

REPORT OF THE WASC PATHWAY B VISIT TEAM

Initial Accreditation

To

University of California
Hastings College of the Law

April 2 – 5, 2012

Victor J. Gold Senior Vice President, Dean and Professor of Law Loyola Law School, Loyola Marymount University	Chair
Beatrice Yorker Dean, College of Health and Human Services California State University, Los Angeles	Assistant Chair
Marina Cing Hsieh Senior Fellow School of Law, Santa Clara University	Team Member
James A. Hyatt Vice Chancellor Budget and Finance & CFO, retired University of California, Berkeley	Team Member
Kevin Johnson Dean, School of Law University of California, Davis	Team Member
Judith W. Wegner Professor, School of Law University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	Team Member
WASC Staff Liaison: Teri Cannon, Executive Vice President	

The team evaluated the institution under the WASC Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities. The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WASC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page numbers

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Visit.....	1
B. Quality of the Report and Evidence.....	2
C. Description of the Team’s Review Process	2

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTION UNDER THE STANDARDS

Standard 1: Institutional Purposes and Objectives.....	3
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Outcomes	8
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources	22
Standard 4: An Organization Committed to Learning.....	27

SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations	29
Recommendations.....	30

APPENDICES

Credit Hour Policy	33
Compliance Audit.....	34

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Visit

The University of California Hastings College of the Law (Hastings), founded in 1878, is the oldest law school in the University of California system. While Hastings is a part of the University of California, it is not governed by the UC Board of Regents. Instead, it is governed by its own Board of Directors. Hastings was a charter member of the Association of American Law Schools (AALS) and has been a member of the American Bar Association (ABA) since 1939. Based on student enrollment, Hastings is the largest freestanding law school west of the Mississippi. In recent years, Hastings has admitted and graduated over 400 Juris Doctor (JD) students per year. Each year Hastings also enrolls about 20 to 30 students in the Master of Laws (LL.M.) in United States Legal Studies degree program for foreign lawyers.

Hastings is seeking regional accreditation from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) at a challenging time for legal education and the legal profession. The recent recession has caused a decline in the job market for new lawyers and a decline in applications to law schools. Hastings' administration, faculty, staff, students, and their Board of Directors have engaged in a rigorous strategic planning process over the past eighteen months that attempts to address these challenges and also move Hastings toward WASC outcomes-based education assessment. As part of that plan, Hastings is in the process of formalizing a long standing relationship with the University of California San Francisco (UCSF), which focuses on health sciences, by proposing two new degree programs: a Masters of Studies in Law (MSL) for health professionals and a Master of Laws (LL.M) in Law and Science. These two programs need WASC accreditation if students enrolled in those programs are to qualify for certain types of financial aid available only to accredited degree programs. This is because the ABA is the accrediting agency only for JD programs.

This report documents a WASC Special Visit for Initial Accreditation by way of Pathway B, since Hastings is already accredited by the ABA. The site visit included the usual meetings with administrators, faculty, students, fiscal, student support and other staff, library personnel, and the Board of Directors. In addition, Team members also met with members of the UCSF/UC Hastings Consortium on Law, Science and Health Policy, coordinators of clinical programs, and staff and students from the Legal Education Opportunity Program (LEOP). Materials requested during the site visit were promptly provided and the Hastings staff was hospitable, cooperative, and professional. Hastings does not have off-campus sites and it does not currently have distance education programs in place. The compliance audit did not find any areas in which Hastings is out of compliance.

B. Quality of the Self-Study under the Standards and Supporting Evidence

The institutional report narrative and the supporting evidence were well organized, coherent, extensive, and reflected enthusiasm for developing a culture of assessment. The self-study included evidence of institutional involvement at many levels including faculty and other key stakeholders. Communications between the Dean and the Chair of the WASC team provided additional important information. The evidence presented during the visit provided the WASC team with adequate opportunity to evaluate the level of Hastings' compliance with WASC Standards of Review. Hastings' staff presented a sophisticated analysis of the financial projections on which Hastings' new strategic plan is based. Hastings' faculty and academic administrators provided sufficient detail for the team to determine the extent to which learning outcomes are established and assessed. The institution's self-analysis aligned with the evidence in the self-study and the evidence provided during the site visit.

C. Description of the Team Review Process

Team members all studied the requirements of the relatively new Pathway B review process, and several attended WASC Evaluator trainings. The team reviewed the self-study and the extensive

materials provided in January 2012 by Hastings prior to completing worksheets in preparation for the initial team conference call on February 28, 2012. Between the conference call and the site visit, team members prepared drafts of this report based on the materials provided by Hastings. On the first morning of the site visit, Hastings' Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and her assistant oriented the team to the exhibit room and all necessary facilities. At the conclusion of the site visit, the team compiled a list of commendations and recommendations which the Chair shared privately with the Dean and then reported to the campus community in an open meeting.

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTION UNDER THE STANDARDS

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Standard 1.1 Formally approved, appropriate statements of purpose: defining values and character

Hastings is an educational institution that has been committed to preparing lawyers for professional service for over 130 years. Its current mission statement, which the Board of Directors formally approved in 1995, reads as follows:

The mission of the University of California, Hastings College of Law is to provide an academic program of the highest quality, based upon scholarship, teaching, and research, to a diverse student body and to assure that its graduates have a comprehensive understanding and appreciation of the law and are well trained for the multiplicity of roles that they will play in a society and profession that are subject to continually changing demands and needs.

All educational objectives of the institution are aimed at teaching law. The types of law courses offered are extensive and varied, reflecting the diversity of law practice.

Standard 1.2 Clear objectives; indicators of achievement at institutional, program, and course level; system to measure student achievement; public data on achievement

The Course Catalog explains general principles that will be taught in various concentrations and courses. Educational objectives and learning outcomes for classes taught by various professors vary and are listed on each course syllabus, typically with an explanation of how grades will be calculated.

Hastings has begun a process of implementing outcomes based education, including creating

institutional/program learning outcomes (PLOs), individual course learning outcomes, and assessment mechanisms. Six program-level learning outcomes have been established and have been mapped to courses in the JD program. As of the site visit, faculty members had already identified which PLOs are addressed in their courses (in the Curriculum Map). They will include those in their syllabi in the future.

Hastings has for many years used various metrics to assess educational effectiveness, including rates of attrition, graduation, bar examination pass rates, and graduate employment. Most of this data has been publicly available, either on the Hastings website or from other sources. But like other U.S. law schools, Hastings had not systematically established other learning outcomes or considered non-traditional ways of assessing the level at which those outcomes have been achieved. This accreditation process helped spur the faculty and administration toward development of a systematic framework for measuring PLOs in the JD program. Hastings has established six PLOs: Doctrinal and Substantive Knowledge, Problem Solving and Critical Thinking, Practical and Communication Skills, Research Skills, Professionalism, and Public Service. A memo from Hastings' ALO to the site visit team described the process by which PLOs were established. In that same memo, Hastings' ALO conceded that, while PLOs have been developed, "little has been done as yet on the institutional assessment of those PLOs." A Curriculum Committee makes recommendations to the faculty about the establishment, modification, or cancellation of classes. In the past year, the Curriculum Committee conducted an extensive review of all programs and courses.

