

REPORT OF THE WASC SPECIAL VISIT TEAM

To Alliant International University/San Francisco Law School

February 27 – 28, 2013

Dr. Pamela Eibeck, Team Chair
Dean Maryann Jones, Assistant Chair
Dean Janice Pearson, Team Member
Dr. Keith R. Bell, WASC Liaison

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
SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	
A. Description of the Institution and Visit	3
B. Quality of the Report and Supporting Evidence.....	4
C. Description of the Team’s Review Process.....	5
SECTION II. EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS	
A. Integration with Alliant International University.....	7
B. Assessment and Student Success.....	9
C. Faculty Governance and Creation of Academic Culture.....	17
SECTION III. PREPARATION FOR THE NEXT INTERACTION WITH WASC.....	21
SECTION IV. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	22

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Visit

San Francisco Law School, located in downtown San Francisco (hereinafter referred to as “SFLS”) was merged with Alliant International University (hereinafter referred to as “Alliant”) in 2010. Alliant offers mainly graduate programs in psychology, education, business, law, and forensic studies. Alliant has five schools, to include the Alliant School of Management, California School of Forensic Studies, Hufstedler School of Education, California School of Professional Psychology, and the San Francisco Law School. Alliant’s main campus is located in San Diego, California, but it also has campuses in several U.S. and international locations, to include San Francisco.

Prior to its merger with Alliant, SFLS had been operating as an independent institution for approximately 100 years, and had been continuously accredited by the Committee of Bar Examiners of the State Bar of California for 70 years. Pursuant to the terms of the merger agreement, in June 2013 the Alliant Board of Trustees will determine whether the merger of the two institutions has been in the best interest of the law school’s students. If not, the merger could unwind.

SFLS currently offers only the Juris Doctor (J.D.) degree, and, until recently, offered only a part-time evening program. A full-time option was added in fall 2012. While the dean was a full-time employee of the law school, all faculty members were adjuncts. The mission of the law school is to provide an accessible as well as affordable quality legal education to underserved populations. The school is small, enrolling a total of approximately 64 students, and highly diverse, averaging 45% women and 50% students of color.

Alliant underwent a Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) visit in spring 2009, prior to the merger with the law school, and an Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) visit in spring 2011. In its action letter of July 5, 2011, the Commission reaccredited Alliant and scheduled the next comprehensive visit for 2019. However, the Commission found, *inter alia*, that the law school did not, at that time, comply with WASC Standards. The Commission letter stated that the law school “is not yet fully integrated with Alliant and lacks several of the expected characteristics of an academic culture at the graduate level.” The law school was asked to hire at least one full-time faculty member, develop a system of faculty governance, support faculty scholarship and creative activity appropriate for a professional doctoral program, build capacity for assessment of student learning and demonstrate that students are meeting those outcomes, and conduct a program review of the J.D. program utilizing Alliant’s Intensive Review process.

As a result of the above findings, the Commission scheduled a Special Visit for 2013. A team visited the law school on February 27 and 28. The team consisted of three members, two of whom were experienced law school deans. The team wishes to thank the institution for the hospitality and the many courtesies shown the team.

B. Quality of the Special Visit Report and Supporting Evidence

Prior to the visit, the institution submitted a Special Visit report that addressed all of the issues raised in the Commission action letter. The institution was also forthcoming with additional information as requested by the team. The report was the result of participation by the law school dean, the law school’s full-time faculty member, and Alliant’s Associate Provost for Institutional Research. The final report was reviewed by

the law school faculty and provided to Alliant's senior management team as well as the Alliant Faculty Senate and Alliant's senior leadership Steering Committee.

As will be discussed more fully below, there has been significant progress in operational integration of the law school with Alliant. In terms of the remaining concerns following the EER visit, the law school is still in the very early stages of creating a culture of evidence-based decision making and assessment of student outcomes. The same is true of implementing a system of faculty governance and faculty ownership of the academic program. Nonetheless, the institution has begun to collect data on student success in a manner required by WASC, and the faculty has begun to engage in the assessment process, all of which is reflected in the institutional report. How data is disseminated and analyzed remains a work in progress. The report does not demonstrate the existence of an effective feedback loop wherein data is directly tied to institutional improvement. Thus, while the report contains much data that was lacking at the time of the EER visit, much more needs to be done in this regard.

