

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To: **University of California, Hastings
College of Law**

October 16-19, 2017

Team Roster

John D. Welty, Chair, Board of Trustees, California Health Sciences University, and
President Emeritus, California State University, Fresno

Barbara A. Sawrey, Distinguished Professor Emerita and Dean Emerita, University
of California, San Diego

Sharlene Sayegh, Professor, Director of Program Review and Assessment, and
Accreditation Liaison Officer, California State University, Long Beach

Michael E. Waterstone, Senior Vice President and Dean of Loyola Law School,
Loyola Marymount University

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). 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 WSCUC website.

Table of Contents

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	
A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History.....	3
B. Description of Team’s Review Process.....	4
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence.....	5
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS	
A. Component 1.....	6
B. Component 2.....	7
C. Component 3.....	16
D. Component 4.....	19
E. Component 5.....	21
F. Component 6.....	24
G. Component 7.....	25
SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS.....	27
SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW.....	27
APPENDICES	
A. Federal Compliance Forms	
1. Credit Hour Review.....	30
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review.....	31
3. Student Complaints Review.....	33
4. Transfer Policy Review.....	34
B. Distance Education.....	35

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Reaccreditation Process

The University of California, Hastings (hereafter referred to as UCH) is a college of law founded in 1878 by the first Chief Justice of the State of California. It is a university affiliated with the University of California, but has its own Board of Directors (11 members, appointed by the Governor). UCH is a free-standing institution offering Juris Doctor (JD), Masters of Law (LLM) for foreign lawyers, Master of Studies in Law (MSL), and Masters of Science in Health Policy and Law (HPL) programs. The school's mission is "to provide an academic program of the highest quality, based upon scholarship, teaching, and research, to a diverse student body." Total enrollment is about 1000, of which 930 are JD candidates.

Although founded in 1878, the university has been accredited by WSCUC only since 2012. The driving force to seek accreditation was the desire to offer non-JD students access to federal financial aid. Since the initial accreditation, a special visit took place in 2013, a substantive change was granted to offer an online MS in Health Policy and Law (joint with UC San Francisco) in 2015, and a progress report was submitted in 2015. In March 2016, staff responded to the progress report indicating that a program review of the JD, as well as assessment plans for all other programs, would be expected at the time of the offsite review. An offsite review was held in Fall 2016, in preparation for the site visit described below. Since the JD program review was not yet carried out, the team recommended a delay of the site visit until October 2017.

The current review team for the site visit is the same as the team for offsite review in 2016. In addition to the institution's self-study and appendices, the review team issued a Lines of Inquiry document in 2016 that included a request for more information about the status of program

reviews and assessment, how student support services are assessed, description of the role of faculty governance, impact of measures aimed at increasing the bar passage rate, and more information about how and what demographic data is collected. The institution responded with additional information prior to the team's site review in Fall 2017.

The institution has one distance education program – a MS in Health Policy and Law, approved in 2015.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

The UCH Accreditation Visit Team reviewed thoroughly the materials uploaded by the institution, including the institutional report, all supporting documents for the self-study, the website, the additional documents submitted in response to the offsite review Lines of Inquiry, materials offered onsite, and messages received through the confidential email account. The team members were assigned various areas of responsibilities as both primary and secondary readers, which were confirmed by all during an initial phone call. Team members prepared worksheets reviewing each of the components, standards, federal required policies, the Inventory of Institutional Effectiveness Indicators, and any special materials related to distance education.

During the accreditation visit (AV), the team conducted interviews with a broad array of administrators (Chancellor/Dean, Academic Dean, CFO, ALO, associate and assistant deans, other administrative directors), chair and vice chair of the board of directors, faculty members (permanent and adjunct), students, and staff members.

C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

This was the institution's first reaccreditation, since they have only been accredited since 2012.

While UCH has extensive experience working with the ABA, they have less interaction with WSCUC.

