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1. **Overview of the Public Policy Clinic**
2. **Introduction**

The Harrison Institute supports actors who shape and make public policy. Some of our clients are nonprofit coalitions that promote policy change at various levels – local, state, federal, and international. Others are decision-makers, including legislators, attorneys general, regulators, procurement officers, planners, and their associations. Students in the public policy clinic work in one of four policy teams:

* ***Community equity*** *Community development* – Develop innovative policy tools to promote housing and environmental justice and more equitable development in underinvested communities in DC.
* ***Health and food***

*Improving food systems*– Reinvent a healthier and better food chain for school children and support goals of the DC Food Policy Council.
*Oral health*– Meet urgent oral health needs of low-income children in DC.
*Just Purchasing Consortium* – Create a coalition and develop a purchasing code with food chain workers so that universities can help to protect their health and labor rights.

* ***Trade and investment***

*Carbon pricing* – Develop options for coordinating carbon pricing programs in the United States and the European Union and avoiding conflict with WTO rules

*Investment agreements –* Help developing countries limit their exposure to investment claims. Develop a flexible, multilateral approach to reform of international investment treaties.

* ***Worker rights***
*Just Purchasing Consortium* – as noted above under health and food.

*BlueGreen Alliance –* Develop standards for public procurement of construction materials and transportation technologies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and require contractors to provide high-quality jobs.

**B. Policy Role and Services**

Students in the clinic analyze law-making authority, identify options for changing policy, help our clients plan their strategy, and draft policy documents based on client choices.

The services that our clients request most frequently include:

* Help develop a strategy using law and policy to reach organizational objectives.
* Analyze limits on lawmaking authority.
* Analyze policy options at all levels – local, state, federal, and international.
* Draft policy proposals including model legislation, agency rules, and association policies.
* Prepare toolkits that identify multiple policy options for responding to complex problems.
* Speak at a public hearing, conference, seminar, or webinar.
* Prepare policy briefs and web pages for public education.
* Train community leaders and build the capacity of their institutions.
* Create the legal structure for an association or network.

**C. Clients & Projects**

**1.** ***Community equity***Across the United States, state and local policy makers are challenged by diverse needs and the call to build equitable communities. Effective legal and policy solutions to address community shocks and stressors—whether it be pandemics, climate change, or the housing crises—must reflect unique community features, needs, and participation of the local citizens.

The Harrison Institute works with policymakers, stakeholders, and community members who are committed to building more resilient and equitable communities, whether by creating more affordable homes or helping frontline communities adapt to climate change. Our focus includes increasing affordable housing in Washington, DC, and working with institutional partners like the Georgetown Climate Center (GCC) and state and local governments to adapt to extreme heat, flooding, and other climate hazards.

In 2021, the Harrison Institute will continue its history of working to combat housing discrimination and displacement by working with local nonprofits (e.g., Douglass Community Land Trust) and community stakeholders (e.g., Ward 8 Community Economic Development initiative) to promote more equitable community development practices in under-resourced and overburdened communities in DC.

***Past clients and collaborators – including climate resilience***

* *Nonprofit organizations*
	+ Douglas Community Land Trust
	+ Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)

- Ward 8 Community Economic Development initiative
- Washington Legal Clinic for the Homeless

* *University-based programs*
	+ Georgetown Climate Center – Harrison frequently partners with GCC to support frontline communities that experience a range of climate hazards (sea-level rise, extreme heat, climate-related displacement).
	+ Center for Racial Equity & Democratic Economy – CREDE is a new Law Center program (in formation 2021) that seeks to help disinvested communities in DC overcome the racial wealth gap
* *State and local governments*
	+ California Air Resources Board (CARB)
	+ Connecticut
	+ Chester, PA
	+ D.C. Department of Energy and Environment (DOEE)
	+ Green Infrastructure Advisory Group – including Denver, Detroit, Santa Fe, D.C., Cambridge
	+ Louisville, KY
	+ Maryland
	+ Milwaukee, WI
	+ Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
	+ New York City, NY
	+ New York state commissions on response to Hurricane Sandy
	+ Oregon Department of Public Health
	+ Virginia
	+ Virginia Beach, VA
* *Government agencies*
* Washington, DC Silver Jackets— with membership from representatives in federal agencies (e.g., Army Corps of Engineers), local agencies (e.g., DC Department of Energy and Environment and the Office of Planning), and academia (Georgetown University)
* *Government associations*
	+ Alliance of Regional Collaboratives for Climate Adaptation (CA metropolitan areas)
	+ Coastal States Organization (CSO)
	+ Eastern Shore Climate Adaptation Partnership (ESCAP) (six counties and two municipalities on Maryland’s Eastern Shore)
	+ National League of Cities
	+ Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management (NESCAUM)
	+ West Coast Governors Alliance
	+ Western Adaptation Alliance – including Denver, Santa Fe, Salt Lake City, Las Vegas
	+ Western Governors Association

**2. *Health and food***
Health justice means access to the care, food, and conditions that people need to be healthy – to avoid preventable diseases and premature death. Most recently, the health team has worked to improve access to oral health care for children with special needs, improve food in schools and hospitals, reduce use of antibiotics in the food chain, and create strategies to operate HIV/AIDS services under the Affordable Care Act.

In 2021, the Harrison Institute is organizing a Just Purchasing Consortium to address health risks and labor abuses of workers who supply food to universities. The consortium is developing relationships with worker organizations as it develops leverage of institutional food purchasers with standards, monitoring and transparency for supply-chain accountability.