The report updated information from the time of the Alliant EER visit and also dealt with new challenges facing both Alliant as well as the law school, to include declining enrollments and operating deficits. The report presented some data of student success disaggregated by gender, race, and ethnicity, something completely lacking at the time of the EER visit.

C. Description of the Team's Review Process

The team visited SFLS on February 27 and 28. The team met with representatives of Alliant, to include the university's President, Provost/ VPAA, and Associate Provost for Institutional Research. In addition to the dean and the full-time member of the faculty,

the team conducted open sessions for faculty as well as full-time and part-time students. The team also met with members of the Faculty Council, the Law School Integration Committee, and the law school administrative staff.

The team reviewed the Special Visit report and accompanying documents submitted by the institution prior to the visit. The team also requested additional evidence, some to be reviewed prior to the visit but much to be made available in the team room during the site visit. The team reviewed many documents relevant to the financial viability of the law school, evidence of faculty governance in operation, student learning, to include annual reports to Alliant as well as the Intensive Review team report, performance on the bar examination, and the existence of policies required by WASC Standards. The team suggests that for future visits the requested information be provided in a more user-friendly manner and be made available earlier in the process.

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS

The merger of SFLS with Alliant University benefitted the law school by bringing resources, enhanced expectations, and the regional accreditation standards associated with the larger university. For example, the part-time faculty are now more engaged with curricular and admissions decisions, are becoming engaged with assessment, and participate in expanded faculty development opportunities. In addition, the school has improved entering student academic qualifications, has added important tools to enhance bar pass rates, and faculty are beginning to teach in other academic units. While these changes have occurred, SFLS has maintained its deep commitment to providing access to

a legal education to those for whom a legal education was rare, especially minorities, women and working adults.

A. INTEGRATION WITH ALLIANT INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Considerable progress has been made to integrate the SFLS into the Alliant University since they joined the university in July 2010. The merger is pending a June 2013 vote of the Alliant Board of Trustees to finalize the merger. The vote will be informed by a recommendation of the Law School Committee established by the merger terms, consisting of three pre-merger SFLS Board of Directors (two of whom are now on the Alliant Board), plus two additional Alliant Board members. The Law School Committee is to base its recommendation on the continued merger based on “what is in the SFLS’s students’ best interests.” All indications from the University leadership during meetings with the team, including the opinion of three board members, suggest that the merger will be affirmed in the summer of 2013.

Governance and management integration: As of the merger, two members of the pre-merger SFLS Board of Trustees joined the Alliant Board of Trustees. In addition, a Law School Committee was established by the Alliant Board of Trustees to monitor the progress of the integration of SFLS into Alliant. Specifically, the Law School Committee has reviewed decisions regarding space and facilities, faculty and staffing, integration of data systems, finance, curriculum and accreditation.

The law school dean now reports to the Provost and VP of Academic Affairs and is an active member of Alliant’s leadership group, the Steering Committee along with other deans and leadership of the University. In addition, the recently added SFLS full-time faculty member is already active with the Alliant Faculty Senate. (CFRs 3.8, 3.9)

IT systems: The information technology and telecommunications systems at SFLS have been upgraded (or are in the process of being upgraded) so that they will have the same telecommunications system, high speed internet access, email, authentication and ERP system as the rest of Alliant. (Note that the last upgrades needed for the telecomm and internet access update will occur this summer after classes are completed.) The SFLS website is fully integrated with that of Alliant. Alliant is replacing administrator computers at the law school as part of their University equipment replacement plan. (CFR 3.7)

While student records since the merger are part of the University's enterprise system, a major upgrade of the Jenzebar system has delayed integrating the full archival data of the law school into the system. The team learned that the University fully expects this to be completed in the next few months.

