Course Evaluation Results: Supreme Court Simulation

Dear Mr. Blackman

In the attachment you will find the evaluation results of the course Supreme Court Simulation.

These results are based on 6 evaluations returned, yielding a response rate of 54.55%.

The indicators shown at the top of the report represent the average of each group of questions, with Cronbach’s Alpha describing the internal consistency of a question group.

The results for each individual question are displayed in a simple bar graph. To the right of each bar graph, more detailed data is displayed, as follows: number of responses to that question (n); the average response on a scale of 1 to 5 (av); the median score (md); and, the standard deviation (dev).

After each group of questions, you will find comments from your students. A faculty "Profile" page which graphically displays your average score for each evaluation question is included.

If you have any further questions do not hesitate to contact the evaluation department.

Your Class Climate Administrator
Josh Blackman
Supreme Court Simulation (10535_202310)
No. of responses = 6

Overall indicators

1. Preparation

2. Setting goals

3. Use of appropriate teaching methodology

4. Effectiveness of presentation
   \( \alpha = -0.29 \)

5. Providing feedback

1.1) The professor had thorough knowledge and command of the subject matter.

1.2) The professor was prepared for the content and activities of each class.

1.3) Course materials (casebook, handouts, syllabi, etc.) were useful and well-prepared.

1.4) Please provide any additional comments ON PREPARATION in the space below:

- I appreciate how transparent Professor Blackman was in regards to our syllabus, his grading, etc. I liked that the syllabus was a "living" doc.
- I wish we had more time to prepare for how to complete the assignments at the beginning of the course.
- Professor Blackman was always prepared for class. One of the challenges of this class was the large records many of these Supreme Court Cases had. His ability to be familiar with it helped our discussions and encouraged us to be as familiar as possible with the record.

2. Setting goals

2.1) The professor clearly identified what students were expected to learn from the course overall and from each section of the course.
2.2) The professor clearly identified what students were asked to be able to do as the course progressed.

2.3) Please provide any additional comments ON SETTING GOALS in the space below:

- Professor Blackman did a really great job in setting our goals and expectations in the course. Even when the course syllabus needed to shift a bit during the semester to accommodate special guests, he made sure that he always informed us of any changes, and he was very reasonable in his expectations of us.
- The Syllabus was clear on what points we could achieve and what the goals were. After every assignment Professor Blackman gave detailed feedback that made it clear what he expected for next time. This constructive criticism coupled with clear goals made the improvement of the work product throughout the semester obviously evident.

3. Use of appropriate teaching methodology

3.1) The teaching techniques (PowerPoint, whiteboard, role-play, simulations, other technology, etc.) the professor used were effective.

3.2) The class was characterized by active learning.

3.3) Please provide any additional comments ON TEACHING METHODOLOGY in the space below:

- Professor Blackman is always on the leading edge of technology and this class was no different.
- This course was very interactive. I definitely feel that because the course was closely tailored to the Supreme Court arguments/cases being heard. We also examined the justices characteristics and mannerisms in a way that felt very intimate and nuanced.

4. Effectiveness of presentation

4.1) The professor facilitated useful class participation.

4.2) The professor kept class discussion on track.

4.3) The professor conducted class in a manner that required preparation.

4.4) The professor answered appropriate questions in a way that advanced student learning.

4.5) The professor encouraged students to work through difficult material themselves.
The professor's examples and illustrations were helpful.

The professor held my attention during the class.

The professor used class time well.

Please provide any additional comments ON PRESENTATION in the space below:

- I appreciate how prepared Professor Blackman was. It was very clear how much he enjoyed teaching this class, and I think that, in turn, this made the class more engaging. I do think that it was clear that some students weren't prepared some days, and I think that impacted the depth of class discussions at times. Professor Blackman definitely filled the class time regardless of participation, but it would have been nice to have more student discussion since it is such a small class.

- I have never in my life imagined how empowering it could feel to learn about real-world Supreme Court cases as an advocate. Professor Blackman kept us on our toes and was always very thoughtful about the manner in which he presented the course material to us.

- The entire class was built around participation from recitation to moot arguments of the cases. The experience was extremely beneficial.

5. Providing feedback

- The professor was accessible outside of class (e.g., email, office hours) through the semester.