Standard 1.3 High performance, responsibility, accountability of leadership system

The Chancellor/Dean of Hastings is Frank Wu, a tenured member of the faculty. The Academic Dean is Shauna Marshall, also a tenured member of the faculty. In addition, the College has

the full range of administrative officials to be expected in a free-standing law school, including a tenured associate academic dean, a tenured associate dean for research, a tenured associate dean for international and graduate programs, a General Counsel, Chief Financial Officer, Controller, a range of Assistant Deans responsible for various functions (Institutional Advancement, Admissions, Communications/Public Affairs, Financial Aid, Career and Professional Development), an Executive Director for human resources, and a Registrar.¹

Each member of the administration oversees a key department of Hastings and meets with Dean Wu on a monthly basis. The organization is designed to create an efficient system of reporting and accountability.

Standard 1.4 Academic Freedom

Hastings is committed to the sharing and critical examination of knowledge. The Faculty Rules and Procedures set forth the commitment to Academic Freedom and the:

1. free inquiry and exchange of ideas;
2. the right to present controversial material relevant to a course of instruction;
3. enjoyment of constitutionally protected freedom of expression.

Hastings adopted a revised Academic Freedom Statement and Disclaimer on Opinions intended to protect and extend academic freedom on campus. The Statement stresses the importance of understanding unpopular or contrary views as part of the learning process, and emphasizes the importance of academic freedom to effective teaching and research. Hastings recently has also promulgated a policy statement making clear that individual faculty and students are entitled to speak their minds, but that an individual's statements are not to be regarded as statements of Hastings.

¹ Associate Academic Dean - C. Keith Wingate (tenured); Associate Dean for Research - Evan Lee (tenured); Associate Dean for International and Graduate Programs - Joel Paul (on leave academic year 2011-12) (tenured); Acting Assistant Dean of International and Graduate Programs - Christian E. Mammen; Library Director and ALO - Jenni Parrish (tenured); General Counsel - Elise Traynum; Chief Financial Officer - David Seward; Controller - Deborah L. Tran; Assistant Dean for Institutional Advancement - Shino Nomiya; Assistant Dean for Admissions - Greg Canada; Assistant Dean for Communications & Public Affairs - Michael Treviño; Assistant Dean for Financial Aid - Linda Bisesi; Assistant Dean for the Office of Career & Professional Development - Sari Zimmerman; Executive Director of Human Resources - Marie Hairston; Registrar - Gina Barnett; Director of Student Services - Rupa Bhandari; Facilities - Sunny Dhamrait; Director of Scholarly Publications - Tom McCarthy; Director of Information Technology - Eric Noble; Communications Manager - Alex Shapiro

Standard 1.5 Diversity: policies, programs and practices

Hastings expresses support for diversity and emphasizes the importance of diversity to the sharing of ideas. Hastings has adopted policies prohibiting employment discrimination and related practices. A discussion of related admissions policies, financial aid, and student services issues is included elsewhere in this report. These include a special “Legal Education Opportunity Program” (LEOP) through which 20% of each class is admitted. Likewise, the diversity of students, faculty and staff are discussed in various portions of this report that follow.

The Disability Resource Program aims to give all students an equal opportunity to succeed and aims to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Hastings recognizes that students with disabilities are a diverse group and the best way to provide them the services that they need is through individualized, appropriate, and reasonable accommodation. The Office of Disability Services has two staff members who educate the community and reach out to students who self-identify with disabilities. The office conducts individual assessments and fashions appropriate accommodations for participation in classes and exams, and supports registration for the Bar Exam. The number of enrolled students identified with disabilities has more than doubled in the past four years to 145.

Standard 1.6 Education as purpose; autonomy

Hastings is a public institution affiliated with the University of California. It is not affiliated with any political, corporate, or religious organizations. As discussed above, Hastings recently passed a revised Academic Freedom Statement that not only reaffirms its commitment to supporting academic freedom, but also precludes the influence of money on academic decisions.

Standard 1.7 Truthful representation to students/public; timely completion; fair and equitable policies

Hastings makes public all policies and procedures on student grievances and complaints,

refunds, grades, appeals, tuition, graduation requirements, and other pertinent information. This information is contained in the Course Catalog or the Academic Regulations. These are updated and can be found on the web site.

The Academic Regulations contain relevant student policies, including those relating to complaints and grievances. Additional informative documents are available to students, such as the Tuition and Fee Schedule and Policies on Tuition Refunds. Students are encouraged to refer to the Academic Regulations, the Academic Planning Worksheet, and the Graduation Requirements Checklist to ensure that they know what courses they must take to graduate. Aside from the first year, students have only a few mandatory courses. Most important documents are available to students online.²

The Hastings policies on grades, how credit is awarded, and how grading is handled follow the generally accepted law school practices for awarding credit, as specified by the ABA. To protect the integrity of grades, professors turn in grade sheets that are entered by Records Office staff only. The Records Office ensures grading anonymity. The use of a mandatory curve follows the practice at most law schools. Hastings has a procedure for grievances over grades but, like many law schools, does not allow substantive appeals of grades. Grades are changed only for mathematical or procedural error.

Standard 1.8 Operational integrity; sound business practices; timely and fair complaint handling; evaluation of performance.

Hastings has adopted policies and procedures that ensure sound business practice. An annual audit is conducted every year by an external agency that evaluates Hastings' finances. The Fiscal Department publishes and makes available to the public its policies on the Hastings website. The Controller is responsible for receiving complaints from faculty, staff, and students about financial concerns. Under the direction of the Chief Financial Officer, the Senior Accountant-Budget and Planning Analyst is responsible for coordinating the development and review of the annual budget.

Hastings has policies governing staff and faculty grievances. Staff grievance policies are contained in the Staff Personnel Policy & Procedure Handbook and the Public Safety Officers Union Contract. Non-administrative staff members are covered by the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees Local 3299 (AFSCME). Hastings and the union have recently reached agreement on a contract. Human Resources maintains a record of all staff grievances. A Staff Grievance Complaint Log for the last five years was provided to the WASC inspection team. The Faculty Rules and Procedures govern faculty grievances. The Office of General Counsel maintains records of all faculty grievances. There have been no faculty or staff grievances filed within the last five years. The procedures for student complaints are included in the Academic Regulations, and the student services office maintains records of student complaints.

Standard 1.9 Honest, open communication with WASC; inform WASC of material matters; follow WASC policies

Hastings is accredited by the ABA and is a member of the AALS. Some of the reporting requirements for WASC are similar to those of the ABA, but there are differences. Hastings has worked hard in the past 18 months to provide data and other information relevant to WASC's standards. In order to address reporting requirements that are particular to WASC, the ALO and the WASC Faculty Committee (recently renamed the Educational Effectiveness Committee) have overseen reporting to date and will continue to play an important role in guiding the institution in its ongoing efforts to satisfy WASC standards.