All financial records are integrated with the Alliant system, although their finances are treated by the auditors as temporarily restricted until the merger is finalized this summer.

Staffing: Alliant recently underwent a university-wide restructuring of staff, reviewing and aligning the job descriptions, business processes, and on-line support systems with an eye to improving efficiencies, inconsistencies and reducing costs. This resulted in a reduction in the number of staff at SFLS from eight down to four, freeing up resources at the law school for other investments in the program. While there was a disruption from the changes, enhanced training and cross training by Alliant is integrating the staff practices at SFLS with the University. (CFRs 3.1, 3.4)

Library: SFLS students continue to receive the same access to the law school's library as before the merger, except with the advantage of a full-time faculty member with expertise in Library Science. However, SFLS students only have access to the broader Alliant University library assets if they travel to the other Alliant branch campus library. (CFR 3.6)

Other moves to standardization have included a syllabus template, faculty evaluations, course evaluations, and diplomas (limited to students who spent the majority of their years as an Alliant student, e.g. year three of the merger.) While these are works in progress, it is clear they are making progress following a well-planned schedule.

Institutional culture: The deepest challenge facing an amalgamation of the SFLS with its long heritage as an independent operation with a larger university is imbuing the law school with the Alliant culture. The team observed that the leadership and staff are actively engaged with their counterparts at Alliant, share the same values, and consider themselves a part of the larger organization. However, the law school faculty and staff will need to embrace Alliant's culture of systematic improvement and quality assurance processes. (CFR 4.4, 4.7, 4.8)

In summary, the team found that Alliant has acted to integrate the law school into the University to the extent possible at this point. If, as expected, the Board votes in June to finalize the merger, the team urges the institution to complete the integration as expeditiously as possible to further maximize operational efficiencies.

B. ASSESSMENT AND STUDENT SUCCESS

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

The institution has made progress in terms of assessment of student learning since the EER visit. The faculty has adopted student learning outcomes and, in 2012, revised them to four in number, including: Doctrinal Knowledge of the Law; Professional Analytics; Communication Skills; and Professional Responsibility. A curriculum map was developed and faculty members have added student learning outcomes to their syllabi. Faculty members who met with the team were familiar with the student learning outcomes. (CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.4)

Assessment at SFLS gives primacy to bar examination results as an indicator of overall student success. While the bar tests only a subset of the school's identified programmatic learning outcomes, it is one useful tool in measuring overall student success. The school historically struggled with low bar passage rates and has focused much of its energies and resources on improvement in this area. The last three administrations for which results are available have seen improved passage rates.

While the law school now has defined learning programmatic learning outcomes, the assessment of these outcomes is in its very early stages. Assessment mechanisms have been identified for each of the learning outcomes, but the school is just beginning to utilize these mechanisms and it is unclear the extent to which both full-time and adjunct faculty were involved in the creation of these mechanisms.

(CFR 2.4)

Assessment consists of three methodologies for the first learning outcome – Doctrinal Knowledge. They include analysis of first year examinations, statistics from the National Conference of Bar Examiners on student performance on the topics tested by the multistate section of the bar examination, and results from the school's Multistate Bar

Examination course. For all three, the law school has begun to collect and disseminate data. What has not yet occurred is analysis of these data and resulting curricular or programmatic changes. The only exception is the results of the MBE Skills course results, which led the law school to “encourage First Year students in these courses to work harder and answer more questions.....” and, for all three assessment methods, an “increased focus on writing at all levels” as well as additional practice exams. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 4.6)

The second programmatic learning outcome is Professional Analytics, which includes analysis and application of legal rules and principles to problems, the ability to formulate legal theories and then alternative solutions and a plan of action. Assessment here consists of three methods: analysis of Moot Court appellate briefs, data from written assignments in the Legal Reasoning course, and analysis of student internship experiences. Few students take internships, so it is unclear what general information can be gleaned from the supervisors’ evaluations of the students. The faculty has not yet begun assessing the Legal Reasoning course results. One set of Moot Court briefs were analyzed by the dean, the instructor, and a third faculty member using a rubric. The results were shared with the Faculty Council, but it is not clear if the results have been quantified or whether any changes were implemented as a result. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 4.6)