The self-study and accompanying materials for WSCUC reaccreditation were built in preparation for the American Bar Association (ABA) accreditation site visit in 2014, and updated for the WSCUC self-study. The Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC) is the faculty team that was given responsibility for assembling the materials. The EEC is normally composed of four-to-six faculty, appointed by the Academic Dean, who serve one-year appointments, plus the Academic Dean and the ALO (ex officio). When developing the self-study materials for the ABA, the EEC added a student, a staff member, and an alumnus to the committee. The EEC also led the writing and assembly of the WASC materials, including everything required for the offsite review in 2016, and then the additional material requested from the Offsite Review Team's resulting lines of inquiry. This means that a dedicated group of faculty and staff did most of the work.

The self-study identifies many of the institution's challenges, and indicates thoughtful reflection on the state of legal education in the U.S., in California, in a public university, and in an urban setting. The college has benefitted from preparing for reaccreditation, and used this opportunity to hire an external consultant (the retiring dean of the law school at Pepperdine University) to attain expert feedback on their JD degree program. The report of the external reviewer became another document provided to the site visit team for consideration.

The update in response to the Lines of Inquiry addressed the issues that remained after the Offsite Review.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions

UCH was granted initial accreditation by WSCUC in 2012. In 2013, a special visit took place, and the team report identified three issues on which the campus should focus: (1) assessment of student learning; (2) program review; and (3) strategic planning.

The Commission requested that by the 2015 progress report the institution show:

- a. Development of a comprehensive assessment plan for all programs and implementation of at least some part of those plans for every program.
- b. Results from program reviews of the master's programs implemented before fall 2014, and how these results have been used to inform improvement.
- c. Development of a program review plan for the JD program

At the time of the offsite review in fall 2016, progress had been made on planning for assessment for all programs, though attention has been primarily on the JD program. A program review for the JD had not been carried out, leading to a delay of the regular onsite review until 12 months after the offsite review, in order to allow time for the institution to finalize this first program review.

The institution has since made progress on all counts, having completed the program review of the JD program in spring 2017, begun an assessment plan for individual courses and co-curricular activities, and started to plan for the review of the master's programs. However, only the JD review is complete.

Everything else is still in various stages of development. The majority of faculty have come to understand what course assessment means, but program assessment is more elusive.

There have been several major changes at the institution in 2017. The UCH Board has appointed a new Chancellor/Dean of the Law College, David Faigman, with a standard 5-year contract beginning in 2017. Professor Faigman had been the Interim Chancellor/Dean for the year prior to his permanent appointment, and has been a professor at UCH since 1987.

A new Academic Dean, Morris Ratner, has also been appointed recently. Professor Ratner joined the UCH faculty in 2012. (Note that the Academic Dean position in a law school is the equivalent of a Provost position at most other institutions.)

Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 1.

Institutional Purposes. UCH has a clear mission statement that describes its purpose and values (CFR 1.1). ("The mission of the University of California Hastings College of the Law is to provide an academic program of the highest quality, based upon scholarship, teaching, and research, to a diverse student body. We work hard to assure our 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.") This is appropriate to the field yet distinctive enough that it conveys its purpose and values.

UCH also publishes its six JD learning program outcomes prominently on its website. Both the mission statement, and the learning outcomes, fall within the recognized academic and practice area of law and legal education. The law school community – faculty and staff – seem committed to accomplishing these objectives at both the academic and co-curricular level. As UCH continues to improve its program

review process on the JD, enhanced communication across sectors of campus, and commitment to use of data will improve achievement of these objectives.

UCH has three other degree programs: the LLM, the MSL, and the HPL (a joint venture with UCSF). The purpose and educational objectives of these programs is more nascent, although plans and personnel are in place for a process of continued assessment of objectives. The learning outcomes for these other programs are listed on the website, although they are not as prominently featured as on the JD program. All three programs are currently polling their graduates, which is an important part of the process.

Integrity and Transparency. UCH is a stand-alone law school that is part of the UC system. It is committed to transparency, integrity, and academic freedom. Its strong academic freedom statement is on its website (CFR. 1.3), and it has a tradition of academic freedom.