Hastings is familiar with WASC's policies and reporting requirements and is dedicated to addressing problems as they arise. As an example, the ALO became aware of a WASC policy, passed in Summer 2011, that changes requirements for dual and joint degrees. Hastings took steps to

² To comply with WASC expectations, Hastings created a web page that lists most of the important documents for students and contains direct links to those documents.

determine if this policy was applicable to its degree programs. After Hastings determined that it was subject to the new policy, the appropriate administrative departments initiated evaluation and action plans to bring Hastings into compliance.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Outcomes

Standard 2.1: Programs appropriate in content, standards, degree level; sufficient qualified faculty

Hastings has a long and distinguished history. It is one of the nation's relatively few free-standing law schools. It currently offers two established programs: the J.D. program, which prepares students for admission to the bar in the United States through a three-year course of study, and the LL.M in United States Legal Studies, geared to foreign students interested in gaining expertise in American law (LL.M for foreign students). These established programs are typical of those offered by other American law schools.

Juris Doctor Program

Required Courses. Hastings' J.D. program requires first year students to enroll in contracts, civil procedure, torts, criminal law, property (4 units each), constitutional law (3 units), legal writing and moot court (2 units fall plus 2 units spring), and a statutory elective (spring, 3 units). A two-unit course in Legal Analysis is also offered in spring semester for students who would benefit from targeted academic support. In the second and third years, students must take a course related to professional responsibility, as well as an upper division writing course and a skills offering. Students are also advised about courses in subjects tested on the bar examination in California and elsewhere.

Advanced Offerings. Hastings offers students the option to pursue concentrations in a variety of fields (civil litigation/dispute resolution; criminal law, intellectual property, international/comparative law, law/health sciences, social justice lawyering, and taxation). It offers a wide array of substantive courses and seminars. The school has carefully organized its listing of courses in a wide range of fields

and its course catalogue guides students about curricular choices, while notifying them of designated advisors in each area.

Dual Degrees and International Opportunities. Hastings also offers students the opportunity to enroll in dual degree programs in cooperation with other institutions including UC Berkeley (masters of city planning, MBA), MBA (UC Berkeley), LL.M (SOAS at University of London), LL.M (Deusto University, Spain), and LL.M (University of Paris, II). The College also offers students the opportunity to participate in a significant number of international exchange programs.

Skills Offerings. Hastings also offers an extensive range of skills-related courses. This includes negotiation, trial advocacy, mediation, and counseling, facilitation, Hastings to Haiti, real estate practice, and a wide range of contextualized drafting courses. Hastings offers a number of clinical programs in such fields as civil justice, community advocacy, community economic development, criminal practice, environmental practice, immigrants' rights, legislation, local government, medical-legal issues facing senior citizens, refugee and human rights, and workers compensation. It also offers judicial externships, alternative dispute resolution externships, and externships in governmental and nonprofit settings. Skills courses are offered on a non-GPA basis. In its most recent annual data report to the ABA, Hastings reported that it had available 1,394 seats in simulation courses, 204 in faculty-supervised clinics, and 197 in field placements (externships). Discussions with clinical faculty confirmed that there are approximately 100 student seats in fall clinical offerings and 50-70 fall externship seats, while in the spring there are 150 clinical seats (including both year-round and spring semester only opportunities) and 140 externship seats.

LL.M. in United States Law for Foreign Students

Hastings currently maintains a relatively small one-year LL.M. program in United States Legal Studies. It hopes to significantly grow enrollment to compensate for lost J.D. tuition occasioned by the

reduction in J.D. enrollment called for by the strategic plan, as described below. The LL.M. program requires completion of 24 credit hours of study, including one first-year course, and a seminar in legal research and writing targeted to international students. Applicants must have completed an initial law degree outside the United States, and receive a TOEFL or IELTS score sufficient to demonstrate English language proficiency. Applicants also must submit a personal statement, a curriculum vitae, transcript and two letters of recommendation. In the most recent year, Hastings conferred 21 LL.Ms. Although Hastings has engaged in an extensive effort to develop a set of PLOs, no specific outcomes for the LL.M. program have been stated. Because this program is directed toward foreign students who already are lawyers, and because their course of study is intended to last only one year, their educational objectives and the relevant learning outcomes may differ from those of J.D. students. The same may be said regarding PLOs for the planned MLS and LL.M. degree programs.

Standard 2.2 Clearly defined degrees re admission and level of achievement for graduation.

Admissions Generally. The Hastings Admissions Policy Statement sets forth the admissions policies adopted by the Hastings faculty. Admissions requirements for all degrees are stated in each individual application. Requirements for the LL.M. and the MSL are also stated in their brochures. In general, Hastings follows a holistic approach to J.D. admissions and considers a candidate's entire application, not merely UGPA and LSAT score. However, Hastings pursues a strategic objective of improving the numerical predictors of student success by increasing the median undergraduate GPA.

LEOP Program. Hastings has a two-pronged admissions framework. The general admissions process focuses on undergraduate and graduate academic performance, LSAT scores, essays and recommendations. The general admissions process is supplemented by a special “Legal Education Opportunity Program” (LEOP) that allows applicants who wish to do so to address adversity they have faced (geographic, linguistic, social, and other) in some depth as part of the application process. LEOP

is designed to foster diversity and assure broad access to disadvantaged applicants. Hastings has historically reserved 20% of the seats in the entering class for LEOP applicants (who might well be admitted through the general process as well), and provides supplemental academic support to LEOP students in the form of skills-based workshops, small group sessions, tutoring and more. Hastings also gives attention to tracking the performance of LEOP students on the bar examination in order to fine-tune academic support.

Admissions Trends. Like most law schools, Hastings has seen a decline in law school applications over the last three years. During this time tuition costs have risen sharply and the legal job market has declined. Over the last three years, as the number of applications dropped (from 6,150 to 5,167), and the College accepted a higher proportion of applicants (29% reported for the school year beginning in fall 2011), ultimately enrolling 414 students in 2011 (8% of those who applied). It is still too soon to know details about the class that will enter in fall 2012. Applicants have declined another 7%, although more than 5,000 applications have been submitted. Admissions patterns remain “soft” since many students apply to 12 or more schools.

During this same three-year period, Hastings reduced the size of its entering class from 469 to 414. The most recent entering class was composed of 51% women, and included 49% whites, 21% Asians, 10% Hispanics, 7% Blacks, less than 1% Native Americans, and 13% “other.” LSAT scores declined during this period with the most recent data reporting a median score of 162 and a range of 157-165. Benchmark undergraduate grade point averages for the class that entered in fall 2011 were reportedly 3.73 (75th %-ile), 3.60 (median) and 3.38 (25th %-ile).

Reduction in number of J.D. students. Hastings’ strategic plan calls for a substantial reduction in its J.D. population. Beginning in fall 2012 it will enroll 20% fewer J.D. students, in effect dropping one of five first year sections. It remains committed to allocating 20% of the available seats to students

admitted through the LEOP program. Reducing the size of the JD class will reduce tuition revenue. Hastings hopes to replace some of this lost revenue by increasing its non-J.D. graduate student population. This includes students enrolled in the existing LL.M. for foreign lawyers, the new M.L.S., and the proposed LL.M. This strategy has been explained as a means of addressing the sharply reduced market for J.D. graduates, providing the remaining J.D. students with more attention and support, and improving the school's standing in the U.S. News & World Report rankings.

Hastings plans to recapture some of the revenue lost through reducing the J.D. class by increasing J.D. tuition. Hastings currently charges approximately \$39,000 per year. This is competitive with tuition at other accredited law schools in California and is the lowest tuition charged by UC law schools. Hastings plans to raise tuition for the coming academic year by 15%, to approximately \$46,000. This will be consistent with the average tuition charged by other UC law schools. In subsequent years, Hastings' long range plan calls for annual tuition increases of about 5%.