The third program learning outcome is Communications, Written and Oral. Again, assessment consists of three mechanisms: objective analysis of the second year writing project, Moot Court oral argument rubric/grading sheet, and the fourth year Trial Practice course grades. The objective analysis of second year writing has not been

implemented. The Moot Court oral argument assessment has been developed and is being used. It is thoughtful in both design and implementation. For Trial Practice, SFLS is considering including external evaluators in the process which could provide valuable information as to whether SFLS students are actually achieving the student learning outcomes. In general, much remains to be done to implement assessment of this outcome. It is not clear how the data will be used to inform programmatic changes. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 4.6)

Professional Responsibility is to be assessed by two mechanisms. The first is analysis of results of the Multistate Professional Responsibility exam, a component of the California Bar Examination. The second is an analysis of the final exams in the required Professional Responsibility course. It is unclear to the visiting team how these results are generating useful data and being used to effect programmatic improvements. The only recommendation thus is that faculty should introduce and mirror professional behavior. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 4.6)

Traditionally, faculty assessed student performance almost exclusively through the administration of midterm and final examinations. The faculty surveyed students as to what formative assessments faculty had instituted were found most useful by students. As a result, faculty have begun giving more practice exams, hypothetical questions, and short quizzes. A second survey was administered, and the results will be reviewed at the spring faculty meeting. Training in formative assessment for all faculty would enable them to be more creative and give students more frequent and immediate feedback. (CFR 2.5)

SFLS is beginning to develop a culture of assessment and evidence-based decision making, but is still in the nascent stages. The assistance of the University's institutional research department is apparent, as the amount of available data has improved since the EER visit, but there is little indication as to how this data is being utilized. Some of the proposed assessment mechanisms have not yet been implemented. For some, it is unclear whether the mechanisms will provide useful information. Where rating systems are used, it is not clear how evaluators are calibrated to ensure agreed upon definitions of various degrees of performance. In most instances, the lack of a coherent feedback loop is apparent. It is unclear exactly how the results are used to effect institutional improvement. The team urges the institution to develop internal expertise in assessment or consider using a consultant to assist with further development of its assessment processes. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 4.6)

PROGRAM REVIEW

The law school is required to participate in Alliant's program review process, which includes the filing of annual reports as well as undergoing an Intensive Review every five to seven years. This is the only summative assessment mechanism other than bar examination results. The Intensive Review visit occurred in November 2012 and was conducted by a member of the Alliant faculty as well as an outside reviewer. The team received the report shortly before the site visit. The report was largely descriptive and would have benefited greatly from the inclusion of evidence-based evaluation. As little factual evidence was offered, the team concluded that the review was not consistent with WASC standards. (CFRs 2.7, 2.10, 4.4, 4.8)

STUDENT SUCCESS: GRADUATION AND BAR PASSAGE RATES

The law school provided disaggregated data on student graduation rates and passage rates on the California Bar Examination. In terms of graduation rates, the institution's Special Visit report states overall graduation rates ranging from 55% - 65% for its four-year, part-time program, although this number is not fully supported by the student data provided. The graduation rate represents a combination of voluntary and involuntary (academic) attrition. Given the demands of an 84-unit, rigorous law school experience for working adults, attrition is higher than at those schools that serve full-time students. (CFR 2.10)

The percentage of women who complete the program has remained fairly constant over the last three years at slightly above 50%. For that same time period, however, the percentage of men who complete the program has decreased from a high of nearly 80% to approximately 50%. The rate of academic disqualification has increased for male students, while it has remained fairly constant for women students. The institution cites financial constraints as the chief reason for voluntary attrition.

