

LSAC Evaluation Service

LSAC's Evaluation Service is a new, simple tool that recommenders can use to provide structured, consistent, and worthwhile information about applicants to law schools. Beginning with the 2011 application cycle, evaluators can use the online tool to rate specific noncognitive factors that will help law schools assess whether an applicant is a good fit for law school and the legal profession. These noncognitive factors are based on recent research on their relation to success in law school and the legal profession. Focus groups of law school professionals informed the design of this service.

The Evaluation Service includes ratings of 30 individual attributes and skills in 6 categories, including:

- Intellectual skill;
- Personal qualities;
- Integrity and honesty;
- Communication;
- Task management; and
- Working with others.

The evaluations are an adjunct to LSAC's current letter of recommendation (LOR) service and will function in a similar way, except that the Evaluation Service is entirely online.

How the Evaluation Service Works

Using ACES², participating law schools will be able to choose any combination of evaluations and letters of recommendation that they may wish to recommend, require, or accept (Figure 1).

Figure 1, Law School Preference Selection in ACES²

| LORs/Evaluations | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|------------|----------|------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|---|---|--|
| Start Date | #EAS Accpt | #EAS Req | #EAS Reccm | #LORs Accpt | #LORs Req | #LORs Reccm | 1st Time Rpt Opts | Update Rpt Opts | |
| 09/02/2009 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | Include all available letters/evaluations | Send letters/evaluations separately when received | |
| 09/01/2009 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | Include all available letters/evaluations | Send letters/evaluations separately when received | |

Start Date:

Number of Evaluations Accepted: Number of Evaluations Required: Number of Evaluations Recommended:

Number of LORs Accepted: Number of LORs Required: Number of LORs Recommended:

1st Time Report Options: Update Report Options Send letters/evaluations separately when received
 Send letters/evaluations with updates
 Send letters/evaluations weekly(Tuesday)
 Send letters/evaluations semi-monthly (2nd and 16th)
 Send letters/Evaluations monthly(2nd)

Applicants will provide evaluator information in their LSAC account.

The screenshot shows the LSAC website interface. At the top, the LSAC logo and 'Law School Admission Council' are displayed. A navigation bar contains links for 'My Home', 'My Account', 'LSAT', 'Apply', 'Forums', and 'Shop'. A shopping cart icon indicates '2 item(s)' and a 'Log out' link is present. The main content area is titled 'Letters of Recommendation and Evaluations' and includes a 'Back to LOR's and Evaluations' link. Below this is the 'My Recommenders and Evaluators' section, which features a table with columns for 'Name' and 'Designation'. The table lists four individuals: Dr. Ryan Howard (Recommender), Helen Thimble (Recommender), Dr. Margaret Ibanez (Evaluator), and Jennifer Livingston (Recommender/Evaluator). Each row has an 'Edit' button. The Michael Sutter row includes both 'Edit' and 'Delete' buttons. An 'Add Recommender/Evaluator' button is located below the table. A sidebar on the left contains 'Edit My Profile' and account information: Account # 34000123, Expiration Date February 28, 2013, Candidate Referral Service status (Registered/Not Registered), and Prelaw Advisor(s) information. The footer contains links for Home, Legal Notice, Help, Contact Us, and Site Map, along with a copyright notice for 2010.

| Name | Designation | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Dr. Ryan Howard | Recommender | Edit |
| Helen Thimble | Recommender | Edit |
| Dr. Margaret Ibanez | Evaluator | Edit |
| Jennifer Livingston | Recommender/Evaluator | Edit |
| Michael Sutter | Recommender | Edit Delete |

Figure 2

Applicants will assign evaluations to law schools to which they apply, just as they do LORs. A single recommender can do both evaluations and LORs, but the applicant must determine, based on each law school's requirements, which service (LOR or evaluation) to solicit and assign.

Schools' evaluation requirements are displayed for applicants just like LOR requirements.

LSAC Law School Admission Council [Cart](#) [Log Out](#)

[My Home](#) [My Account](#) [LSAT](#) [Apply](#) [Forums](#) [Shop](#)

Georgetown University Law Center - Spring 2010

Assign Letters of Recommendation (LOR) and Evaluations

LOR and Evaluation specifications for this school:

- **Requires** 2 evaluations. Will accept up to 3 evaluations.
- **Requires** 1 letter. Will accept up to 3 letters.
- Accepts letters of recommendation when the initial law school report is sent.
- The law school report will be updated and sent each time LSAC receives a letter of recommendation and/or evaluation.