In addition, Hastings has modified its approach to financial aid allocation. While need-based awards and loans will continue to be made available through the financial aid office, approximately \$1.1 million in scholarships geared to "merit" and "impact" will be awarded in order to recruit the academically strongest class. The financial aid office will continue to make need-based awards of between \$9,200 and \$15,000 to eligible students. Loans will also continue to be available to eligible students. The financial aid office reports that graduates in the class of 2011 had an average law school debt at graduation of \$102,000 and that recent graduates have a default rate under 1%. Hastings hopes to meet the increasing need for financial aid by increasing private fund-raising.

The school has a very low involuntary attrition rate, reporting a loss of only two students during 2010-11. A total of 20 students transferred. A similar pattern was evident in the previous year, according to data submitted to the ABA.

Proposed MSL and LL.M Programs in Health, Science and Law

Hastings is about to launch two new programs; the Master of Studies in Law (MSL) and the LL.M in Law and Science. Hastings and the University of California at San Francisco developed these programs to provide interdisciplinary education to lawyers and health science professionals. Slated to begin in the Fall of 2012, the MSL is intended to give health professionals an in-depth introduction to legal reasoning and doctrine, while the LL.M, slated to begin in the Fall of 2013, is designed to give lawyers an in-depth introduction to subjects in science and health policy. The MSL program is a one-year program that includes cohorted sections of Legal Research and Writing and an MSL Seminar. All other courses will come from the J.D. curriculum. Students will take a minimum of one of the following first-year classes in the first semester: Civil Procedure 1, Contracts 1, Constitutional Law 1, Criminal Law, Property or Torts. The MSL proposal was approved by the Admissions Committee, the Curriculum Committee, and the Academic Standards Committee. In drafting the academic regulations for MSL students, the Academic Standards Committee closely collaborated with Professor David Faigman and the UCSF/UC Hastings Consortium. The regulations were approved by the faculty. A syllabus for the MSL Seminar has been developed with a course description that includes three learning objectives (that can be formulated into learning outcomes), course requirements, and a topical outline. Initial PLOs were drafted by Professor Faigman during our visit. These should be refined to further distinguish the MSL from the JD PLOs with the input of consortium faculty and adoption by the Curriculum Committee.

The LL.M in Law and Science is proposed as a one-year program for attorneys who are interested in the intersection between law and science, health policy or intellectual property. The range of upper level courses, seminars and clinics offered by Hastings will provide students with the knowledge to practice law along the cutting edges of science and health. Students will be admitted into one of three tracks; science, health policy or intellectual property.

Standards 2.3-2.5: Learning Outcomes, Faculty Responsibilities, Student Involvement.

An emphasis on student learning outcomes is relatively new to legal education because the ABA has not focused on learning outcomes or direct assessment of student learning beyond the awarding of grades or tracking bar passage. For several years, however, regional accreditors have emphasized outcomes. As a result, a small but growing number of law schools in the United States are grappling with this subject.

Hastings has proceeded with extensive faculty consultation to develop institutional learning outcomes in connection with its application for accreditation by WASC. It has adopted the following formulation of learning outcomes for its overall program:

1. *Doctrinal and Substantive Knowledge.* Students will be able to identify, explain, and employ basic concepts, theories, procedures, and rules of law in both core legal areas and in their own chosen area(s) of specialization.
2. *Problem Solving and Critical Thinking.* Students will be able to analyze, assess, and form independent judgments on a variety of legal issues, and will use these skills to solve client legal problems.
3. *Practical and Communication Skills.* Students will be able to gather and analyze evidence, communicate effectively in appropriate written and oral formats with a multiplicity of audiences, and demonstrate other professional skills.
4. *Research Skills.* Students will be able to independently retrieve, organize, analyze and evaluate paper and electronic legal and interdisciplinary sources, and differentiate between the types and relevance of the authorities.
5. *Professionalism.* Students will demonstrate the professional skills necessary for effective and ethical participation in the legal profession.

6. *Public Service.* Students will be able to describe the roles and responsibilities of lawyers in overcoming obstacles to legal access and in promoting social justice.

The minutes of faculty meetings in the past year indicate that Hastings' faculty members seriously and diligently considered this formulation of desired learning outcomes. In addition, Hastings has encouraged individual faculty members to develop learning outcomes/objectives in connection with individual courses, and a substantial number of faculty members have done so. The WASC site team had an opportunity to speak with many faculty members concerning the value of program and student learning outcomes. Faculty members shared a variety of opinions regarding assessment. The "culture of assessment" ranges widely, spanning the spectrum from early adopters to a few who are skeptical. A substantial number of faculty members offered convincing statements regarding the value they had already found in employing student learning outcomes and the benefits they believe accrue from using formative assessment strategies such as "clickers." Students who met with the WASC team also noted the growing presence of learning outcomes on syllabi, beginning in the current semester. It appears that there is a real and growing commitment to incorporating learning outcomes into the educational fabric of Hastings.

Moving so quickly toward the adoption of learning outcomes is a significant achievement for Hastings and suggests that it is serious about incorporating related approaches to improving teaching and learning. At the same time, these developments are relatively new, and there has not been a significant period in which Hastings or WASC can assess actual implementation of learning outcomes in the curriculum, attention to learning outcomes in course assessment, or attention to lessons learned through this new focus on learning outcomes. The WASC team is optimistic that Hastings will persist in the effort, but recognizes that both Hastings and WASC need to monitor ongoing developments.

The WASC team met with students and discussed their educational experiences. Most reported working very hard in Hastings' relatively competitive environment. Hastings provided the team with data derived from its 2011 administration of the Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE). This data indicated that 40-49 % of students said they frequently asked questions in the classroom.

Standard 2.6 Attainment of Graduates.

Most Hastings graduates take the bar examination in California after graduation. For 2011, 81% of Hastings graduates passed the July California bar examination on their first attempt. This compares to the statewide average for ABA accredited California law schools of 76%.

For the class of 2010, Hastings reported the following statistics regarding its graduates' employment: 350 out of 421 graduates were reported as employed 9 months after graduating, with 234 reporting long-term employment and 115 reporting short-term employment (2 long-term and 56 short-term positions were funded by Hastings itself). Of those employed, 192 graduates reported employment in law firms, 53 in government, 37 in business or industry, 25 in public interest, 19 in federal/state/local government, and 24 in academia.

Standard 2.7 Systematic program reviews

Traditional indicia of achievement (bar performance and employment) by Hastings J.D. graduates are regularly reported to the ABA, as required. The California Bar Examiners have begun to provide more detailed information on student performance (by subject area) on the California bar examination, and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs reviews that information.

Hastings regularly collects and reports a variety of other data to the ABA pertinent to the J.D. program. Student attrition is tracked and reported to the ABA by gender and race/ethnicity. Involuntary academic attrition, typically occurring at the end of the first year of study on the basis of GPA, has been below 1% for the past four years. The Associate Academic Dean maintains monitors student grade point

averages, intervening with counseling and enrollment in intensive skills courses at several junctures. Students whose first year grades fall into the lowest decile typically must enroll in a 2-unit Legal Analysis course taught by the Academic Support Program in either spring of their first year or fall of their second year. In addition, students in the lowest ten percent of the class entering their third year are strongly counseled into one or both semesters of a Critical Skills class aimed at preparing for the bar exam. Other voluntary programs open to all first year students address basic legal skills. Although performance on the California Bar for first time takers in the lowest quartile is significantly below the rest of the class, there has been no systematic study of the effect of enrollment in the Critical Skills class or the application of other academic resources toward bar exam passage.