In terms of race and ethnicity, Hispanic students graduate at the highest rate (almost 80%). Black/African American students graduate at the lowest rate (approximately 40%). The Special Visit report states that the law school is working to determine the factors that cause women and minorities to graduate and take the bar at lower rates, but it is unclear exactly how the institution is going about this. However, the law school has concluded that, for all students, poor time management/study planning skills as well as weak writing skills upon entering law school contribute to academic failure; consequently, the law school has begun to address these issues. Enhanced orientation, academic support programs, increased units in the required legal writing

curriculum, as well as the ability to offer federal financial aid are intended to facilitate enhanced student completion rates.

Data on passage rates on the California Bar Examination reveal that the institution has had inconsistent results over the last several years. For several years, the passage rates were below the average for California-accredited schools. For the last three administrations for which results are available however, the law school's results have equaled or exceeded the average for California-accredited schools. While the law school satisfies the standard set by the California Committee of Bar Examiners for bar pass rates for its accredited schools (the Committee requires a cumulative rate of 40% and the school's cumulative rate is 48%), and while rates have been trending upward, improved bar passage rates have become the institutional priority.

For the most recent three-year period for which bar results are available, women and men have similar first-time passage rates (48% and 50%). However, women have less success on subsequent attempts, leading to an ultimate pass rate of 50% for men and 41% for women. Students of color pass at a substantially lower rate than white students. For the classes of 2010 – 2012, white students had a first-time passage rate of 67% compared to 33% for students of color. The institution has not presented any evidence as to why students of color pass the bar examination at lower rates than white students. This is of concern to the team, given that half of the institution's entering students are students of color. The team was unable to find a plan to address the graduation or bar pass rates of students of color independently. Rather, the school has determined that the increased support (academic and financial) to all students will decrease these disparities. (CFR 2.10)

The team urges SFLS to enhance the depth of its statistical analysis of its admissions, retention, graduation, bar passage, and employment data. The team was provided a database from which greater analysis could be drawn. Such analysis might enable the institution to change admissions criteria and curriculum to better support its diverse student body. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 4.4, 4.6)

STUDENT SERVICES AND THE CO-CURRICULAR ENVIRONMENT

At the time of the EER visit, the law school did virtually nothing in terms of assessing student services and other co-curricular programs. During the visit, the team met with approximately one-fourth of the students in two sessions. All were first and second year students who had never been on campus prior to the merger. Some students expressed concern about the limited hours of library access on weekends and the slowness of the Internet connection for legal research. Some students commented that the large number of emails received from Alliant is useless to them, and ironically, that “communications from SFLS are non-existent”. Some commented that response to emails to staff was slow or non-existent. The development of formal methods to assess student services could disclose student priorities and concerns and enable the institution to address them. (CFRs 2.11, 4.4)

Co-curricular programs are limited at SFLS. While SFLS has created an enhanced student orientation program, the law review no longer publishes and there is no placement assistance. Surveys are administered to students following the orientation, but despite results indicating some areas for improvement, it is unclear whether the law school has modified the program in any way in response. (CFRs 2.11, 4.4)

The Faculty Council has formed an Ad Hoc Committee on Student Involvement that is deciding upon projects to undertake. Possibilities include Shadow Your Professor project, Summary of a Civil or Criminal Case project, overhaul of the internship program, and a Student Peer Review project. The first Shadow Your Professor opportunity was occurring at the time of the visit with a student following a District Attorney (also an adjunct faculty member) during his work for the day.

In conclusion, the team recognizes that the evolution from a school that had virtually no culture of systematic assessment of student learning or evidence-based decision making to one that satisfies WASC expectations cannot be achieved in the amount of time that transpired between the EER visit and this Special Visit. The law school took seriously its obligations in this regard, and the team documented real progress. Nonetheless, there is a great deal more that needs to be done in the assessment of student learning.

C. FACULTY GOVERNANCE AND CREATION OF ACADEMIC CULTURE

Like most of the law schools in California that have neither WASC nor American Bar Association (“ABA”) accreditation, faculty governance at SFLS was not developed. With no full-time faculty members, the dean of the law school was the only full-time academic. Accordingly, there was virtually no faculty ownership of the academic program, to include admission, curriculum, and academic standards, and no requirement of or support for faculty scholarship or other creative activity. The team is well aware that this transition is not an easy one, nor is it one that can be achieved in short order. Accordingly, while much remains to be done, the law school has begun to create an academic environment appropriate for a graduate professional school.