***Past clients & collaborators***

* *University-based programs*
* Arizona State University, McCain Institute
* Georgetown University programs:
	+ Health Justice Alliance
	+ Center for Health Insurance Reform
	+ O’Neill Institute for National and Global Health Law
	+ Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor
	+ Workers’ Rights Institute
* University of Michigan, Ross School of Business
* University of California, President’s Office, Sustainability Program
* *Worker organizations*

- United Food & Commercial Workers

- International Brotherhood of Teamsters

* *Federal agencies*
	+ Centers for Disease Control, Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity
	+ Health Care Dynamics International, a contractor for the U.S. government, in support of policy projects for the Centers for Medicare/Medicaid Services: Center for Public Integrity (CPI) and the Office of Strategic Operations and Regulatory Affairs (OSORA).
* *State and local legislators, agencies, and school districts*
* DC Food Policy Council
* DC Office of the State Superintendent for Education
* Baltimore Food Policy Task Force, along with the Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future
* Individual legislators in Maryland, California, Connecticut
* Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene
* Maryland Attorney General, Office of Consumer Protection
* National Conference of State Legislatures
* School Districts: Aldine (TX), Charleston (SC), Des Moines, Detroit, the District of Columbia, Grand Rapids, Gwinnett County (GA), Milwaukee, Nashville, Oakland, Orange County (FL), Omaha, San Diego, Prince William County (VA).
* Washington State Department of Agriculture

• *Non-profit organizations*

* DC Good Food Purchasing Program Coalition
* DC Central Kitchen
* National Alliance of State and Territorial AIDS Directors (NASTAD), a membership organization of state and territorial AIDS directors that provides technical assistance and advocacy support related to HIV/AIDS and viral hepatitis.
* National Employment Law Project
* School Food FOCUS (Transforming Food Options for Children in Urban Schools), which recently merged with FoodCorps, and its regional initiatives, which include the National Procurement Initiative, the Upper Midwest Learning Lab (school districts of Chicago, Cleveland, Des Moines, Detroit, Omaha, Minneapolis and Saint Paul) and the Southern Learning Lab (school districts of Gwinnett County (GA), Nashville, and Orange County (FL)).
* Washington Sustainable Food & Farming Network (WSFFN).

**3.** ***Trade and investment***Most policy campaigns are both local and global: climate, public health, decent work, even democracy itself. For three decades, our trade team has supported governments and NGOs that seek to balance democracy and trade. We work to preserve policy space for domestic innovation and support frameworks for global policy – like climate change and tobacco control.
Our past clients and collaborators include the following.

***Past clients & collaborators***

* *Nonprofit organizations*
	+ Action on Smoking and Health (ASH)
	+ The Atlantic Council Climate Leadership Council
	+ Health Justice, Manila
	+ Heinrich Boell Foundation
	+ Open Society Foundations
	+ Public Citizen
	+ Resources for the Future (RFF)
	+ Sierra Club
	+ Southeast Asia Tobacco Control Alliance (SEATCA)
* *State commissions and agencies*
	+ California Energy Commission
	+ California Coastal Commission
	+ California Senate – Subcommittee on International Trade & State Legislation
	+ Idaho House of Representatives – Office of the Speaker
	+ Maine – Maine Citizens Trade Policy Commission
	+ New Hampshire House of Representatives – Commerce Committee
	+ Vermont – Study Committee on International Trade and State Sovereignty
	+ Washington – Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Trade Policy
	+ Utah – Utah International Trade Commission
* *Government associations*
* Council of State Governments (CSG)
* International Municipal Lawyers' Association (IMLA)
* Intergovernmental Policy Advisory Committee (IGPAC)
* National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG)
* National Association of Counties (NACO)
* National Association of Development Officers (NADO)
* National Caucus of Environmental Legislators (NCEL)
* National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL)
* *International organizations*
	+ Framework Convention Alliance, Washington and Geneva
	+ Greens Group of the European Parliament
	+ International Labor Organization (ILO), Washington Office
	+ Third World Network (Geneva)
	+ National Economic Development and Labour Council (NEDLAC), Johannesburg South Centre (Geneva)
	+ Mesa Tecnica de La Oroya, Peru
	+ Our World is Not for Sale (OWINS)
	+ Presbyterian Church USA, World Mission – Peru
	+ Southeast Asia Tobacco Control Alliance (SEATCA)
	+ UN Economic Commission on Latin American and the Caribbean
* *University-based programs*
* Pardee Center – Boston University
* Center for the Advancement of the Rule of Law in the Americas (CAROLA) – Georgetown
* Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment, Columbia Law School
* Public Law Center – Tulane University Law School

**4. *Worker rights and human rights***
****The rule of law for working people has not kept pace with the cost of living, global competition, and modern slavery.  The human rights team supports those who protect workers in global supply chains and establish just employment policies in universities and other domestic institutions. Our clients and collaborators include governments from local to global, members of Congress, human rights advocates, unions, institutional purchasers, and monitoring organizations.

In 2021, our work will take a more domestic turn by focusing on the plight of workers in food-supply chains of U.S. universities. This project to organize a Just Purchasing Consortium is shared with the health and food team as noted above. Recent clients and collaborators include the following.