NOTE: Letters/Evaluations are sent as part of your law school report to the law schools to which you apply, according to each law school's LOR requirements and its scheduling preference for receiving reports. Law schools may change their schedule for receiving reports at any time.

Assign Letters to This School

Letter

Letter

Letter

Assign Evaluations to This School

Evaluation

Evaluation

Evaluation

Edit My Profile
Account #: 34000123
Expiration Date: February 28, 2013
Candidate Referral Service: Registered (ABA) / Not Registered (Non-ABA) [Update](#)
Prelaw Advisor(s): [i](#) Advisor Name [Access](#)
Advisor authorized to view academic details: No [Change](#)

Figure 3

For LORs, applicants still print out request forms that go to their recommenders. For evaluations, they submit a request, which includes the evaluator's e-mail address, to begin the process. The process takes place completely online.

Manage My Recommenders/Evaluators

My Recommenders

Active status is removed. User is able to print form or submit request multiple times.

| Recommender Name | ID/Description | Status | Received by LSAC |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Dr. Ryan Howard | L1 Generic Letter | Received | 05/06/2009 |
| | L2 For school ABC | | |
| Helen Thimble | L4 For school XYZ | LSAC Action | 05/01/2009 |
| Dr. Margaret Ibanez | L5 Generic Letter | Received | 05/11/2009 |
| | L6 For school 123 | Rescinded | 06/15/2009 |
| Jennifer Livingston | L10 Use if have to | Received | 03/11/2009 |
| Michael Sutter | L7 Generic Letter | | |
| Robert Norman | L9 Use for all schools | Printed | |
| Jeffrey Mohen | L11 Employer LOR | Updated | 07/09/2009 |

My Evaluators

| Evaluator Name | ID/Description | Status | Received by LSAC |
|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Darren Smith | E2 For top choices | | |
| Shawn Roberts | E1 all schools | In Progress | |
| Jennifer Livingston | E3 For Yale | Received | 06/17/2009 |
| Louise Morgan | E8 For schools y | Requested | |

[What do the icons and codes mean?](#)

Figure 4

Applicants have the option of waiving their right to see the evaluations. They must provide a separate waiver of access for LORs and for evaluations.


Law School Admission Council

[Cart](#) [Log Out](#)

[My Home](#) | [My Account](#) | [LSAT](#) | [Apply](#) | [Forums](#) | [Shop](#)

Evaluations

Access Rights Waiver

Please review the waiver information and indicate your preference.

* Indicates a required field.

Important Note:

- We strongly encourage you to respond "yes" and waive your right to view evaluations at the law schools. Evaluators may be more candid and consequently, the law schools will look more favorably upon your application to their law school.
- You are NOT waiving your right to see the Evaluation at LSAC or via the LSAC website. You are waiving your right to see the Evaluation at the law school it was sent to in conjunction with your application.

The purpose for which this confidential statement is being obtained is admission to a Credential Assembly Service-participating law school. It will be received and maintained in confidence. If you are admitted and enroll-and if your law school retains copies of the evaluation once the admission process is concluded-you may inspect this evaluation at that school unless you have voluntarily waived this right.

Waiver

I understand that evaluations concerning me are sent to the Credential Assembly Service-participating law schools to which I apply, and I hereby expressly and voluntarily waive any and all access rights I might have to such evaluations under the Federal or State Law or any laws, regulations and policy. (Law School Admission Council will not process this evaluation if this statement has been modified in any way).

Once you make a selection for this evaluation it cannot be changed.

* Do you waive your access rights?

Yes

No

[Cancel](#) | [Continue](#)

Figure 5

Applicants can track the status of their evaluations in their LSAC account.