The law school has now hired a full-time faculty member who brings to the law school experience in teaching and administering a law library. This faculty member was hired in May 2012. In addition to a law degree, he holds a master's degree in Library and Information Science, has taught legal writing and analysis at both ABA and California-accredited law schools, and has worked as a law librarian in both types of law schools. He was the law library director at a California accredited school that has WASC accreditation. His extensive teaching experience and administrative experience operating a law library make this new faculty member a true asset to the law school. Nonetheless, the team has concerns about the magnitude of his teaching, advising, committee, library, and administrative responsibilities. Accordingly, the team is unable to conclude that the law school is adequately staffed in light of the need for full-time faculty to be actively engaged in the development and implementation of the school's assessment efforts, the evolution into a mature system of faculty governance, and creation of faculty scholarship (CFRs 2.1, 2.2b, and 3.2)

The report indicates that the plan to add further full-time faculty has been put on hold due to diminished enrollments and the fact that the LLM and MLS programs have not yet been initiated. As noted above, the work load of the current full-time faculty member has caused the team to question whether the current staffing level is adequate for the institution to satisfy WASC Standards. The team further directs the law school's attention to the requirement that additional graduate degree programs cannot be established without the addition of full-time faculty. (CFRs 3.1 and 3.2)

Since the EER, the law school has begun to develop faculty governance structures. The faculty members who met with the team reported a much more engaged

faculty since the merger with Alliant. The law school now has in place a Faculty Council, composed of all members of the faculty and which meets three or four times each year. The purpose of the Faculty Council is to “ensure the active representation of the faculty in the governance of the Law School.” The full-time faculty member is a member of the Alliant Faculty Senate. Faculty committees now in place mirror those in place at most law schools and include Curriculum, Admissions, Peer Review, Academic Standards, Faculty Historian, and an Ad Hoc Committee on Student Involvement. Most have just begun to operate, and some, such as Curriculum, have a purview much more narrowly circumscribed than Curriculum Committees at most law schools. The faculty reported that the Curriculum Committee only meets when “there is a major issue.” The faculty has yet to take full ownership of curriculum planning and assessment. (CFRs 2.4, 3.2, 3.11, 4.6)

In terms of the WASC criterion that the institution actively promote scholarship and creative activity, the law school is in the very initial stages. The report states that the Faculty Council is actively engaged in “strengthening and documenting creative activity.” Consistent with its role as an institution that trains students for the actual practice of law, the law school faculty adopted a very broad, comprehensive definition of scholarship, consistent with that of Alliant. The team finds that this makes a great deal of sense given that all but one of the faculty members are adjuncts. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9)

The institutional report states that the work is proceeding in three phases, with the first being a survey of the faculty to determine what individual faculty members are doing in terms of scholarship or other creative activity. That information will be used to develop faculty profiles and “build a sense of scholarship/creative activity community.”

Only after that will a Scholarship Subcommittee be created to review the results of the survey and develop recommendations for improving scholarship. While recognizing the difficulty of creating a culture of scholarship in an adjunct-driven institution, particularly one that is deeply involved in creating assessment mechanisms and implementing faculty governance, the team found that more could be done in this regard. This will not happen, however, without institutional support for and development of scholarship. The team urges the institution to begin to address WASC requirements in this regard. (CFRs 2.8, 3.4)

Faculty evaluation processes have been routinized and implemented. The revised Faculty Handbook includes a new process for faculty evaluation. The school takes a two-pronged approach to evaluation. The administration conducts what is essentially a paper review of the faculty member's syllabi and examinations and peer review of classroom performance is done by two faculty members. Although there is an attached form that must be completed, it is fairly cursory and of limited value in developing faculty's teaching skills. New faculty members are reviewed during their initial year teaching. Reviews occur every three years thereafter. (CFR 3.3)

The institution should consider providing faculty with access to accreditation standards and information pertaining to developing trends in legal education. The team concluded that the faculty have some misperceptions about what the Committee of Bar Examiners required in terms of curriculum and assume that additional skills courses would not be allowed. Furthermore, given the large body of scholarly literature currently available regarding law school pedagogy and skills training, some effort to familiarize the

faculty with these works would result in more informed decision making as their primacy in curricular decisions emerges.