***Past clients & collaborators***

* *Nongovernment organizations (US based)*
	+ BlueGreen Alliance
	+ International Corporate Accountability Roundtable (ICAR)
	+ International Labor Rights Forum
	+ Solidarity Center
	+ Worker Rights Consortium
* *Government Associations*
	+ Sweatfree Purchasing Consortium, which consists of three states (Maine, New York and Pennsylvania) and 13 cities (including Los Angeles, Milwaukee, Madison, Portland, San Francisco, Santa Fe, and Seattle)
* *International organizations*
	+ Center for Sport and Human Rights
	+ Electronics Watch
	+ Danish Institute for Human Rights
	+ Global Electronics Council
	+ Global Pro Bono Bar Association
	+ Human Rights Watch
	+ International Learning Lab on Procurement and Human Rights
	+ Sport and Rights Alliance
* *Unions*
	+ AFL-CIO, International
	+ International Brotherhood of Teamsters
	+ International Trade Union Confederation
	+ Public Services International
	+ United Food & Commercial Workers
* *University-based programs*
	+ Arizona State University, McCain Institute
	+ Georgetown University programs:
		- * Health Justice Alliance
			* Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor
			* Workers’ Rights Institute
	+ University of Michigan, Ross School of Business
	+ University of California, President’s Office, Sustainability Program
	+ University of Greenwich – Business, Human Rights and Environment Research Group
	+ Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor – Georgetown
	+ University of Nottingham – Public Procurement Research Group

**D. Experiential learning**

* 1. ***Clinic learning goals.*** Our educational goal is to enable students to use core skills to adapt their policy role to any project or setting. The role of a policy lawyer is less scripted by rules of procedure than more traditional roles like defense counsel, prosecutor, or business counselor. A policy lawyer crafts a new role for each project, each of which requires a unique strategy. One client might ask you to draft a bill to amend existing law; the next might ask you to develop a strategy to create a new health care system.

	Students develop their roles as part of a project-specific team, but the skill sets our students employ is common to all subjects and to any government, corporate, or nonprofit setting in which our students will practice. These skill sets are distributed across three categories and are reflected in our curriculum, supervision methods, and evaluation criteria.
* ***Management and strategy*** *(4 credits for two semesters / 2 credits for fall semester only).* Being a good—or even competent—lawyer requires more than understanding the basics of the law. It is critical for lawyers to have a good grasp of the nuts and bolts of working with others: supervisors, colleagues, and clients.You will learn to “manage up,” which entails defining your role and setting expectations of supervisors by pro-actively developing a work plan, preparing weekly agendas, and tracking deadlines to drive the supervision process. Defining your role necessarily entails understanding the ethical demands of accountability, the boundaries set by client confidences, and the choices you must face if your personal values conflict with those of your client. This skill set includes collaboration—the art of managing horizontally. In a team setting, you will learn to divide labor, vet work plans, and critique outlines, drafts and presentations. You will also learn to modulate your natural tendency, as necessary, to participate in seminar discussions diplomatically.

We will assess your progress using the evaluation criteria detailed in part II.E:
	+ Manage up: supervision meetings.
	+ Initiate self-evaluation.
	+ Manage project work.
	+ Collaborate effectively.
	+ Meet ethical standards.
* ***Research and analysis*** *(5 credits for two semesters / 3 credits for fall semester only).* Different projects call for different research and analysis skills. Some projects require traditional legal analysis only, which can be statutory, regulatory, treaty-based, or grounded in caselaw. Other projects require policy analysis, including creating policy solutions to enable your client to achieve their goals. Some projects will require both. You will also explain your analytic method in a written product—possible more than one type. As you apply analytic theory to specific problems, you will practice critical thinking to compare competing ideas and provide diverse sources to avoid unintended bias. You will conclude by guiding your client’s use of analysis to serve a strategic purpose and make decisions or move forward.

We will assess your progress using the evaluation criteria detailed in part II.E:
* Define the problem.
* Use diverse sources to learn the context efficiently.
* Outline analysis based on the analytic method.
* Apply your theory and think critically.
* ***Communication*** *(5 credits for two semesters / 3 credits for fall semester only****).***Style matters, and we will challenge you to self-edit using the clinic’s preferred guides for usage, clarity, plain language, grammar and punctuation, document design, and display of visual information. You will learn to:
	+ prepare for writing and speaking as a process, which starts with identifying your audience and what it needs to know about the problem or policy you are presenting.
	+ practice translating the logic of analysis into headings and visible transitions.
	+ learn to distinguish informative from persuasive communication, as well as what it means to *understand* your writing or speaking by beginning and ending with how your audience can use the analysis—to make a decision, to make an argument, to implement a strategy.

We will assess your progress using the evaluation criteria detailed in part II.E (“Grading and Overall Evaluation”):

* Meet audience needs for introductory material.
* Present the logic of organization.
* Relate analysis to the audience.
* Use appropriate style.
* Conclude actively.
* Edit your document.

**2. *Institutional learning outcomes.*** The policy clinic’s learning outcomes are organized somewhat differently that those adopted by the faculty for Georgetown Law as a whole. Nonetheless, the clinic still covers all of the bases as aligned in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Georgetown Law’s learning outcomes** | **Policy clinic’s learning outcomes** |
| Knowledge of substantive and procedural law… | Research and analysis--*The clinic evaluates knowledge as an indicator of effective research skills.* |
| Ability to engage in legal analysis … |
| Ability to conduct legal research … |
| Ability to communicate … orally and in writing | Communication skills |
| Ability to use problem-solving and collaborative techniques | Management and professionalism*--The clinic evaluates critical thinking as an aspect of analysis as well as strategy.* |
| Ability to engage in critical and strategic thinking |
| Understanding the rules, ethics, and values … |

**3. *Seminar Curriculum*.** Seminars stress active learning through student presentations, writing exercises, peer critique, and interaction with practitioners. Seminars meet on Friday mornings for three hours (10:00 am to 1:00 pm) with additional seminars or team meetings on Wednesday afternoons (3:00 to 5:00 pm).