The screenshot displays the 'LSAC Completed Applications' page. At the top, there is a navigation bar with links for 'My Home', 'My Account', 'LSAT', 'Apply', 'Forums', and 'Shop'. The left sidebar contains navigation options: 'Overview', 'Credentials', 'Applications', and 'Edit My Profile'. The main content area is titled 'LSAC Completed Applications' and includes a search bar for 'Sort Completed Applications' (set to 'Alphabetical') and a 'School Search' button. Below this, a section titled 'LSAC Member Law Schools' lists 'US Schools'. The first entry is 'Completed Brooklyn Law School - Spring 2010' with a deadline of '01/23/2010'. This entry is expanded to show three columns of information: 'Law School Report', 'Applications', and 'Credentials'. The 'Law School Report' column shows 'Status: Sent', 'Report Requested: 7/05/2009', and 'First Time Report Sent: 7/14/2009'. The 'Applications' column shows 'Status: Completed', 'Created: 8/1/2010 3:41:39 PM', and 'Method: Apply and Submit Online'. The 'Credentials' column shows 'Transcripts received', 'Letters of Recommendation' (1 required, 1 assigned), and 'Evaluations' (1 required, 1 assigned). Below the expanded entry, two other schools are listed: 'Completed Penn State University - Spring 2010' (Deadline: 02/1/2010) and 'Completed Northern University - Fall 2009' (Deadline: 02/1/2010).

Figure 6

When an applicant lists an evaluator in his or her LSAC account, the evaluator will receive an e-mail from LSAC with a link back to a private, secure evaluator website. The evaluator creates an account with LSAC. The account will display all applicants who have requested an evaluation from that person.

LSAC Law School Admission Council

My Account My Home Sign out
Evaluator ID: 45612378

Evaluations

Use this page to manage your candidate evaluations.

- Start a new evaluation for a candidate;
- Continue with an in progress evaluation;
- Withdraw a submitted evaluation; and
- Edit a submitted evaluation.
- View and/or print answers previously submitted.

[More information about Evaluations >>](#)

My Account

[Update personal information](#)
[Change username or password](#)

My Evaluations

Use the **Add Candidate** button to add a new evaluation and enter the evaluation number provided in the email request.

| Candidate | Evaluation Description | Candidate Description | Status | |
|--|-------------------------|--|---|---|
| Margaret Trolle margaret@sample.edu | For Harvard | Student at Biology class. | In progress | <input type="button" value="Continue"/> |
| Jordan Stilton jordanstilton@sample.com | General for all schools | Student at English class. | | <input type="button" value="Start"/> |
| Elizabeth Bond lizbond@samplewebsitename.com | For NY schools | Rick Matteo's cousin's second cousin, we met at party. | Submitted: 11/20/2010 | <input type="button" value="Edit"/> <input type="button" value="Withdraw"/> |
| Rick Bedford Rickbedford@websitename.com | For Penn | Your son's best friend as a teenager. | Withdrawn | |
| Susan Thompson susant@younamesample.edu | For Penn | Cook at University party. | <i>Editing</i> Submitted: 12/14/2010 | <input type="button" value="Continue"/> |

Figure 7

Evaluators will respond to questions about the relationship to the applicant, in addition to rating the applicant's skills and attributes.

[My Account](#) [My Home](#) [Sign out](#)
 Evaluator ID: 10000109

Law School Admission Council

Evaluations

Evaluation Responses

Please review your responses and click on the **Submit Evaluation** button to confirm or **Cancel** to go back to previous page.

Applicant: **Elizabeth Bond**

[Print Responses](#)

Background Questions

Question: Which of the following would best classify your relationship to this applicant??
Answer: Teacher/Instructor

Question: How long have you known this applicant??
Answer: Fewer than 6 months

Question: How current is your relationship with this applicant??
Answer: Ongoing

Category: Intellectual Skill

| Question | Below Average (Bottom 50%) | Average (Top 50%) | Good (Top 25%) | Very good (Top 10%) | Excellent (Top 5%) | Truly Exceptional (Top 1-2%) | Inadequate Opportunity to Judge |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Is a critical thinker and problem solver | ✓ | | | | | | |
| Is an analytical thinker | ✓ | | | | | | |
| Can synthesize information | | | ✓ | | | | |
| Is intellectually curious | | ✓ | | | | | |
| Constructs logical, cogent arguments | | | ✓ | | | | |

Category: Personal Qualities

| Question | Below Average (Bottom 50%) | Average (Top 50%) | Good (Top 25%) | Very good (Top 10%) | Excellent (Top 5%) | Truly Exceptional (Top 1-2%) | Inadequate Opportunity to Judge |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Is a critical thinker and problem solver | ✓ | | | | | | |
| Is an analytical thinker | ✓ | | | | | | |
| Can synthesize information | | | ✓ | | | | |
| Is intellectually curious | | ✓ | | | | | |
| Constructs logical, cogent arguments | | | ✓ | | | | |

Evaluation Summary Sample.bmp

Zoom:

Figure 8

Evaluators do not have to complete evaluations in one sitting; they can go back to their account as needed. Completed evaluations are submitted online to LSAC.