While Hastings annually reports data on the J.D. program to the ABA, it also is subject every seven years to a reaccreditation inspection of that program, which includes the creation of an extensive self-study and site visit by an ABA-appointed team. Hastings' last reaccreditation inspection by the ABA occurred in the 2007-2008 academic year.

Hastings has not yet developed a program review process for its foreign-lawyer LL.M program or for its new MSL and LL.M. programs. Hastings indicated to the WASC team that it intends to develop such review processes and that its ALO will be in charge of that effort.

Hastings also does not yet have a well-developed, integrated capacity to engage in institutional research and needs to create systems that would allow various units within the school to share and analyze data concerning student performance and learning outcomes. This problem affects the J.D. program but also appears to hinder assessment of learning outcomes in the LL.M. program for foreign students. When members of the WASC team inquired about LL.M. students' experience in sitting for bar examinations upon graduation, those questioned lacked systematic information on key points.

Hastings should develop a meaningful institutional research capacity and create systems needed to analyze data regarding student learning outcomes and their implications for the achievement of PLOs.

In 2010, the Academic Dean convened a “bar pass group,” including the Associate Academic Dean, Directors of ASP, LEOP, and Disability Resources. This group has discussed ways to support graduates taking the bar, but has not fully analyzed data of past takers to evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs and interventions. An institutional research advisor could provide significant assistance in this effort.

Standard 2.8. Scholarship, creativity, curricular and instructional innovation valued and supported.

The production of legal scholarship is an essential function of a law faculty. Hastings has an excellent reputation for producing cutting-edge research. Faculty members at Hastings are among the leading scholars in their fields and publish in leading law reviews, interdisciplinary peer-reviewed journals, and write books. Scholarship is a key factor in determining promotion and tenure. To facilitate research, faculty members are provided with \$5,000 each year for travel, conferences, and research assistants. The Academic Dean also provides \$10,000 summer research stipends. About fifty percent of the faculty apply for and receive a summer research stipend each year. An additional three to four small funds are available to support research, including empirical studies. Faculty members hold work-in-progress presentations that provide feedback on scholarly research. Faculty members also participate in colloquia and scholarly conferences.

The Strategic Plan includes as a goal the production of engaged scholarship. The strategic objectives that accompany this goal are:

1. Support rigorous scholarship that will be valuable to scholars and practitioners;
2. Promote scholarship through conferences, symposia, publications, and blogs;
3. Translate scholarly research for the broader legal community, policymakers, and the public;

4. Provide support to faculty to assist them in advancing and publicizing their scholarship; and
5. Develop the capacity to place timely op-ed articles.

Standard 2.9. Linkage among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service

Hastings currently has four centers: (1) Gender and Refugee Studies, (2) Negotiation and Dispute Resolution, (3) State and Local Government Law, and (4) WorkLife Law. There is also a UCSF/UC Hastings Consortium on Law, Science & Health Policy, and a proposal to create a Center for Criminal Justice and Ethics. The centers are intended to combine law and policy, conduct research, and provide expert research and advocacy. They provide students and practitioners the opportunity to work together to combine scholarship, learning, and service. For example, the Center for State and Local Government Law allows students to take a legislative course and work through the clinic as a legislative researcher in a clinical placement with a legislative or public entity.

Standards 2.10-2.14: Support for Student Learning

Most departments that directly provide academic or related co-curricular services are under the supervision of the Associate Academic Dean. The Academic Dean also provides direction for the range of support that faculty provide students beyond the classroom. Although these units have distinct functions, increased coordination among student services, records, the Academic Support Program, LEOP, the disability services office, as well as legal writing, clinical, and doctrinal faculty may more effectively and efficiently serve often overlapping populations. The need for more detailed data to monitor and analyze student academic performance is discussed above.

The Office of Career and Professional Development collects and reports on student employment in compliance with ABA standards and law school convention. Responding to recent public calls for increased disaggregation of data on salaries and types of employment, the Office has broken out its results for the graduating class of 2011 in greater detail. The 2011 Law School Survey of Student

Engagement (LSSSE) study revealed high utilization of job search assistance (85-94% use from first year to third years), but declining satisfaction as students moved from their first year toward graduation into a difficult job market. The Office has collected some data on student utilization of its programs and has a strong interest in more information about needs and use. In 2010, a collaboration with Student Services and other departments on a “spring survey” for graduates yielded high participation and useful data. Correlation of services or job search success with academic indicators or performance may be hampered by FERPA concerns. Again, an institutional research professional might help formulate ways to analyze relevant data.

Students responding to the 2011 LSSSE survey report that 62-78% of students used financial aid advising in their first through third years, appearing to capture substantially all students on aid. Satisfaction with this advising grows from half of first year students to two-thirds of the students poised to graduate. Transfer students increased from 22 to 32 in 2011. These students receive an orientation and individual meetings to assist with their initial fall course registration. No particular efforts are directed to them thereafter. The anecdotal observation is that transfer students do well, but no studies have measured their performance or satisfaction as a specific category of student.

The Office of Student Services directly serves students, with programs ranging from orientation to graduation. In addition to providing Student Health Services, the College offers a range of programs to support the social interaction and wellness of the student community, such as yoga classes.

The Office also supports about 70 student organizations, which are a major source of the design and execution of many timely professional, social, and service programs for the student body. A list of these organizations is provided on the Hastings website. Co-curricular programs are responsive to student demand and, with more conscious alignment, could contribute substantially to assessment of the recently adopted learning outcomes. For example, 93% of first year students volunteer or do pro bono

work, and around two-thirds of upper division students are members of law journals, offering vehicles for development of public service, research and writing skills.

In 2011, the College participated in the Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE), mentioned above, for the first time. The results of this inquiry provided both objective and comparative data with peer institutions on students' self-assessed academic gains and social satisfaction. Many of the indicators measured can provide feedback on student learning outcomes in areas such as self-assessed gains in critical and analytical thinking ability, complex problem-solving, and encouraging the ethical practice of law. Faculty and many departments were eager to explore both the findings of the 2011 survey in follow-up consultations with a LSSSE consultant, and see the survey instrument as a promising source of information and feedback in upcoming years.

Hastings has already mobilized to respond to one finding in the LSSSE results: academic advising and planning. While over three-quarters of all students reported used these services, satisfaction rates fell significantly below 2011 LSSSE rates at selected peer institutions. Only 55% of first year students were satisfied, dropping to 37% of 2Ls, and 36% of third year students. While critical information about graduation and course requirements has been provided on websites for students, the Office of Student Services now has added live programming to address registration questions and concerns. Students are assigned a faculty advisor when they enter law school, but the extent of subsequent contact varies widely. Top administration has committed to invigorating this structure, scheduling times and training for faculty to convene small group advising meetings.