UCH has demonstrated institutional commitment to the principles enunciated in the WSCUC Diversity Policy. Their “Diversity Committee” is reflected on the law school leadership page, although more information could be provided on its work. UCH has always evidenced a commitment to diversity of its students through its Legal Education Opportunity Program (LEOP) program. There has been change in leadership in that program recently, and hiring an effective new director is important. Law School leadership seems committed to making that happen. Finally, the law school notes in its JD program review that it can improve the diversity within the ranks of its adjunct professors. This is an issue faced by many law schools, and UCH appears to be serious about improvement.

Like all American law schools, UCH has faced significant financial challenges as law school applications have declined precipitously in recent years. UCH was transparent with the fiscal challenges facing them, and has a long-term plan in place that will generate revenue from auxiliary services which will help to stabilize their financial situation.. UCH has independence from UC system with its own budget and board. Continued state support is important for UC Hasting’s fiscal health. (CFR 1.5).

UCH has been transparent about student complaints, and has processes in place to fairly and accurately resolve them. The institution clearly distinguishes amongst its different degrees, but could improve its presentation of costs and enrollment numbers of its various programs on its website. (CFR 1).

Finally, UCH communicated with WSCUC in an open and honest manner and followed its policies and procedures during the review process. (CFR 1.8).

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 2.

Teaching and Learning. UCH is a stand-alone graduate law school. The educational mission is focused, and is based on the requirements of the ABA. In addition to the standard JD degree, which accounts for more than 90% of the enrollment, several specialized master's programs have been developed. The LLM degree and the MSJ are common at law schools, and fill a need, respectively, for educating foreign lawyers on U.S. law, and providing a masters' degree for law-affiliated professions. The Masters in Health Policy and Law is a localized special program that brings together UC San Francisco (a graduate-only school of health professions) with UCH's legal expertise. (CFR 2.1)

The purposes of each degree have been well thought out, though the JD occupies the largest portion of admissions, recruitment, and teaching effort. The website materials are plentiful (though not as modern looking as that of many other institutions), and do provide public access to standard data, mission, degree purposes and requirements. (CFR 2.2)

The campus website provides a definition of student learning objectives (SLOs), as well as methods by which they are assessed. The site also lists numerous examples of JD course syllabi that include SLOs. A large majority of the faculty include SLOs in the syllabus. In some courses, rubrics for assessing student work and feedback are used. (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6)

Course-level SLOs are well accepted by the faculty, but program learning objectives (PLOs) and outcomes are still being developed and assessed. Passage rates for the California State Bar Exam are one very important measure the faculty look to for feedback, since it can be compared for all law schools in California. However, faculty and administrators alike commented that the bar exam is a single high-stakes test that does not adequately reflect the totality of legal preparation of students in the 21st century. UCH needs to set its own PLOs, and assess themselves regularly.

Scholarship and Creative Activity. Teaching and learning are not separate matters. The last decade at UCH has seen an increase in attention to working with faculty on their teaching techniques. All instructional faculty are supported in the introduction of technology into their classrooms. The Review Team heard of other innovative techniques being used in instruction, and heard several testimonials from faculty about how different their teaching style is now, compared with a few years ago. (CFR 2.3, 2.5, 2.8)

The professorial faculty are proud of their scholarly activity, and the faculty rules support the activity as part of their review. In addition to the regular professorial faculty, there are many other appointment categories for faculty/instructors, each with different expectations. There was evident respect and collegiality amongst the faculty ranks in the area of teaching, but only the professors are expected to demonstrate scholarly activity. As outlined in the faculty rules, service is expected of all professors. (CFR 2.8, 2.9)

Student Learning and Success. The institution is invested in the success of its students. Many faculty and staff are dedicated to providing appropriate services to the students. Tutors, a writing center, co-curricular activities, career assistance are just some of the available resources promoted to students. The review team met many of the staff assigned to work with students, and also met with students to learn about the resources from their perspective, which was very positive.