LSAC Law School Admission Council

My Account My Home Sign out
Evaluator ID: 45612378

Evaluations

Applicant: Jordan Stilton
Note from candidate: Student in your biology class. (The Candidate has waived their right to review the Evaluation responses.)

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Background | Completed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Intellectual Skill | Completed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Personal Qualities | Completed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Integrity and Honesty | Not Started <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Communication | In Progress <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Task Management | Not Started <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Working with Others | Not Started <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Final Comments | Not Started <input type="checkbox"/> |

[Save and Review Evaluation](#)

[Legal Notice](#) [Contact Us](#)

All contents © 2009 Law School Admission Council, Inc.
All rights reserved.

Figure 9

Evaluation reports are sent to schools on paper or electronically, or both, depending on the preferences specified by the school. The report compiles results from all evaluators for that applicant and is sent in conjunction with the applicant's law school report.

The first page of the evaluation report contains information about the evaluator and his or her relationship to the applicant.

| Evaluations | |
|--|--|
| This candidate has waived access rights to view the evaluations. | |
| Dr. Fred Smith ● Political Science Dept. 123 Elm Street Birmingham, AL 33333 fsmith@birm.edu | Institution/company: Birmingham University Phone: 212.333.3333 Relationship: Teacher Relationship Length: more than 4 years Last interaction: ongoing |
| Dr. Alice Alder ■ History Dept. 42 Maple Ave. Gibson, TN 37222 aalder@wtc.edu | Institution/company: West Tennessee College Phone: 615.222.2222 Relationship: Teacher Relationship Length: 6 months Last interaction: ongoing |
| Ms. Jane Jones ◆ CASL, Inc. 777 Main Street Nashville, TN 37202 jjones@casl.com | Institution/company: CASL, Inc. Phone: 212.333.3333 Relationship: Employer Relationship Length: more than 5 years Last interaction: ongoing |

Figure 10

The second part of the report displays in an aggregated grid format the ratings of all evaluators for the 30 skills and attributes.

| KEY: ■ Dr. Soandso ◆ Mr. Flibberflee ● Prof. Whatsername | Below Average (Bottom 50%) | Average (Top 50%) | Good (Top 25%) | Very Good (Top 10%) | Excellent (Top 5%) | Truly Exceptional (Top 1-2%) | Inadequate Opportunity to Judge |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | This candidate... | | | | | | |
| Intellectual Skill | | | | | | | |
| Is a critical thinker and problem solver | | | | ■ | ■◆ | ◆ | |
| Is an analytical thinker | | | | ■ | ● | ◆ | |
| Can synthesize information | | | | ■ | ● | ◆ | |
| Is intellectually curious | | | | | ■◆ | ● | |
| Constructs logical, cogent arguments | | | | | ■◆ | | |
| Personal Qualities | | | | | | | |
| Is highly motivated | | | | ■ | ◆ | | |
| Shows empathy/compassion | | | | | ■◆ | | |
| Has surmounted difficulties and obstacles | | | | ■ | ◆ | ● | |
| Possesses practical judgment | | | ■ | | ◆ | ● | |
| Shows initiative | | | | | ■◆ | | |
| Demonstrates professionalism | | | | ■ | ◆ | | |
| Integrity and Honesty | | | | | | | |
| Behaves in accord with high ethical standards | | | | ● | ■◆ | | |
| Is reliable | | | | ■ | ● | ◆ | |
| Is trustworthy | | | | ● | ◆ | ■ | |
| Is honest | | | | ● | ■◆ | | |
| Communication | | | | | | | |
| Communicates effectively in writing | | | | | ■◆ | | |
| Writes persuasively | | | | | ■ | ◆ | |
| Communicates well orally | | | | | ■ | ◆ | |
| Is a thoughtful attentive listener | | | | | ■ | ◆ | |
| Asks appropriate questions for information gathering | | | | | ■◆ | | |
| Task Management | | | | | | | |
| Prioritizes well | | | | ■ | ◆ | | |
| Has realistic objectives | | ■ | | | ◆ | ● | |
| Fulfills commitments | | | | ● | ■ | ◆ | |
| Manages work and time efficiently | | | | ■ | ◆ | | |
| Working with Others | | | | | | | |
| Respects other points of view | | | | ● | ◆ | ■ | |
| Works well with people from different backgrounds | | | | | ■◆ | ● | |
| Motivates others toward a common goal | | | | ■ | ◆ | | |
| Is able to lead groups of people from different backgrounds | | | | ● | ■ | ◆ | |
| Organizes and manages others well | | | | ● | ■ | ◆ | |
| Demonstrates good judgment in leadership decisions | | | | | ● | ■◆ | |