Student dissatisfaction with academic advising may stem from features of Hastings that also may make other aspects of student support challenging. On reflection, some administrators identified the urban setting, "commuter" nature of the institution, and sheer size as inhibiting development of a closer knit community that might otherwise better foster peer and institutional support. The LSSSE 2011

report provides a baseline measure: 33% of students in their final year reported having positive relationships with faculty, 22% with administrators, and 47% with peers. The Strategic Plan to reduce the J.D. student body by 20% over time may relieve some of this pressure, although some students expressed concern over its effect on access and diversity. While the planned addition of more LL.M. and M.L.S. students might add to student diversity, the increased number of students attending various degree programs, each with its own set of academic requirements, might put additional stress on student services at Hastings.

The size of the school may also foster in students the practical skills and professional judgment that animate some of Hastings' programmatic and learning objectives. Students contrasted law school with their undergraduate experiences, expressing the need to take responsibility for their own survival and self-manage in graduate school. Delivery of a wide range of resource materials is facilitated by being posted on the web, but its use and navigation require individual student initiative.

Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources

Standards 3.1, 3.4: Sufficient qualified personnel for operations and academics; staff development

Hastings employs 156 staff members that support campus operations. Some "staff" also provide classroom instruction, such as academic support and specialized library research. The school also employs additional student employees and graduate student employees to help with shorter term projects. The strategic plan, however, calls for reduction in the size of the staff by some 20%. Some employees have already been laid off, some positions have been converted from full to part time, and some vacant positions have been eliminated. The ultimate impact on the academic program of a 20% reduction in staff, once fully implemented, is not clear. Library staffing seems to be especially hard hit.

Hastings faculty consists of between 160 and 180 professors each semester, about 67 of which are full time members of the faculty and the rest are adjuncts. As of the date of the site visit, the campus

appears to employ a sufficient number of qualified faculty and staff to maintain its operations and academic programs. Full implementation of the 20% reduction in staff, however, may alter this picture.

The institution offers a number of programs to keep its employees abreast of developments in their fields of expertise including: tuition reimbursements, internal education programs, and support for attending conferences and seminars.

Standards 3.2-3.4, 3.11 Sufficient qualified and diverse faculty; faculty policies, procedures and evaluation; faculty development; faculty role in academic leadership

As noted above, Hastings is a large law school with a student body of approximately 1300 and a faculty headcount of 160-180 including full and part-time/adjunct faculty members per semester. Its 67 full-time faculty members are dedicated teachers and distinguished scholars as evidenced by their academic backgrounds, course syllabi, and scholarly accomplishments. For the most recent year reported, the faculty is approximately 55% male and 45% female, with approximately 19% of the faculty made up of people of color (8% black, 8% Asian, and 3% Hispanic). No faculty grievances have been filed in the last five years and there seems to be relatively low faculty turnover, suggesting that the faculty and administrative leadership work well together.

Hastings employs a wide range of adjunct faculty, drawn from the local bar and elsewhere (including members of the judiciary, accomplished attorneys and leading public officials). Hastings reports that it employs 62 part-time (adjunct) faculty members in substantive fields. It also staffs its legal research and writing and moot court programs for first year students with adjuncts (numbering 34 such adjuncts in the fall and 39 in the spring). The practicing bar in San Francisco and nearby areas includes a large number of talented attorneys and it appears that Hastings has made a considered decision to take advantage of this resource to augment its full-time faculty. The Academic Dean and faculty members report that there are systematic efforts to orient and evaluate adjunct teachers to maintain program quality. Because a very substantial part of the academic program at Hastings is conducted by adjunct

professors, it is important that those professors embrace the use of student learning outcomes in their courses. While Hastings has undertaken a significant effort to encourage full-time faculty to consider outcomes, it is not clear that this effort has been extended to adjuncts.

Hastings has clear policies in all areas relating to faculty, including a set of faculty policies and procedures covering such matters as appointments, promotion and tenure, research and parental leaves, faculty rights and responsibilities, committee jurisdiction, establishment of centers, and faculty grievances. There is a separate academic freedom policy that references AAUP standards. Standard teaching evaluations are also employed. There is a separate faculty guidebook that provides information of a more pragmatic sort.

Hastings has a formal policy relating to faculty research support which provides \$2,500 per year to cover costs of student research assistants plus an additional \$2,500 for other discretionary uses (such as travel to professional meetings). Additional funds can be requested. In addition, a substantial number of faculty members occupy endowed chairs, which may provide additional financial support.

The faculty at Hastings is actively involved in governance and provides effective leadership. The established committee structure covers all relevant areas. Faculty meeting minutes indicate that faculty members engage on key questions such as curriculum and establishment of learning outcomes.

Standards 3.5-3.7: Fiscal, and Information Resources:

Hastings plans future budgets five years at a time as seen in the Five Year Budget Plan and the Five Year Budget Plan Narrative. In response to past decreases in state funding, the budget plan addresses additional potential decreases. Given the uncertainty of state support, a budget strategy is being employed to ensure the financial stability of Hastings.

Many of the strategic goals recently adopted by Hastings relate to finances and the allocation of funds to support educational objectives. One of the goals is to “maintain financial health.” Some of the

strategic objectives to support this goal include reducing core operating expenses, conducting a capital fundraising campaign, and diversifying revenue streams. The strategic goal of maintaining financial health is key to the achievement of the strategic goals that impact the academic program.

The LSSSE survey showed that 36-43% of students spend more than 5 hours per week commuting to Hastings. Providing access to information technology off-campus is crucial to support the needs of this large body of commuter students. An online catalog provides access to books, scholarly journals, and videos in the library. Students have access to this catalog on or off campus, which supports students conducting research at home.

In order to supply sufficient technology resources to faculty, staff, and students, Hastings employs 12 technology staff members. There are three additional staff members in different departments who use technological expertise to support their individual departments. Hastings has an extensive wireless network. There are also wired computers in various places for faculty, staff, and student use: 11 in the law library, 11 in classrooms, 50 in computer labs, and 77 in staff and faculty offices. The law library appears to be very well run and has an extensive print and electronic collection.

In the last few years, all classrooms have been updated with the latest instructional technology. All seminar rooms have projectors with DVD and VCR players. Lecture rooms have all been remodeled to include a console, video projection, a computer, digital marking display, recording, PA system, and presentation capabilities. All classrooms have an automated lecture capture system that is used to provide accessibility by the Disability Resource Program and for all students during make-up classes.

Standards 3.8-3.10: Organizational Structures and Decision Making Processes

The Board of Directors is responsible for governing Hastings, including ensuring the institution's sustainability. The Board meets quarterly. Additionally, each Board committee meets an additional four times a year. Meeting notices and schedules are posted on Hastings' website. The Board is comprised of

eleven Directors. New Directors are appointed by the Governor of the State of California, confirmed by a majority of the state Senate, and by a majority vote of the sitting directors.

Hastings has a Chief Executive Officer whose full-time responsibility is to the law school. The Board Policies on the Appointment of the CEO outline how both the Chancellor/Dean and the Academic Dean are appointed. The Standing Orders outline the institution's line of reporting, appointment processes of Chancellor/Dean and Academic Dean, and the duties of the Chancellor/Dean.