**Fall semester**

* ***Orientation***
* Role of policy lawyer
* Skill sets – management, analysis and communication
* Current projects

- Community equity

 - Health and food

- Trade and investment

- Worker rights / human rights

* ***Management and professionalism***
	+ Managing up – planning tools and weekly accountability
	+ Professional culture –communications, cognitive bias, emotional intelligence, personality types, and representation and inclusion.
* ***Research and analysis***
* Primary sources – statutes, treaties, and caselaw for doctrines of interpretation
* Legal frameworks – sources of authority and limits on authority
* Logical organization – division and classification
* Policy analysis – choosing alternatives based on rational criteria
* Legal analysis – conflict and preemption, for example
* ***Strategy***
* Strategy as a process (planning backwards from desired outcomes)
* Goals and objectives
* Strategy template for policy-making: define outcomes, make forum choices, engage networks, implement roles and tactics, secure resources
* Logical framework
* Theory of change
* ***Presentation skills***
* Using stories to connect
* Showing what you mean – video and web tools
* Editing visual information
* Concluding actively
* Student presentations – each student presents once

• ***Writing skills***

* Writing process – purpose, organization, writing, editing
* Editing
	+ Eliminate fuzzy language (ambiguity, vagueness, generality)
	+ Choose legal language or plain language
	+ Meet language conventions (grammar, punctuation, usage)

• ***Ethics & client relations***

* D.C. Bar rules – confidentiality, conflicts and personal values
* University rules – using the work of others (i.e., plagiarism)
* Talking about work

**Spring semester**

* ***Practice using strategic planning tools***
* Defining goals, objectives, and tasks
* Developing a strategy template and logical framework
* Mapping a theory of change
* ***Guest lecturers: policy practitioners***
* Communications firm
* Law firm with a lobbying practice
* Government (e.g., staff for agencies, congressional committees, or members of Congress)
* Foundations and funding
* Unions
* Nonprofit organizations
* ***Student presentations***
* Each student presents twice

**3. *Clinical methods.*** Students work an average of least 25 hours per week over two semesters or 28 hours for those that opt for fall semester only. Half of this time is highly structured interaction between students and faculty that creates a blueprint for independent student work. The following expectations for student-faculty interaction are average hours per week (including preparation time).

* ***Structured work*** – 12.5 hrs/wk. The following components are averages per week.
* ***Seminars*** – 6.5 hrs/wk. Starting with orientation, seminars convey the theory and practice of policy lawyering. In a typical class, students learn by using a skill or analytic method to present an aspect of their project, and the faculty will explain the relevant evaluation criteria. Seminars meet on most Fridays at 10:00 am and on Wednesdays at 3:00 pm during weeks when there are student presentations.
* ***Team meetings*** – 1.5 hrs/wk. Team meetings usually occur on Wednesdays when seminars do not meet and at other times as needed. They involve students and staff who work on a general topic (health, climate, human rights, trade) or a project. Team meetings can serve a variety of purposes:
- Small group seminar on the law of one or more projects.
- Strategy sessions in which students seek broader input on their project.
- Rehearsal of presentations to clients or conferences.
- Peer critique sessions for partners or larger groups to discuss student work.
- “Rounds” to discuss problems or issues that arise from projects or client relations.
* ***Supervisor meetings*** – 1.5 hrs/wk. In weekly supervision meetings, students develop planning skills and receive feedback on all aspects of performance. Students manage this meeting. They prepare an agenda of analytic questions, reactions to faculty comments on their work, and reflections on the previous seminar. Non-routine topics include end-of-semester evaluation and students’ personal learning memos on goals and career interests.
* ***Client or constituency meetings*** – 2 hrs/wk. Students interact with clients and collaborators in a variety of settings. For example, students may present to a planning session or a larger coalition meeting, or they may observe a coalition meeting or conference to gather information for strategic planning.
* ***Peer critique*** – 1 hr/wk. We use peer critique to teach presentation skills in seminars. We also use it selectively to strengthen editing skills as students work on writing for their clinic projects.
* ***Independent work*** – 12.5 hrs/wk. Students are expected to spend additional time developing their skills through planning, research, analysis, drafting, formatting work products, and practicing presentations.

**II. Student Supervision & Evaluation**

**A. Student Autonomy and Supervision**

Our work requires knowledge of law and policy, understanding of political context, and ability to translate analysis for a policy audience.

Clinics that use a nondirective style are able to do so because they narrow the focus of practice; their students can master skills and knowledge in a particular forum. In addition, some clinics avoid projects with tight deadlines so that students can work through 10 or more drafts of a brief or report. Because of time constraints, these options are usually not available in the policy clinic.

Our supervision style tends to be **more directive** in the following ways:

* ***Strategic planning*** – The Institute staff coordinates strategic planning for projects that take years to develop. As part of a team, students contribute to work plans, present options to clients, and develop individual work within the context of a longer-term plan.
* ***Writing*** – Student writing is usually limited in the number of drafts that students can complete and revise based on supervisor comments. We strive to enable students to write an outline and three drafts based on supervisor feedback. If time permits, students can complete additional drafts, but at some point, a supervisor will edit and contribute to the final draft.
* ***Presentations*** – External presentations are often made as a team, particularly in the first semester, with supervisors introducing students to clients and constituent groups.

We encourage students to initiate planning, research, outlines for analysis, definition of work products, and setting deadlines for documents and events.