The institution is using data to inform their decisions with respect to student success, but this process is not yet robust. Institutional research on campus is spread over many units, and is not yet as coordinated or consolidated as it needs to be to track students, and use the data to monitor interventions. (CFR 2.10, 2.13)

Co-curricular assessment is just beginning, though the Career Development Office has a strategy that could be the basis for other units to adopt and adapt. (CFR 2.11)

Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability.

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 3.

Faculty and Staff. The institutional report and its supporting exhibits indicate a committed and dedicated faculty. Faculty have a strong commitment to the institution and many faculty have participated in a great deal of committee work to prepare for the accreditation process. There is significant concern among faculty regarding the bar passage rate as well as maintaining the college's commitment to serving a diverse student body. There appears to be sufficient number of faculty to meet the institution's mission. There is a significant number of adjunct faculty who come from the legal profession to assure student engagement with practicing professionals (CFR 3.1 and 3.2)

UCH does have a documented process for reviewing faculty performance. Ladder faculty do have opportunities for professional development experiences. While an attempt has been made to engage adjunct faculty in professional development there appears to have been limited participation. This is an area which needs attention (CFR. 3,3)

UCH does have an annual performance review process for staff which utilizes a standard performance review form. The actual method of review may vary in individual areas. The linkage of performance with

salary increases has been sporadic. UCH could benefit from a clearer process of linking performance with salary increases. (CFR 3.2)

UCH could benefit from the development of a professional development program for staff. Many staff members are called upon to complete a variety of tasks. The continued development of staff will empower them to be more valuable to the institution. (CFR 3.3)

Fiscal, Physical and Information Resource. The institution engaged in a significant strategic planning effort in 2011 which resulted in a decision to reduce enrollment by 20% over a three year period. This change was successfully accomplished and has been well managed to assure that the financial condition of the College remained stable. (CFR 3.4)

Student tuition has remained flat for several years. Tuition revenue is the primary source of revenue for UCH. In addition, approximately 25% of the UCH revenue comes from the state of California. UCH has increased its tuition discount rate to as high as 47% in recent years to remain competitive in recruiting students. This increase is not sustainable over the long-term. As a result, an attempt is being made to reduce the discount rate to its previous level of 30% for the entering class of 2019-20. Revenue from other sources such as private funds and auxiliary services will offset this change in order to assure continued financial stability. A 2016 review by Moody's gave UCH a A2 rating with a negative outlook. This is among the highest in the country for a stand-alone law school. (CFR 3.4)

A review of the financial audits for the past three years reveals a satisfactory finding, with no exceptions noted (CFR 3.4) UCH has had long-term leadership in the financial area. The financial condition has been carefully managed as UCH has down sized its enrollment.

The College has engaged in a facility master planning process which calls for the construction of new academic space followed by the demolition of older academic space to be replaced by new construction of additional student housing to serve both UCH students and UCSF students. See Component 7 for further elaboration. This plan appears to be very well conceived and should serve UCH very well,

UCH has recently appointed new leadership in information technology. There appears to be a renewed commitment to improving information technology support for the campus. Efforts are also being made to engage in the use of University of California relationships where possible. (CFR 3.5)

Organizational Structures and Decision- Making Processes. The Chancellor and Academic Dean are new to their roles in the past two years although the Chancellor has been at UCH for 30 years. The senior leadership of the college are well prepared for their tasks and have a strong institutional memory. (CFR 3.6 and 3.7)

Interviews revealed a lack of communication among offices and people. Given the small size of the campus this was surprising. There appears to be a need to review the organizational structure of the campus with improved communication as a goal.