Administrative, academic, and executive responsibilities are divided between Chancellor/Dean and the Academic Dean. The Chancellor/Dean provides overall leadership and performs necessary external functions. Other responsibilities include: accountability to the Board for all operations; awarding of degrees; making financial awards to students; appointing, determining compensation, promoting, demoting, and dismissing employees; representing the Board and the school in government relations; fixing fees and assessments on students with Board approval; working with the CFO to make budget and appropriations recommendations; executing contracts on behalf of Hastings; committing to expend and accept funds; and fundraising.

The Academic Dean performs many of the internal functions of a traditional CEO, including running daily operations. The Board's Bylaws provide that the Academic Dean "shall serve as the chief academic officer of the College under the Chancellor and Dean and shall administer the academic program of the College in accordance with the policies adopted by the faculty. The Academic Dean shall also serve as Chief Executive to the extent of the authority delegated by Chancellor and Dean."

Standard 4: An Organization Committed to Learning

Standards 4.1-4.3, 4.8: Strategic Thinking and Planning; Stakeholder Involvement

Hastings just finished its first campus-wide, comprehensive Strategic Plan. The plan represents the work of the Strategic Planning Committee which was comprised of students, faculty, board

members, and staff. As part of the planning process, students, alumni, faculty, employees, and Board members were surveyed on the priorities of the institution and plans for the future. The process was designed to be transparent (by making all documents publicly available online) and inclusive (by reaching out to all segments of the community). The Strategic Plan is designed to address the dramatic changes taking place within the legal field, both in academia and practice. The plan identifies the priorities of the institution and creates strategies for managing resources to target those priorities.

The Strategic Plan aligns academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the institution. Each strategic goal touches on one or more of these critical areas, identifies them as institutional priorities, and recommends strategic objectives for improvement. The document shows that the institution understands that tough choices must be made in order to meet the needs of the changing legal profession. Some of these choices include making advances in the use of classroom technology, and some include deciding that resources must be shifted away from certain areas in order to support goals that are deemed to be higher priorities to the academic success of Hastings and its students.

Prior to the Strategic Plan, institutional planning was conducted primarily through the Board of Directors in the form of its long-range plan. The most recent long-range plan was completed for the period covering its completion until 2016. Planning processes are described in the Board Bylaws and Standing Orders. Wide-scale institutional evaluation and planning also takes place annually in preparation for ABA accreditation requirements. Every seven years, Hastings completes a thorough written self-study, as required by the ABA.

Standards 4.4-4.7: Quality Assurance, Faculty Leadership in Assessment, Inquiry into Teaching, Learning and Continuing Improvement

As discussed above, Hastings has a long-standing record of excellence in preparing students for law practice. Its J.D. program is solid and well positioned to help graduates meet future challenges,

since the program consists of a well-organized and comprehensive curriculum. Hastings has also attended to student achievement through a well-executed academic support program primarily aimed at the lowest decile of the class. The LEOP program also carefully tracks its students' performance in order to determine whether more needs to be done to support students from non-traditional backgrounds who may find academic and bar performance particularly challenging.

In these respects, Hastings demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement that is as well-established as that of any law school in the United States. On the other hand, few law schools in the United States are positioned to meet the full expectations of regional accreditors relating to quality assurance, assessment and tracking, faculty assessment of teaching/learning/climate/co-curricular objectives, improvement in curricular/pedagogy/assessment, and stakeholder involvement.

Hastings has made substantial progress in addressing these issues, but needs to continue to develop in the following areas: quality assurance processes, assessment and tracking, data analysis, attention to learning outcomes, attention to co-curricular objectives and their attainment, ongoing improvement of curricula/pedagogy/assessment, and stakeholder involvement in assessing institutional effectiveness. Because Hastings seeks WASC accreditation in connection with a proposal to offer new masters programs related to health and law, and because these are free-standing academic programs, Hastings will need to incorporate learning objectives and related practices into these programs as they develop. Given the timeline for the new M.S.L. degree program, Hastings needs to devote immediate attention to developing M.S.L.-specific learning outcomes and assessment methods.

Standard 4.5: Institutional Research Capacity

Hastings' Strategic Plan and its PLOs are closely aligned, with many overlapping themes and goals. The PLOs are new, and the newly created Education Effectiveness Faculty Committee will soon begin planning and implementing assessment methods for these learning outcomes. Hastings reasonably

anticipates that, because of the close link between the Strategic Plan and PLOs, assessment of the effectiveness of those outcomes also will provide evidence of the success of the Strategic Plan. The development of institutional research resources to assist in this evaluation, as described above, may be especially important.

SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The WASC Pathway B Visit Team appreciated the thoroughness of Hastings written materials submitted in support of its application for Pathway B accreditation and the hospitality of the entire Hastings community during the site visit. The WASC team offers these concluding commendations and recommendations.

Commendations

1. *Assessment Valued.* Hastings has made a significant effort to learn about and engage the institution in assessment of student learning and has adopted appropriately framed Program Learning Outcomes that reflect substantial faculty involvement.
2. *Skilled and Knowledgeable Graduates.* Hastings values the knowledge and skills necessary to practice law and aspires to prepare graduates to function in the increasingly global workplace of the 21st century.
3. *Collegial Faculty.* Hastings has a strong and collegial faculty who exhibit effective faculty governance through their committee structure and who adopt pedagogical innovations.
4. *Clinical Programs.* The clinical programs and faculty at Hastings effectively engage and assist students to develop as professionals by employing a variety of assessment methods emphasizing hands on learning, building practical skills, and providing effective support.

5. *UCSF-Hastings Partnership.* Capitalizing on the relationship with UCSF is a timely innovation that positions Hastings to be a center of excellence at the intersection of health, law and science with the potential to benefit society and particularly local underserved communities.
6. *Diversity.* Hastings is distinguished by the diversity of the student body and its commitment to the Legal Equal Opportunity Program which provides significant academic support.

Recommendations

1. *Assess Program Learning Outcomes.* Hastings should continue to develop and begin to assess program learning outcomes specifically tailored to the JD and international LL.M programs. Distinct program learning outcomes for all new degree programs also need to be developed and assessment methods established and implemented as these programs are offered. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 4.6-4.8)
2. *Program Review.* Given that Hastings will begin offering new programs not subject to external review by another accrediting agency, it needs to develop and implement a process of program review, which includes, among other things, appropriate metrics to ensure Program Learning Outcomes are being achieved. (CFRs 2.7, 4.4)
3. *Assess Learning in Class.* Hastings should include formative and summative assessment techniques to measure student learning outcomes in all courses, including use of multiple strategies where appropriate and feasible. (CFR 2.3-2.5, 4.7)
4. *Monitor Strategic Plan.* Hastings needs to carefully monitor the implementation of the Strategic Plan with particular attention to the effect on access and diversity of the student body and the effect on student support services. Hastings should ensure continuing and effective communication regarding personnel actions and other aspects of the Plan's implementation and monitor continuing validity of key fiscal assumptions as the plan unfolds. (CFRs 1.5, 3.5, 4.1-4.3)

5. *Institutional Research Plan.* Hastings needs to establish a robust institutional research enterprise to facilitate collection, analysis and distribution of data concerning assessment of learning outcomes and implementation of the strategic plan. (2.6, 4.1-4.5)

6. *Information Technology Plan.* Hastings needs a strategic information technology plan that prioritizes initiatives such as infrastructure needs, data requirements associated with additional institutional research functions, and redesign of business processes. (CFRs 3.7, 4.1-4.3, 4.5)