- The professor provided useful opportunities for practice and feedback on course concepts and content during the semester.

Please provide any additional comments ON PROVIDING FEEDBACK in the space below:

- Every single assignment in this class was critiqued and graded with detailed feedback which is so atypical to the usual law school assignment feedback. Not to mention, We were each individually assessed in every practical exercise. Most of all, we were always provided the feedback in a very prompt time period.

- Professor Blackman is truly the most accessible professor that I've encountered at STCL. He seems very invested in his students and cares about how they are doing in his class. I wish I would have taken a class with him sooner.

- This class involved constant feedback which was helpful.

6. Overall evaluation

- Overall, the professor was effective in teaching this class.

Please provide any additional comments about the course or professor in the space below:

- This class should be taught every year. It was a core part of my law school experience. I only wish the grading didn't seem so subjective.

- This class was alot of fun and educational on all levels. Due to the variety of cases I learned some sumbsative law on a broad range of subjects from EPA/ water issues to Civil procedure questions on general jurisdiction. But more than just substance we learned about how the Supreme Court functions and what goes into preparing and asking judicial questions. Finally, the opportunity to speak with current Supreme Court Advocates was an invaluable experience that gave me a lot of practical insight.
This was a really great class that provided a unique perspective to the Supreme Court. This has been one of my favorite classes in law school and a great learning experience. The aspect of being able to communicate with the actual advocates has been very rewarding. This class has exceeded my expectations that I had going in.

This was the best course I took in 3 years at South Texas. Professor Blackman did an excellent job at creating assignments that guided us through the process, brought in brilliant guest speakers from the various parties, and the oral arguments were a highlight of the course. I absolutely recommend this course to anyone interested in the Supreme Court, advocacy, or the higher-level concepts of law that don't come up often amidst the day-to-day minutiae of law school.

7. Learning Objectives

Please provide two ratings of your knowledge and/or ability level for each of the statements listed below:
- rate your current knowledge and/or ability level after completing this course
- rate your prior knowledge and/or ability level before completing this course.

8. Supreme Court Simulation

I can present appellate arguments of the type delivered by Supreme Court advocates

8.1) - after this course:

- fully agree: 66.7%
- somewhat agree: 33.3%
- neutral: 0%
- somewhat disagree: 0%
- fully disagree: 0%

n=6
av.=5.67
md=6
dev.=0.52

8.2) - before this course:

- fully agree: 33.3%
- somewhat agree: 16.7%
- neutral: 16.7%
- somewhat disagree: 33.3%
- fully disagree: 0%

n=6
av.=2.33
md=2.5
dev.=1.21

I can ask questions in the persona of Supreme Court justices

8.3) - after this course:

- fully agree: 66.7%
- somewhat agree: 33.3%
- neutral: 0%
- somewhat disagree: 0%
- fully disagree: 0%

n=6
av.=5.33
md=5
dev.=0.52

8.4) - before this course:

- fully agree: 0%
- somewhat agree: 0%
- neutral: 0%
- somewhat disagree: 50%
- fully disagree:50%

n=6
av.=1.5
md=1.5
dev.=0.55

I can interact with Supreme Court advocates

8.5) - after this course:

- fully agree: 100%
- somewhat agree: 0%
- neutral: 0%
- somewhat disagree: 0%
- fully disagree: 0%

n=6
av.=6
md=6
dev.=0

8.6) - before this course:

- fully agree: 0%
- somewhat agree: 16.7%
- neutral: 16.7%
- somewhat disagree: 33.3%
- fully disagree: 33.3%

n=6
av.=2.83
md=3
dev.=1.6
### Profile

**Subunit:** LAW  
**Name of the instructor:** Josh Blackman  
**Name of the course:** Supreme Court Simulation

Values used in the profile line: Median

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Preparation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1) The professor had thorough knowledge and command of the subject matter.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1.2) The professor was prepared for the content and activities of each class. | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree |
| | n=6 | av.=5.00 | md=5.00 | dev.=0.00 |

