, III. Each of David T. Jones’s two grandchildren is given the right to inherit under the will per stirpes.

David T. Jones, the testator, has died, of natural causes, on November 1, 2013, while a patient at Little Company of Mary Hospital in Torrance, California. At the time, Jones was living in the City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, at the address 3221 Torrance Blvd., Torrance, CA 90503.

William T. Jones has consulted with Paul Probater’s office about the necessity of a probate of his father’s estate, and has informed Probater of the following:
1. There is no family trust, and the will Probater oversaw being executed on May 12, 2005 is the latest will of David T. Jones. There are no codicils.
2. The will does not prohibit the use of full powers under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. Indeed, William T. Jones has the original will in his possession, and brings it in and hands it over to Probater, and the will says what William says it says.
3. William T. Jones is willing to serve as executor of his father’s estate, and is mentally competent to do so.
4. At the time of his death, David T. Jones owned the following property:
   a. Personal property totaling in value $55,000.
   b. A two-unit duplex in the City of Torrance, valued at approximately $1 million, on which there is an existing trust deed in the amount of $200,000. This property produces a monthly income, in terms of rentals, of $3000 per month.
   c. A personal residence, also in Torrance, valued at approximately $1.5 million, on which there is an existing trust deed in the amount of $200,000. The deed to this property was original held by Jones and his deceased wife as joint tenants, but when the wife died in 2003 Jones duly filed an affidavit of death of joint tenant regarding the property with the county recorder’s office.
   d. Some subsurface mineral rights in the State of Wyoming.
5. William T. Jones resides at 1334 4th St.,
Anytown, California 90503, with his wife and daughter Susan.

6. David T. Jones III resides at 1950 Globe Ave., Phippsburg, Maine 04562 with his wife and son David T. Jones, III.

7. David T. Jones, when he died, was living alone at his residence in Torrance, and died rather suddenly after a short hospital stay at Little Company. His only children were the two sons (i.e., he had no stepchildren, no foster children, and no children whom he was considering adopting). Since his wife predeceased him he made sure that Probate inserted into his will the fact of his wife’s predecease, omitted her from the will, and, therefore, William T. Jones is not worried about the possibility of a pretermitted heir nor of a will contest. The deceased wife of David T. Jones did not leave any heirs when she died and her entire estate was inherited by David T. Jones, her husband (now the deceased).

8. In addition to the two notes secured by deeds of trust, the decedent Jones left debts totaling approximately $60,000. These were in the form of credit cards, two personal loans, some outstanding utility bills, and a car loan. Jones was solvent and paying on these debts when he died, being the beneficiary of both a military pension (he was a Vietnam vet) and a large private pension from his former employer. Probate has determined that there is no reason not to proceed with a probate of the Estate of David T. Jones, and has tasked you with drafting a Petition for Probate. He has asked you to either procure a blank DE-111 form from the county courthouse, or a library, or download one from the Internet, and fill it out in draft, based on the above information, and hand it in to him for review. He tells you to request publication in the Torrance Daily Breeze. Draft the DE-111.

Assessment Method:
Essay/Written Assignment

Standard and Target for Success:
It is expected that students will average grades of “C” (2.0) or above on this SLO.

Assessment Method Description:
Written assignment designed to assess students’ legal comprehension of concepts of family law.

Sample Assignment:
12/01/2014 - A total of 28 students from the Fall 2014 section of Law 13 – Family Law participated in and completed the assessment with 77% average. 70% reflects acceptable achievement level. This data suggests that students were able to absorb the material,

08/03/2015 - Law faculty need to re-evaluate course material to ensure compliance with current code and court requirements.
## Course SLO Assessment Cycle:
2014-15 (Fall 2014)

**Input Date:**
11/08/2013

**Course SLO Status:**
Active

### Assessment Methods & Standard and Target for Success / Tasks

1. There are four forms to be completed for this test/assignment. They all can be found on the internet by searching “California Court Forms” or just use this link.
   http://www.courts.ca.gov/formnumber.htm
2. The forms that you will complete are:
   a. FL100, Petition-Marriage
   b. FL180, Judgment
   c. FL300, Request for Order
   d. FL341, Child Custody and Visitation (Parenting Time) Order
3. Use the information below to complete each form. You will need to use logic and common sense in determining which boxes to fill in and which to leave blank.
4. Be sure to use the forms that are fillable online so that you can print directly from the Internet.
5. The assignment is due no later than 12.8.14 in class or you may send it to me by email attachment anytime before class.
6. General instructions/facts: The parties to the divorce are Mary and Carl Thomas. They have one child, Emma who was born 12-2-2009. The parties married 6-6-2008 and separated 9-1-14 when Mary discovered that Carl was unfaithful and having an affair. She has come to your office and you are assisting her with the court forms.

**Assessment Method:**
Exam/Test/Quiz

**Standard and Target for Success:**
It is expected that students will average scores of 70% or above on this SLO.

### Results

- **Results:**
  - Analyze the fact patterns, and complete the required forms. Student success is based on the fact that faculty is teaching to the course outline and the proper course objectives are being stressed. No adjustments to the SLO are necessary at this time.

  **Standard Met?** :
  - Yes

- **Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:**
  - 2014-15 (Fall 2014)

- **Faculty Assessment Leader:**
  - V. Pham

- **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**
  - J. Slawson

---

## Assessment Method Description:

**Lab assignment which assesses students’ knowledge and understanding of preparing court forms.**

### Assessment Method:
Performance

### Standard and Target for Success:
It is expected that students will average scores of 70% or above on this SLO.

---

02/02/2015 - A total of 22 students from the Fall 2014 section of Law 19 participated in and completed the assessment with 73% average. 70% reflects acceptable achievement level. This data suggests that students were able to absorb the material, analyze the fact patterns and properly complete the appropriate court forms. Student success is based on the fact that faculty is teaching to the course outline and the proper course objectives are being stressed. No adjustments to the SLO are necessary at this time.

**Standard Met?** :
- Yes

**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:**
- 2014-15 (Fall 2014)

**Faculty Assessment Leader:**
- V. Pham

---

08/03/2015 - Law faculty need to re-evaluate course material to ensure compliance with current court requirements.

**Action Category:**
Curriculum Changes
### Course SLO Assessment Cycle:
2014-15 (Fall 2014)

### Input Date:
11/08/2013

### Course SLO Status:
Active

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Methods &amp; Standard and Target for Success / Tasks</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Method Description:</strong> Objective questions designed to test students’ knowledge of course material.</td>
<td>12/12/2014 - A total of 102 students from the Fall 2014 sections of Law 4 participated in and completed the assessment with 69% average. 70% reflects acceptable achievement level. While the students did not meet the target for success, this data suggests that clearer definitions between Common Law and the Uniform Commercial Code need to be explained. Additional examples of when to apply the appropriate rules will be given during future semesters. Student success is based on the fact that faculty is teaching to the course outline and the proper course objectives are being stressed. <strong>Standard Met?</strong> : Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Method:</strong> Exam/Test/Quiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard and Target for Success:</strong> It is expected that students will average scores of 70% or above on this SLO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Action Category:
SLO/PLO Assessment Process

### Action & Follow-Up
08/24/2015 - Law department needs to change the assessment process based on results to assure all faculty are giving assessment at same time prior to final examination.