In sum, while progress has been made since the EER visit, faculty governance remains a work in progress and much remains to be done before the institution can be said to have a mature system of faculty governance. Similarly, the institution has not yet reached the stage of creating an academic culture appropriate to a graduate-level institution. The institution could benefit from additional full-time faculty members in this regard.

SECTION III. PREPARATION FOR THE NEXT INTERACTION WITH WASC

The unique situation of subsuming a California-accredited law school into a larger entity such as Alliant International has created special challenges. The cultures and expectations differ. Faculty, staff, and administration have worked diligently and with great commitment to bring about this transition. Operationally, integration with Alliant has shown great progress since the EER visit. SFLS has taken the first steps to develop faculty governance and assessment.

At the time of the Special Visit, improving student performance on the bar examination was the school's highest priority. Although much effort had been directed to addressing the concerns raised by the 2011 EER visit, the institution has been taxed to its maximum capacity. In terms of building an academic culture consistent with WASC standards, much remains to be done.

Before the next interaction with WASC, SFLS will face many challenges. Evolution of the budding faculty role in governance will require attaining clarity about

the faculty's roles and responsibilities. The dean and new full-time faculty member are clearly overburdened. Adjunct faculty have been and will continue to be crucial and valuable contributors to the institution but, with their other commitments, will likely be unable to drive the governance, academic, scholarship, and assessment work that needs to be done. In particular, an additional full-time faculty member with experience in more robust assessment and faculty governance would support developing a more mature graduate education culture. The institution will need to explore how it will find the faculty and other resources needed to initiate the proposed additional graduate degrees.

SFLS will have to produce evidence of data collection and findings on all aspects of the institution's operation, demonstrating evidence-based strategic planning. In particular with regard to student and institutional learning, SFLS will have to demonstrate that it has internalized the value of that learning, consistently uses evidence in decision-making, and has developed processes to ensure findings are documented, reviewed and used.

SECTION IV. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS. The team found much for which to commend the law school, especially in its work to transition into a school of the University.

1. The team commends the law school for its dedicated staff of administrators and faculty clearly committed to the school's students.
2. The team commends the law school for its pervasive commitment to providing a quality and affordable legal education to a diverse population.

3. The team commends the law school for progress in raising expectations and increasing the support structures for the success and bar passage rate of students.
4. The team commends the law school for progress in engaging faculty and moving toward effective governance.
5. The team commends Alliant for the progress in terms of integrating the law school into the university and assisting the law school in its efforts to achieve capacity in terms of transitioning from a state accredited school to one with regional accreditation without changing the values of the institution.

RECOMMENDATIONS. The team recommends the following:

1. While the law school satisfies the minimum requirement that each graduate degree program have at least one full-time faculty member, the team urges the institution to make the hiring of an additional full-time faculty member a priority and to develop a comprehensive faculty staffing plan. (CFRs 2.2b and 3.1)
2. The team recommends that the institution continue to expand the faculty's role in curricular development, admissions, academic standards and policies and act to develop and support a culture of faculty scholarship. (CFRs 2.3, 2.8, 2.9, and 4.7).
3. The team recommends that the institution formalize and execute a plan for assessing student learning outcomes and the co-curricular and student services functions that includes the systematic collecting and

sharing of data, analysis and interpretation of the data, and utilization of the results for program improvement. (CFRs 2.3 – 2.7, 2.13)

4. The team recommends that the institution analyze the disparities in student retention, graduation, and bar passage rates and develop specific plans for addressing these disparities. (CFR 1.5)