| 1.3) Course materials (casebook, handouts, syllabi, etc.) were useful and well-prepared. | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree |
| | n=6 | av.=5.00 | md=5.00 | dev.=0.00 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Setting goals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1) The professor clearly identified what students were expected to learn from the course overall and from each section of the course.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2.2) The professor clearly identified what students were asked to be able to do as the course progressed. | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree |
| | n=6 | av.=5.00 | md=5.00 | dev.=0.00 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Use of appropriate teaching methodology</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1) The teaching techniques (PowerPoint, whiteboard, role-play, simulations, other technology, etc.) the professor used were</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3.2) The class was characterized by active learning. | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree |
| | n=6 | av.=5.00 | md=5.00 | dev.=0.00 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Effectiveness of presentation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1) The professor facilitated useful class participation.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4.2) The professor kept class discussion on track. | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree |
| | n=6 | av.=5.00 | md=5.00 | dev.=0.00 |

| 4.3) The professor conducted class in a manner that required preparation. | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree |
| | n=6 | av.=4.83 | md=5.00 | dev.=0.41 |

| 4.4) The professor answered appropriate questions in a way that advanced student learning. | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree |
| | n=6 | av.=5.00 | md=5.00 | dev.=0.00 |

| 4.5) The professor encouraged students to work through difficult material themselves. | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree |
| | n=6 | av.=5.00 | md=5.00 | dev.=0.00 |

| 4.6) The professor's examples and illustrations were helpful. | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree |
| | n=6 | av.=5.00 | md=5.00 | dev.=0.00 |

| 4.7) The professor held my attention during the class. | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree |
| | n=6 | av.=5.00 | md=5.00 | dev.=0.00 |

| 4.8) The professor used class time well. | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree |
| | n=6 | av.=4.83 | md=5.00 | dev.=0.41 |
## 5. Providing feedback

### 5.1) The professor was accessible outside of class (e.g., email, office hours) through the semester.
- **Strongly Agree**
- **Strongly Disagree**

- **n=6**
- **av.=5.00**
- **md=5.00**
- **dev.=0.00**

### 5.2) The professor provided useful opportunities for practice and feedback on course concepts and content during the semester.
- **Strongly Agree**
- **Strongly Disagree**

- **n=6**
- **av.=5.00**
- **md=5.00**
- **dev.=0.00**

## 6. Overall evaluation

### 6.1) Overall, the professor was effective in teaching this class.
- **Strongly Agree**
- **Strongly Disagree**

- **n=6**
- **av.=5.00**
- **md=5.00**
- **dev.=0.00**

## 8. Supreme Court Simulation

### 8.1) I can present appellate arguments of the type delivered by Supreme Court advocates- after this course:
- **Fully agree**
- **Completely disagree**

- **n=6**
- **av.=5.67**
- **md=6.00**
- **dev.=0.52**

### 8.2) I can present appellate arguments of the type delivered by Supreme Court advocates- before this course:
- **Fully agree**
- **Completely disagree**

- **n=6**
- **av.=2.33**
- **md=2.50**
- **dev.=1.21**

### 8.3) I can ask questions in the persona of Supreme Court justices- after this course:
- **Fully agree**
- **Completely disagree**

- **n=6**
- **av.=5.33**
- **md=5.00**
- **dev.=0.52**

### 8.4) I can ask questions in the persona of Supreme Court justices- before this course:
- **Fully agree**
- **Completely disagree**

- **n=6**
- **av.=1.50**
- **md=1.50**
- **dev.=0.55**

### 8.5) I can interact with Supreme Court advocates- after this course:
- **Fully agree**
- **Completely disagree**

- **n=6**
- **av.=6.00**
- **md=6.00**
- **dev.=0.00**

### 8.6) I can interact with Supreme Court advocates- before this course:
- **Fully agree**
- **Completely disagree**

- **n=6**
- **av.=2.83**
- **md=3.00**
- **dev.=1.60**
## Profile Line for Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subunit: LAW</th>
<th>Name of the instructor: Josh Blackman</th>
<th>Name of the course: Supreme Court Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Setting goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use of appropriate teaching methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Effectiveness of presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Providing feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Outcome-based evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements to be rated</th>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>Percentage of students</th>
<th>CSA Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low (6)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high (1)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can present appellate arguments of the type delivered by Supreme Court advocates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can ask questions in the persona of Supreme Court justices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can interact with Supreme Court advocates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presentation adapted from Raupach et al. Med Teach 2011; 33: e446-ee453. Error bars indicate standard errors of the mean.