The institution has a full-time Chancellor and a Chief Financial Officer. Senior leadership of UCH is very qualified and are dedicated to the future of the college. (CFR 3.8)

Minutes of the Board of Director's meetings reveal a board that is engaged in the institutional governance and participates actively in board meetings. The Board has a strong committee structure which appears to function effectively. Board members participate in Association of Governing Board (AGB) conferences and utilize materials from AGB to help guide their practices. (CFR 3.9)

Faculty involvement in governance is codified in the Faculty Rules and Regulations. A five-member executive committee elected annually by the faculty serves in an advisory role to the administration. Faculty participate in institutional decision making through committees that are appointed annually. Committee recommendations that require faculty approval (new programs, new courses} are voted upon by all voting faculty at regular monthly meetings of the faculty. An ad hoc Educational Effectiveness Committee was appointed several years ago. This committee has taken on program review and assessment tasks. It is suggested that this committee become a standing committee. The shared governance process appears to be working very well for UCH. (CFR 3.10)

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement.

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 4.

Quality Assurance Processes. Law schools are just entering into program-level assessment and periodic program review. UCH has recently reviewed its JD program and understands the importance of collecting, analyzing, and reporting both quantitative and qualitative data from both internal and external sources. It is slowly building a culture of evidence incorporated throughout the curricular and co-curricular areas (CFR 4.1).

UCH does not have a centralized Office of Institutional Research and data is currently analyzed at the unit rather than institutional level. Because of the lack of coordination of data collection and consequently common definitions, there is inconsistency in data reporting (CFR 4.2). The ALO has been appointed as the Director of Accreditation and Assessment to address such inconsistencies.

Institutional Learning and Improvement. It is clear from the institutional report, exhibits, and interviews that the leadership at UCH is committed to the concept of continuous improvement through assessment. Though this commitment has not fully been operationalized, new senior staff, specifically the recently appointed Academic Dean, place curricular and co-curricular assessment as a high priority for program review. The Career Development Office's effort is a strength in this regard and can provide a model for the rest of the institution (CFR 4.3).

UCH has in place an ad-hoc Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC) that the Academic Dean hopes to transform into a standing committee. This committee developed rubrics and planned assessments for the JD program. Both oral and written communication now have assessment rubrics and the EEC, along with the writing committees have planned implementation of assessment. One remaining concern is calibration of the rubrics and use of them beyond the classroom. Co-curricular objectives were produced

just prior to the Accreditation Visit, but one department, the Career Development Office (CDO) has not only developed measurable outcomes, but has begun a system of formative and summative assessment of practical skills for the emergent lawyer and coordinates the data it receives from this direct assessment with student surveys, participation in sponsored events, and employment data required for their specialized accreditation. Discussion of assessment appears to be institution-wide though implementation is more scattershot. Thus far, there are pockets of faculty and staff engaged in improvement, but student voices are not as clearly incorporated into change. The institution relies on the Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE) for indirect evidence of student achievement. Though many student organizations are listed on its website, the institution has not articulated the ways in which students are brought into the assessment process (CFRs 4.4, 4.5).

UCH has been extraordinarily transparent about the existential issues it has faced over the last several years, both in legal education broadly and at UCH specifically. The institution has engaged in frank and open dialogue with all of its stakeholders on a range of issues including bar passage, financial realities, and strategies for the future (CFRs 4.6, 4.7).

Transfer Policy Review. The transfer policy only applies to the JD program. There is a wealth of detail on the website, including a checklist for potential transfer students, but getting to that information is somewhat difficult. It is embedded in the "Academics" section of the site, but there is no clear link for prospective students on the main page. They need to click three pages. It is, however, available through the search function on the site. The "Transfer Enrollment Checklist"

<http://www.uchastings.edu/admissions/jd/transfer-students/Transfer%20Checklist/index.php> is very helpful for students. Once located, the policy notes specific and clear procedures for transferring into the JD program (CFR 2.2, 2.14).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with the Standard.

IEEI. The Inventory has a strong self-reflective component, particularly with regards the need for more direct assessment measures (CFR 2.6). Nevertheless, the inventory for assessment methods is still in formative stage and all of the programs are unclear about the ways in which in-class assessments become or serve as programmatic assessment. UCH now lists the learning outcomes for all degree programs on its website (CFR 2.3), but those outcomes are not easily located or as transparent as they might be (CFR 2.2b, 2.3, 3.5, 4.1).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with the Standard.

Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of the Degrees

UCH offers four distinct degrees: the JD, MSL, LLM, and HPL (a joint venture with UCSF). Each has adequate meaning, quality, and integrity, although it will be important to initiate meaningful program review for MSL, LLM, and HPL, and to continue the cycle of continuous improvement on the JD. For the campus as a whole, a key commitment is serving a diverse population and training students to face demanding and changing workforce realities and social contexts. (CFRs 1.1, 1.4, 4.7) Though UCH refers to institutional learning outcomes, they are not located on the website. (CFRs 1.2, 2.2b)

UCH has defined six JD learning outcomes:

- **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.
- **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.

- **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.
- **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 authorities.
- **Professionalism:** Students will demonstrate the professional skills necessary for effective and ethical participation in the legal profession.
- **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.

Each of these learning outcomes is a significant part of the academic program and supporting co-curricular initiatives. (CFR 2.2b) Although UCH regularly makes use of the LSSSE data and has put in place data review structures particularly revolving around bar passage, it could benefit from a centralized institutional research office to assess each of these objectives. (CFRs 2.10, 4.2, 4.3)

There is strong support from senior leadership on the importance of program review, but discussion with faculty, administrative staff, and students, however, suggest that this model is not widely known.

The university community may need to continue discussing and promoting the model for it to be institutionalized and truly provide the framework outlined above.

LLM. UCH has defined four LLM outcomes:

- Student understands the function, responsibilities, and powers of federal and state political and judicial institutions.
- Student is able to find, read, and analyze U.S. legal authority and apply common law principles to hypothetical cases.

- Student demonstrates effective analysis and communication skills suitable for an audience of U.S. legal professionals.
- Students demonstrates knowledge of basic concepts and theories of law in core legal areas.

UCH provided information on the learning outcome assessments for the 2015-16 and 16-17 academic years. This has focused on student work in the fall term, including research papers, memos, midterm exams, evaluated problem and exercises, and individual meetings with faculty members. These show a commitment to thinking in serious assessment terms, and the new Associate Dean for Global Programs is bringing creativity to the project. (CFR 2.4) As a program with modest enrollment that is typically completed in a year (and for which there can be few if any common classes), there are evaluation and assessment challenges. But it is important that UCH keeps moving ahead on a program review and continuous improvement process.

MSL. UCH has defined three MSL outcomes:

- Students will be able to demonstrate substantive knowledge of basic concepts and theories of law in both core legal areas and their chosen areas of focus.
- Students will be able to analyze and evaluate legal arguments and apply that knowledge to work effectively from within their professional area of expertise.
- Students will have the demonstrated ability to use legal and interdisciplinary resources for comprehensive research and to apply their research skills within their professional area of expertise.

Senior administrators seem engaged with the project of thinking through this program, including its future trajectory. At present, it is small (around 10 students/year), and is the furthest away from meaningful program review. The size and irregularity of content make assessment more complicated, but UCH should prioritize program review of assessment of this program.

MS in Health Policy and Law. This is a fully online degree program jointly conferred by UCSF and UCH. It can be completed in one or two years, full or part time. UCSF and UCH have partnered with Berkeley Resource Center for Online Education for online development, marketing, and startup funding. The program launched in August 2016, and has already attracted approximately 30 students/year. The program presents as an innovative partnership delivering value as a unique degree. Although relatively new, there are already sophisticated formative and summative student assessments (both during the semester and a capstone project), overall program assessment, and a post-graduation survey. The program is supposed to undergo external review every five years. The internal assessment incorporates self-study, graduate student survey, and committee review. It will important to monitor progress as this develops. (CFRs 3.1, 4.1, 4.4)

Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation (CFRs 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3)

Since UCH is a graduate-only institution, it is not required to follow the core competencies but rather "intellectual competencies that are foundational" to the legal profession (Handbook p. 31). Nevertheless, the institution has chosen to assess some of the core competencies since they apply to the graduate law school experience and they are woven into the fabric of each degree program's learning outcomes (CFR 2.2b). While UCH has articulated a framework for assessment, its direct assessment of student learning remains in an inchoate phase. It has thus far been reliant on GPA as a marker of educational effectiveness which can mask actual student achievement and ability. There has been one assessment of written communication at the program level in 2014, and the team received results of a first-round assessment of oral communication in 2016. The 2014 assessment resulted in the creation of the Legal Writing Resource Center (CFRs 2.4, 2.6). But there remains a hesitancy with assessing written communication that was discussed briefly in the JD self-study and confirmed during

various meetings with committees and individuals during the Accreditation Visit (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.6).