**B. Structure for Feedback and Reflection**

We use a variety of feedback techniques to evaluate different types of performance:

* ***Regular weekly meetings with supervisor:***  On a weekly basis, students set the agenda to reflect on past performance, account for progress, provide evidence of planning, and submit a time sheet. Supervisors use students’ agendas to evaluate strategy and management. In a typical weekly meeting, a student will:
	+ discuss the relevance of the previous seminar to student work and questions about upcoming seminar assignments;
	+ review the past week's activity (including a completed time sheet);
	+ plan the next week (including updates to the project work plan and any new client requests);
	+ identify substantive issues that require discussion or guidance;
	+ initiate self-evaluation and discuss supervisor evaluation of student performance;
	+ identify ethical issues and potential responses; and
	+ evaluate client, team or supervisor relations.
* ***Student-initiated meetings:*** The weekly routine is a baseline. We encourage students to initiate additional conversations with their immediate supervisor or other institute staff as the need arises. Doing so will improve efficiency and promote one goal of critical thinking, which is to enable a lawyer to manage mid-course corrections.
* ***Comments on written work:***  Supervising attorneys provide comments on all major written work. These usually include margin comments on drafts and short feedback memos or outlines that summarize margin notes and list major substantive questions.
* ***Personal learning memos:*** Students submit four short memos through the year to promote reflection. The memos are intended to:
	+ define personal learning goals entering the clinic (September);
	+ identify desired changes in assignments, topics or methodology (December);
	+ self-evaluate performance; identify needs to improve (March); and
	+ comment on personal accomplishments in the clinic (April).
* ***Formal planning*:**  Students are required to produce a work plan or strategic plan for their part of the projects. The clinic provides templates for doing both. This plan includes goals and objectives of the project, research tasks, and products the students are expected to produce.
* ***Mid-year evaluation conferences:*** Each student meets with his/her supervisor at the end of the first semester and again in mid-March to discuss the student's overall performance in the clinic. Students lead these conversations and complete a self-evaluation summary (see attached form) for the fall semester. We aim to set targets for improving performance during the second semester.
* ***Year-end evaluation conferences:*** Each student meets with his/her supervisor at the end of the second semester to discuss the student's overall performance in the clinic. Students lead this conversations and complete a self-evaluation summary (see attached form) for the spring semester.
* ***Evaluation calendar:*** The policy clinic has a series of target dates and deadlines in order to provide notice of performance that students need to improve and to avoid a crush of work at the end of the second semester, which makes it difficult to provide feedback before students run out of time. The milestones for evaluation and *approximate* dates are:

10/1 First personal learning memo – State your goals for personal development in the clinic.

12/1 Second personal learning memo – List desired changes in the clinic: assignment, topic or methodology for second semester. Identify desired changes in personal approach to clinic work.

1/15 Fall semester evaluation meeting to review overall performance.

3/15 Third personal learning memo – Assessment of performance (of oneself);
list evaluation categories where improvement is desired.

3/15 Mid-spring evaluation meeting to review overall performance.

4/1 Deadline for first drafts of remaining written work products.

4/15 Deadline for second drafts of remaining written work products.

5/1 Fourth personal learning memo – Comment on personal accomplishments in the clinic.

5/1 Deadline for final drafts of remaining written work products.

5/10 Deadline for remaining year-end tasks (transition memo, time-sheets, etc.) and remaining work without an extension.

5/10 Year-end evaluation meeting to review overall performance.

* ***Evaluation file:*** Supervisors keep the following compilation of student work.

1 Weekly meeting agendas and notes

2 Time sheets, which the student provides on a weekly basis

3 Personal learning memos or comments in which the student evaluates the clinic

4 Work plans and updates

5 Draft written products, supervisor comments, and comment forms

6 Comment forms on presentations in seminars, meetings and conferences

7 General evaluation forms and comments, including mid-year and year-end reviews

**C. Student Evaluation of the Clinical Program**

To receive the full benefit of evaluation of the program by students, the Harrison Institute schedules a group discussion at the last seminar of each semester. It covers student views on supervision, clinical projects, seminar curriculum and the program as a whole. In addition, students are encouraged to meet confidentially with the Institute director or the assistant dean for clinical programs.

**D. Student Responsibilities for Time and Participation**

Credits for the policy clinic are set at 14 credits for two semesters and 8 for fall semester only. For two-semester students, the average effort should be at least 25 hours per week over two semesters. For one-semester students, the average effort should be at least 28 hours per week for the fall only. These are the minimum levels of effort that the clinic expects a student will need to perform competently. Weekly completion of time sheets is mandatory.

The clinic does not preclude extracurricular activities such as work or journal participation. However, time conflicts are not acceptable reasons for failure to meet clinic deadlines or responsibilities. Students should anticipate time conflicts far enough in advance to avoid them. Clinic work can sometimes be shifted, but lead-time is essential.

Seminar participation is mandatory and constitutes a major portion of performance on which students are evaluated.

**E. Grading and Overall Evaluation**

The policy clinic grades each of three skill sets for the role of policy lawyer. These grades appear on a student’s transcript at the following levels of credit:

 *Two semesters Fall only*

Management and professionalism 4 credits 2 credits

Research and analysis 5 credits 3 credits

Communication skills 5 credits 3 credits

Law Center policy requires clinic grades to reflect an historical curve, which requires supervisors to compare overall student performance over the past several years. At the end of the second semester, our grading process involves the following steps.

1. Supervisors review each student file of work products, supervisor comments, weekly agendas, time sheets, personal learning memos, and other notes.
2. The student and supervisor both complete an evaluation summary (described below).
3. The student and supervisor meet to assess the student’s performance. Using the evaluation summary as the agenda, the student takes the lead in self-evaluation, and the supervisor responds with points of agreement, disagreement or additional observations.
4. After this meeting, the supervisor recommends a letter grade to the clinic director for each of the three skill sets.
5. Supervisors meet to compare each grade and its supporting evaluation summary in order to assure fairness among students with different supervisors.
6. The clinic director decides and registers the final grade.