APPENDICES

Credit Hour Policy

Compliance Audit

Team Report Appendix
CREDIT HOUR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Institution: UC Hastings
 Kind of Visit: Pathway B
 Date: April 3, 2012

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all CPR, EER and Initial Accreditation Visits. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on credit hour	Does this policy adhere to WASC policy and federal regulations?	Yes
	Comments: 13-week semester with 60-minute classes. Exceeds minutes. Published in Academic Regulations.	
Process(es)/ periodic review	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)?	Yes
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Yes
	Comments: ABA requirements dictate the hours and registrar's staff schedules and double checks	Yes
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?	Yes
	Comments:	none
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? None How many syllabi were reviewed? What degree level(s)? What discipline(s)?	n/a
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	n/a
	Comments:	none
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated)	What kinds of courses? Nonclassroom courses, including internships/field work/clinics (which have classroom component), independent study, research and teaching assistants, moot court and other competitions, law review. 18 of 86 units limit. How many syllabi were reviewed? 10 What degree level(s)? Pro doc What discipline(s)? Law	Yes
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? The rules are in the academic regulations and fieldwork guides. (45 hours per unit)	Yes
	Comments:	

Compliance Audit Checklist for Special Visits and Pathway B Visits

Instruction to team:

Please attach this form to the team report. Missing documents should be noted in the recommendations section of the team report.

Name of Institution: UC Hastings College of the Law

Date of Visit: April 2-5, 2012

CFR	Documents Required	
Standard 1		
1.1	Mission statement	X
1.2	Educational objectives at the institutional and program levels	X
1.2.1	Public statement on student achievement (retention, graduation, student learning)	Bar pass and employment only
1.3	Organization chart (X 3.8, 3.9, 3.10)	X
1.4	Academic freedom policy	X
1.5	Diversity policies and procedures; Procedures for Special Accommodations	X
1.6	-	-
1.7	Catalog (online ____, hard copy ____) with complete program descriptions, graduation requirements, grading policies (X 2.10.1)	X
1.7.2	Student complaint and grievance policies	X
1.7.2.1	Policy for grade appeals	X
1.7.2.2	Records of student complaints	X
1.7.3	Faculty grievance policies	X
1.7.3.1	Record of faculty grievances	X
1.7.4	Staff grievance policies	X
1.7.4.1	Record of staff grievances and complaints	X
1.7.5	Employee handbook	X
1.7.6.1	Up-to-date student transcripts with key that explains credit hours, grades, levels, etc.	X
1.7.6.2	Admissions records that match stated requirements; complete files	X
1.7.6.3	Policies and procedures to protect the integrity of grades	X
1.7.6.4	Tuition and fee schedule	X
1.7.6.5	Policies on tuition refunds	X
1.7.6.6	Policy on credit hour/award of credit Processes for review of assignment of credit Review of syllabi/equivalent for all kinds of courses	X
1.8	Regular independent audits of finances (X 3.5)	X
1.9	WASC-related policies to ensure sub change policies	Will need
1.7-1.9	Documents relating to investigations of the institution by any governmental entity and an update on the status of such investigation A list of pending legal actions by or against the institution, including a full explanation of the nature of the actions, parties involved, and status of the litigation	No current litigation or investigations
Standard 2		

CFR	Documents Required	
2.1	List of degree programs, showing curriculum and units for each (X 1.7)	X
2.2	Complete set of course syllabi for all courses offered	X
2.2.1	(For associate and bachelor's degrees) statement of general education requirements (X 1.7)	n/a
2.3	SLOs for every program	Same for all four degree programs
2.4	-	-
2.5	-	-
2.6	-	-
2.7	Program review process with clear criteria, which include assessment of program retention/graduation and achievement of learning outcomes	None
2.7.1	Regular schedule of program review (including for non-academic units)	None
2.8	Policies re faculty scholarship and creative activity	X
2.9	-	-
2.10	Data on student demographics	X
2.10.1	Data on retention and graduation, disaggregated by demographic categories and programs	X
2.10.2	Collection and analysis of grades at the course or program level, as appropriate	X
2.10.3	Policies on student evaluation of faculty	X
2.10.4	Forms for evaluation of faculty by students	X
2.11	List of student services and co-curricular activities	X
2.11.1	Policies on financial aid	X
2.12	Academic calendar (X 1.7 catalog)	X
2.13	Recruitment and advertising material for the last year	X
2.13.1	Registration procedures	X
2.14	Registration forms	X
Standard 3		
3.1	Policies on staff development	X
3.2	List of faculty with classifications, e.g., core, full-time, part-time, adjunct, tenure track, by program	X
3.3	Faculty hiring policies	X
3.3.1	Faculty evaluation policies and procedures (X 2.10)	X
3.3.2	Faculty Handbook if available	X
3.4	Faculty development policies	X
3.4.1	Faculty orientation policies and procedures	X
3.4.2	Policies on rights and responsibilities of non-full-time faculty	X
3.4.3	Statements concerning faculty role in assessment of student learning	None
3.5	Audited financial statements (X 1.8)	X
3.5.1	Appropriate financial records	X
3.5.2	Appropriate policies and procedures for handling of financial aid (X 2.11)	X
3.5.3	Campus maps	X
3.6	Inventory of technology resources for students and faculty	X
3.6.1	If online or hybrid, information on delivery method	X
3.6.2	Library data/holdings, size	X
3.7	Inventory of technology resources and services for staff	X
3.8	Organization chart (X 1.3 and 3.1)	X
3.9	Board list	X

CFR	Documents Required	
3.9.1	Board member bios	X
3.9.2	List of Board committees	X
3.9.2.1	Minutes of Board meetings for last two years	X
3.9.2.2	Governing board bylaws and operations manual	X
3.10	CEO bio	X
3.10.1	CFO bio	X
3.10.2	Other top administrators' bios (e.g., cabinet, VPs, Provost)	X
3.10.3	Policy and procedure for the evaluation of president/CEO	X
3.11	Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority	X
3.11.1	Faculty organization chart (if applicable)	n/a
3.11.2	Minutes of last year's faculty meetings	X
Standard 4		
4.1	Strategic plan	X
4.1.1	Operations plan	X
4.1.2	Academic plan	X
4.2	Description of planning process	X
4.2.1	Process for review of implementation of strategic plan	X
4.3	-	-
4.4	New program approval process	X
4.4.1	Program review process (X 2.7)	In process
4.5	Description of IR function and staffing	Registrar
4.6	Process for review and analysis of key data, such as retention, graduation (X1.2)	X
4.7	-	-
4.8	-	-

Comments: Records are excellent and complete.

Related to Substantive Change		
1	Locations of all off-campus sites and programs offered at such sites (more than 50% of program)	None
1a	Number of students enrolled at such sites	
1b	Date of first offerings	
2	Names of all programs for which 50% of the program is offered through distance education	
2a	Number of students enrolled in each	
2b	Date each was first offered	
3	Names of all hybrid programs	
3a	Number of students enrolled in each	
3b	Date each was first offered	
Accuracy and Availability of Records		
	Policies and procedures for students, faculty and staff are stated consistently in all media	X
	Policies, procedures, and information are readily available to relevant constituents	X
	Records are accurate and up to date	X