Assessment is effective if it is ongoing and provides guidance for future action. To that end, the lack of a developed assessment plan for all program learning outcomes remains a central concern. The institution clearly is engaged substantive dialogue about the issue, and there have been a number of changes to the curriculum that suggest it is a learner-centered institution (CFR 4.3), but there seems to be some confusion about the differences between classroom assessment and program assessment. All syllabi now have course learning outcomes, and there is a manual on the institution's website. The team spoke to a number of people who confirmed that all faculty now engage in assessment that links to course-level outcomes. But there is some concern about calibration and use of rubrics that a consistent assessment plan can remedy. To its credit, UCH recognizes that at some point its faculty must stop discussing strategies for assessment and simply choose a method and implement it.

The necessity to begin systematic program assessment is especially crucial since recent changes in the ABA's accreditation standards (2015) now incorporate and require direct assessment of student learning and future ABA accreditation visits will expect assessment to be incorporated into the curriculum. UCH is taking seriously this changing landscape in relation to assessment and accreditation standards (2.2b, 4.1, 4.2, 4.7).

In addition to programmatic assessment, the institution is just embarking on periodic program review (CFRs 2.7, 3.3, 4.1). The JD program was reviewed in May 2017 and received valuable feedback on improving educational effectiveness. The results of the external review should be shared widely with the campus community in order to develop an action plan based on the recommendations of the external evaluator. The policy on program review received by the team states that the results should be shared at the next full faculty meeting following the receipt of the evaluator's report (CFR 4.1). The next steps will be to articulate a program-review cycle and embed this cycle in the program-review policy template

to ensure that all of the degree programs undergo external review in a timely manner. Since the MSL had begun a draft self-study prior to the OSR, it might be logical to schedule its program review soon.

Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation

UCH takes seriously the importance of admissions, retention, and graduation data. As part of its ABA Disclosures, it produces the "Standard 509 Information Report" which provides disaggregated admissions and enrollment data by race and gender and includes bar passage rates. In addition, UCH is working to analyze its relatively low Bar passage rates vis-à-vis other California Schools. Most recently, the campus community produced a longitudinal study of bar passage rates at UCH from 2011 – 2015 (CFR 4.2). As one result of the findings, UCH has begun developing learning outcomes in student services. The institution should be commended for the ways in which it has brought all stakeholders together to reflect seriously on issues related to the changing landscape of American law and law schools and how that landscape affects the student population. This is evident in the attention given to the student services departments since its progress report to WSCUC (CFR 1.1, 2.1, 3.4, 4.7).

Still, though, the mission of the institution could be more effectively supported with a stronger and more direct definition of student success (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 2.13, 2.14), evidence garnered from direct assessment (CFR 2.7, 2.13), and more substantive use of data (CFRs 4.1, 4.2). For good reason, it has relied heavily on Bar passage rates as a metric of student success, but Bar passage is only one element of success for the institution. It could also examine student achievement of program learning outcomes as a vehicle for better understanding and acting upon the low passage rate.

Currently, UCH does not have a formalized Institutional Research office that would be a natural place to locate quantitative evidence of student success. Indeed, it appears that the Director of Accreditation and Assessment serves not only as ALO, but chief assessment officer, institutional research director, and Title IX coordinator. The result is an overworked office that is spread too thin, with data that is not

centralized, and miscommunication across various units about the usefulness and meaning of specific pieces of data (CFRs 3.3, 4.1, 4.2).