Well before final evaluation and grades, students and supervisors need a mid-course evaluation of overall performance. This occurs in late October for fall-only students and December and mid-March for two-semester students.

Our language for evaluation uses terms that *approximate* levels of performance for grades. This gives students a sense of how they are doing without locking in expectations for a particular grade. The following chart shows how grades correspond with approximate evaluation terms and how we define these terms based on skill performance and work readiness.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **Evaluation term** | **Performance based on criteria for the skill set** | **Work readiness:****E.g., written analysis** |  |
|  A | Consistently excellent | Consistently excellent for all criteria | Ready to deliver or publish |  |
|  A- | Mostly excellent | Mostly excellent; mixed with room for improvement on some criteria | Requires light editing  |  |
|  B+ | Very good | Meets most criteria, some need improvement | Requires moderate editing  |  |
|  B | Good | Meets some criteria; several need improvement | Requires substantial editing  |  |
|  B- | Adequate | Meets some criteria; several need significant improvement | Requires revision, more than just editing |  |
|  C+below | Not adequate | Meets few criteria; most need significant improvement | Requires substantial revision; not focused on client needs, incomplete, or extraneous |  |

**F. Outline of Evaluation Criteria**

The following outline covers each of three core competencies for purposes of student evaluation and grading. It is not exhaustive, however, and students will be credited and critiqued for performance that is “outside of the box” for work that is responsive to client or program needs.

**1. Management and professionalism**

a. *Manage up: supervision meetings.*

(1) Prepare weekly agendas or additional formats to report progress, raise questions about analysis or strategy, propose next steps, and reflect on how seminars on theory relate to practice. As necessary, prepare a post-meeting update to capture insights from the meeting and revisions to next steps.

(2) Efficiently brief supervisors on research results and analysis, ensuring that supervisors understand your work and you have the guidance to move forward.

(3) Submit weekly time sheets; compare priorities with effort expended.

(4) Be on time, and notify clients or supervisors in advance of schedule conflicts.

b. *Initiate self-evaluation.*

(1) Initiate self-evaluation in light of clinic evaluation criteria: in weekly meetings, in reflection memos, and in self-evaluation summaries.

(2) Respond to constructive criticism from supervisors and peers, for example, by revising work or asking questions about the feedback.

(3) Develop habits of critical thinking to become self-correcting,[[1]](#footnote-1) for example:

(a) to overcome sensitivity to criticism that impedes learning,

(b) to summarize and reflect on feedback about language habits or analysis, and

(c) to think critically about your analysis as noted in section 2(d).

c. *Manage project work.*

(1) Outline a work plan that states goals and objectives, defines work products, and identifies tasks with time estimates.

(2) Create a timeline to logically sequence stages of work and set deadlines for multiple drafts of work products.

(3) Once deadlines are set, either meet them, or in advance, renegotiate the deadline or the scope of work.

(4) Develop personal productivity methods to manage competing priorities, minimize attention residue, and concentrate without media distractions.

(5) Meet the clinic's time expectation (weekly average of 28 hours per week for the fall or 25 for two semesters).

d. *Collaborate effectively.*
Group settings include client and team meetings, seminars, conferences, panel presentations, coalition meetings, informal receptions, etc.

(1) Negotiate division of labor in project teams.

(2) Share or alternate leadership roles for team meetings and work planning.

(3) Manage differences when working in groups, and seek managerial guidance when necessary.

(4) Participate in seminar discussion and peer critique.

(5) Time your intervention for best effect (*e.g.,* when you speak up, how much you speak), keeping others’ needs in mind as well as your own.

(6) Maintain a professional tone when challenging someone’s point of view, criticizing someone’s performance, debating sensitive topics, *etc.*

(7) Identify your role in external meetings.

e. *Meet ethical standards.*

(1) Comply with:

(a) The Student Code of Professional Responsibility (Student Handbook).

(b) Georgetown University guidance on avoiding plagiarism ([link here](https://honorcouncil.georgetown.edu/whatisplagiarism)).

(c) D.C. Rules of Professional Conduct (clinic document files on Canvas).

(2) Anticipate ethical issues or value conflicts and raise them in supervision meetings.

(3) Evaluation note: Standards of professional conduct are also relevant to other skill sets. If you violate a rule of professional conduct, it will affect your grade. A violation does not average out or diminish simply because it occurs early in the academic year.

**2. Research and Analysis**

a. *Define the problem and identify client goals.*

(1) Define the problem or question as presented by your client (or as it appears to the public) and as it relates to your client’s goals.

(2) As necessary, define a more specific legal or policy question that you must analyze.

(3) As you begin, state your “approach” – a tentative answer that you test or a theory of change that you develop.

b. *Diversify sources for efficiency and credibility.*
Primary sources (statutes, treaties, case law) are essential, but they rarely provide sufficient context. The converse is also true; secondary sources provide context but rarely provide sufficient specificity to answer a question. To strike the right balance, you should –

(1) Use general secondary sources (e.g., treatises and restatements) to get your bearings.

(2) Find specific secondary sources (e.g., journal articles), if they exist, to refine your approach. Look for specialized collections or libraries (e.g., agency libraries or files or web-based collections) including in-house documents.

(3) Find primary sources that are specific to the question, sector, or jurisdiction.