Figure 11

Evaluators can include comments after each category and general comments at the end of each evaluation. These are appended to the documents that are transmitted to the law schools.

Comments

Intellectual Skill

Dr. Soandso: Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Vivamus aliquam scelerisque nisl at feugiat. Pellentesque tincidunt nunc non elit congue ut dignissim urna vulputate. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Duis volutpat magna lacinia orci aliquam eu hendrerit nibh convallis. Nullam fringilla ligula at tellus luctus rhoncus.

Prof. Whatshername: Nulla ultricies dolor eget sem euismod vestibulum. Ut sit amet lectus eros, quis sagittis augue. Nunc iaculis, ligula ut aliquam iaculis, nibh ipsum imperdiet lorem, non rutrum sem lectus non neque. Proin ac purus nibh. Nam risus felis, placerat non pharetra vel, fermentum sed elit.

Personal Qualities

Dr. Soandso: Ut et magna eu leo blandit pretium. Suspendisse a mi vitae tortor cursus convallis. Proin id ipsum a eros rhoncus pretium id vitae arcu. Donec condimentum mauris tempor ante tristique sit amet facilisis sem laoreet. Vestibulum lobortis arcu quis tellus cursus ut vestibulum lacus fermentum. Proin sem quam, pharetra sit amet dignissim vel, euismod at ante. Nam tincidunt, massa eu hendrerit feugiat, mauris magna vulputate tortor, a euismod risus turpis sit amet ligula.

Prof. Whatshername: Nunc ut lacus felis. Cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. Sed sollicitudin bibendum cursus. Suspendisse tincidunt facilisis elit ut ultrices. Nam porttitor pharetra ligula quis varius. Etiam tincidunt enim non metus dictum quis egestas quam porttitor. Cras dignissim leo at felis porttitor eu interdum velit molestie.

Mr. Flibberflee: Donec molestie convallis aliquam. Vestibulum malesuada viverra est, non fringilla massa lacinia posuere. Mauris adipiscing ligula non urna consequat laoreet. Donec quam nunc, interdum ut dignissim vitae, euismod eget mauris.

Ethics and Integrity

Prof. Whatshername: Donec feugiat faucibus purus et sagittis. Ut nec tellus ac urna vulputate dignissim at sed diam. Duis viverra est tincidunt sapien mollis ullamcorper. Fusce risus odio, mollis sed mattis sit amet, dictum at diam. Ut vulputate adipiscing arcu, in lacinia lacus dignissim et. Suspendisse porta nisl pellentesque purus auctor vitae congue est rhoncus. Fusce tempus, nunc ac ullamcorper molestie, sem duī imperdiet lacus, quis porta ipsum nisl vestibulum augue.

Communication

Dr. Soandso: Duis nec neque sit amet metus semper laoreet. Donec molestie, velit ac pharetra porta, risus magna tempor felis, a condimentum turpis quam at risus. Fusce molestie libero lectus, vel adipiscing ante. Ut sagittis, nibh vel vehicula porttitor, nibh felis sodales metus, a vestibulum felis eros nec nibh. Duis sed turpis velit, vestibulum aliquet diam. Aenean eu vulputate mi.

Figure 12