(4) Ask people for advice on the best sources: supervisors, practitioners, reference librarians.

(4) Cite balanced sources for accuracy and credibility:

(i) Politically and legally balanced sources.

(ii) Primary and secondary sources.

(iii) Recent and seminal sources.

c. *Outline analysis based on the analytic method.*

(1) *Identify the analytic method.*
A method has a name (e.g., “preemption analysis”) and provides logical steps for answering a question, making a choice, or solving a problem. Most of your analysis will be one or more of three types: legal, policy, and strategic.

(1) Legal analysis typically answers a question. For example, does the jurisdiction have authority to adopt a law? Is a state law preempted by federal law? Are national laws consistent with treaty obligations?

(2) Policy analysis typically compares alternatives based on criteria such as cost-benefit, political feasibility, risk of adverse litigation, and administrative complexity.

(3) Strategic analysis contributes to a sequence of events planned to achieve desired outcomes. Typically, a strategic plan uses one or more of these formats:

(a) *Logical framework* – Define inputs, outputs, and short-, medium-, or long-term outcomes.

(b) *Theory of change* – Start with desired results (long-term goals) and (a) identify a causal sequence of necessary preconditions, (b) insert interventions that you or others control to bring about the preconditions, (c) insert assumptions about political, social or environmental conditions, and (d) write a narrative to explain the theory of change.

(c) *Strategy template* – Mapping backwards from desired results (a policy decision), the strategy template frames a theory of change in terms of a typical policy-making process.

(2) *Outline the analysis.*

(1) Start with a rough outline.

(2) Refine the outline based on steps of the analytic method.

(3) Expand the outline as research progresses.

(4) Edit based on principles of division, classification and sequence. If you are comparing two or more policy choices or jurisdictions, use a logical framework in two dimensions (i.e., a matrix with rows and columns). For example, policy options would be one axis and selection criteria the other. For another example, types of domestic laws would be one axis and various treaty obligations would be the other.

d. *Apply your method and think critically.*

(1) Explain the theory of your analysis and the source of authority from which it derives (for example, case law or statute).

(2) Think critically about your ideas or arguments. For example:

(a) Is the law or doctrine you are using clear or fuzzy? For example, can you derive more than one interpretation from it?

(c) Are legal doctrines subjective and imbued with a bias? What is the bias?

(d) Are there inherent limits or weaknesses in your arguments?

(e) Do you compare your arguments to competing ones?

(f) Do you compare or contrast relevant case law or policy models?

(g) Is your analysis tailored to the goals and objectives of your client(s)?

(h) Are client goals and objectives inchoate or based on unquestioned assumptions?

(3) Synthesize legal rules or elements of policy.

(4) Apply the rules or elements to the specific facts and law of the problem.

(5) Provide an active conclusion (for example, recommendations for next steps).

**3. Communication**

 **a. Writing**

(1) *Meet audience needs for introductory material.*

1. Explain the purpose of the document and audience role (e.g., to make decisions).
2. Establish an appropriate tone to reflect the purpose (e.g., informative vs. advocacy).
3. Write your lead paragraphs in a way that is interesting and narrative, not technical.
4. After your lead, explain the context for understanding the issues and analysis.

(2) *Present the logic of organization.*

(a) Set an appropriate length and degree of technical detail.

(b) Use the analytic outline for headings and a table of contents for long documents.

(c) Use logical graphics for headings, body text, tabulation and white space.

(d) Implement your outline with clear topic sentences for paragraphs.

(e) Use parallel structure in format and syntax to show parallel logic.

(3) *Relate the analysis to your audience.*

(a) Explain your analytic method for legal questions or policy choices.

(b) Illustrate abstract concepts with graphics (e.g., a framework or Venn diagram), examples, or stories.

(c) Provide user aids (*e.g*., action agendas, policy options, decision criteria) when the value of analysis is not self-evident to the audience.

(d) Summarize complex analysis at transition points.

(4) *Use appropriate style.*

(a) Use plain language unless the context requires otherwise.

(b) Cite authority for facts and ideas derived from others. As a default, use legal citation style (Bluebook, Baby Blue, Maroon, etc.) unless another style is more appropriate.

(c) Follow language conventions.

* Identify documents. (Policy Clinic Style Manual: Author, topic, date or version number).
* Follow grammar rules. (Chicago Manual of Style)
* Follow punctuation rules. (Chicago Manual of Style)
* Use guidelines for clarity. (Policy Clinic Style Manual)

(5) *Conclude actively.*

(a) Summarize complex analysis.

(b) Address the purpose and guide the reader’s use of your analysis:

(1) Identify client needs to make decisions or choose among policy options.

(2) Provide options, and summarize pros and cons.

(3) Anticipate next steps.

**b. Speaking**

(1) *Meet audience needs for introductory material.*

 (a) Explain the purpose of the presentation and audience role.

 (b) As necessary, introduce yourself and your role.

 (c) Explain the context for understanding the problem or legal issues.

(2) *Organize the presentation logically.*

 (a) Determine and keep to an appropriate length.

(b) Provide a “roadmap” – an outline or agenda of the points you cover. For complex presentations, present your roadmap in writing or text of a slide.

(3) *Relate the analysis to audience needs.*

(a) Show what you mean: Present abstract concepts with graphics, examples or stories.

(b) Summarize complex analysis at transition points.

(c) Provide user aids (*e.g*., action agendas, policy options, decision criteria) when the value of analysis is not self-evident to the audience.

(4) *Use appropriate style.*

(a) Contact – Maintain eye contact with the audience; do not rely on extensive written notes or text; take a visible position; avoid counter-productive body language.

(b) Language – Use plain language or explain terms of art; avoid habitual interruptions (*e.g.,* unnecessary phrases or “ums”).

(c) Tone – Use an emotional tone that is appropriate for the purpose and audience.

(d) Sound – Use volume and pace that are appropriate for the audience and location.

(5) *Conclude actively.*

 (a) Reiterate your theme and purpose, including audience role.

 (b) Reiterate your main argument, conclusion or theory.

 (c) Invite dialogue with questions or next steps.

 (d) Respond to questions without defensiveness or overstatement.

(e) Respond to questions with substantive information; defer when you are not sure.

Student Evaluation Summary — Harrison Institute Policy Clinic

Student \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 ***Levels of student performance – Criteria for performance are listed in categories below***

 □ *Excellent* – Meets all criteria; work requires only light editing

 □ *Very good* – Meets most criteria, some need improvement; work requires modest editing

 □ *Good* – Meets some criteria; several need improvement; work requires substantial editing

 □ *Adequate* – Meets some criteria; several need significant improvement; work requires revision

 □ *Not adequate* – Meets few criteria; many need significant improvement; requires substantial revision

|  |
| --- |
| Management and professionalism *Move the ‘x’* |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Manage supervision meetings |  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Initiate self-evaluation |  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Manage project work |  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Collaborate effectively in groups |  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Meet ethical standards |  |
| Research and analysis  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Define the problem  |  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Use diverse sources  |  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Outline analysis based on method |  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Apply theory / think critically |  |
| Communication  |
| **Writing style** |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Meet audience needs (intro) |  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Present logic of organization |  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Relate analysis to audience |  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Use appropriate style |  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Conclude actively |  |
| **Speaking style** |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Meet audience needs (intro) |  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Present logic of organization |  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Relate analysis to audience |  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Use appropriate style |  |
| □ □ □ □ □ **x** Conclude actively |  |

Agenda Template for Weekly Meeting

**Harrison Institute – Policy Clinic**

Student \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**1. Meeting management**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| □ Student agenda |  |
| □ Student time sheet  |  |

**2. Work in progress**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| □ Progress on research / analysis |  |
| □ Collaboration with other students |  |
| □ Supervisor comments |  |

**3. Project planning**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| □ Deadline management |  |
| □ Next client meeting / expectation |  |
| □ External events or contact |  |
| □ Project goals and objectives |  |
| □ Accountability issues |  |

**4. Seminars**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| □ Student participation / presentation |  |
| □ Relevance of previous seminar |  |
| □ Assignment for previous seminar  |  |
| □ Assignment for next seminar |  |

**5. General evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| □ Student work |  |
| □ Clinic operations |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comments on Presentation Style**Harrison Institute for Public Law – Policy Clinic**Topic** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | Presenter  |
| Evaluator  |
| Date  |
| Time from to |
|  |  |
| I n t r o d u c t i o n |
| Introduce theme/purpose |  |
| Connect / est. credibility |  |
| Define context |  |
| Provide roadmap |  |
| Other |  |
| M a i n b o d y & a n a l y s i s |
| Relate with story or example |  |
| Show what you mean:Frame of analysisFrame of choicesFlow of logicPictures |  |
| Quality of visuals:Minimize chart junkMinimize text |  |
| Summarize complexity |  |
| C o n c l u s i o n |
| Length  |  |
| Restate theme / purpose |  |
| Conclude actively |  |
| Responses to questions |  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| S t y l e t h r o u g h o u t |
| Contact & visibility |  |
| Language – jargon |  |
| Language – habits |  |
| Volume |  |
| Pace & tone  |  |
| Other |  |
| S u b s t a n t i v e c o m m e n t s |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Editing Audit Harrison Institute for Public Law

Student \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Document Topic **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| P u r p o s e | Note page of occurrence – successive drafts |
| Intro purpose or theme |  |  |  |
| Active conclusion |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| O r g a n i z a t i o n |
| Outline, logical format |  |  |  |
| Div/class/sequence |  |  |  |
| Parallel structure |  |  |  |
| Topic sentence |  |  |  |
| A n a l y s i s |
| Abstract / examples |  |  |  |
| Citations / cite form |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| C l a r i t y – F u z z y  |
| Vagueness |  |  |  |
| Ambiguity |  |  |  |
| Generality |  |  |  |
| Legal language, jargon |  |  |  |
| C l a r i t y – C o m p l e x |
| Long sentence |  |  |  |
| Intrusive clause |  |  |  |
| Complex conditional |  |  |  |
| Double negative |  |  |  |
| Noun string  |  |  |  |
| C l a r I t y – P a s s I v e |
| Passive verb |  |  |  |
| Nominalization |  |  |  |
| C l a r I t y – E x c e s s i v e |
| Redundancy |  |  |  |
| Unnecessary words |  |  |  |
| G r a m m a r |  |
| Pronouns: that/which |  |  |  |
| Singular/plural |  |  |  |
| Verb tense |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| P u n c t u a t i o n |  |
| Comma |  |  |  |
| Colon |  |  |  |
| Capitalization |  |  |  |
| Hyphen / dash |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

1. *See* Critical Thinking Foundation, Our Concept and Definition of Critical Thinking, <http://www.criticalthinking.org/pages/our-conception-of-critical-thinking/411> (“Critical thinking is self-directed, self-disciplined, self-monitored, and self-corrective thinking. It presupposes assent to rigorous standards of excellence and mindful command of their use. It entails effective communication and problem-solving abilities, as well as a commitment to overcome our native egocentrism and sociocentrism.”) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)