Several key programs promoting student success are housed under the directorship of the Associate Dean for Academic and Professional Success (ADAPS). Specifically, this office advises students in the Legal Education Opportunity Program (LEOP) which is designed to support students from adverse backgrounds succeed in law. In summer of 2016, UCH conducted a survey and focus group of LEOP students. While student perception of their learning is a necessary component of determining student success, here, too, UCH has not triangulated this data with direct assessment of student work. It must be pointed out that the office is in a bit of a transition period with a change in personnel and leadership. A new associate dean was recently appointed and the long-time director of the LEOP program unexpectedly retired in the summer, leaving a gap in the infrastructure of the program. A search for a new director was underway during the team's visit. Though these are challenges, there is a great opportunity for the office of Academic and Professional Success to reimagine the LEOP program for the twenty-first century and link standards of performance at or near graduation (such as the Bar exam) to student learning more broadly. In multiple discussions during the visit, the team encountered a core commitment to the principles of the LEOP framework, and one example is the recent appointment of two LEOP faculty advisors, addressing a perception that LEOP students were not receiving adequate academic support. The key issue for all those with whom the team spoke is how to better serve this population, especially as it is a core element of the institution's mission. Indeed, it is a long-term goal to increase the LEOP population to 20% of the student body, a sizeable increase from the 12% currently enrolled (CFRs 1.4, 1.6, 2.2b, 2.13).

In addition to services serving students from adverse backgrounds, there are a number of other programs that support the intellectual and psychological wellbeing of UCH' students. The Inns of Court and Moot Court programs provide invaluable practical experience for students. Inns of Court divides 1L

students into four cohorts in which they develop professional skills from faculty and staff and are mentored by alumni who provide networking advice and workshops about the profession. There is also the Startup Legal Garage, a longstanding program in which students are partnered with tech or biotech startups to provide legal work and research. This program is currently not open to all students, however, though the institution is exploring ways to include all degree programs in the program. Academic accommodations are provided to students with known circumstances, but they must work with the Disability Resource Program (DRP). The office engages in outreach for students who have not requested accommodations first by meeting with low-performing students. Given that a high proportion of UCH students are registered for accommodations for classwork, the institution is trying to get more student to apply for Bar accommodations (CFRs 2.5, 2.8).

There is a Health Center at the institution that provides health and mental wellness checks for students. In addition, there are opportunities for students to exercise mind and body. At the Tower, which houses approximately 250 students, there is a basketball court, fitness center, and yoga studio which one student described as “lifesaving.” There are yoga mats and bean bag chairs on the sixth floor of the 200 Building (known as the “chill zone”) for students wishing to take a break from their studies. Student services also hosts the Social Hour in the Dining Commons of the 200 Building for students to mingle outside of class. All of these student-centered activities, both social and academic, are strengths of the institution that it could consistently advertise to current and prospective students. The institutional report did not emphasize these attractive and essential aspects of the student experience, but as it develops an assessment plan for academic support programs and student services, it might consider how to more fully integrate them with the traditional academic focus (CFRs 2.11, 2.13).

Another concern is the undeveloped framework of assessment in most of the student services departments. While the institution has constructed learning outcomes for various academic support programs, there has been little movement towards engaging in direct assessment or reviewing various

student services programs (CFRs 2.13, 2.7, 4.1). As of now, UCH relies on indirect assessment in the form of the Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE) or in-house surveys and focus groups of students who are part LEOP to determine student success as a result of academic support. While indirect evidence from surveys provides valuable evidence of student perceptions of their learning, it should complement, not replace direct assessment (CFRs 2.6, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13).

There is some momentum that might serve as a model not only for student services, but also for the entire institution. The Career Development Office (CDO) has developed measurable learning outcomes and has developed an assessment framework that relies both on quantitative measures such as employment data as well as more qualitative measures. These qualitative measures use both formative and summative assessment and are currently being tracked in the office. As an example, the office works with students to develop resumes and cover letters. They provide early discussion and feedback and then evaluate the refined documents later in the term. Interviews with students during the visit indicated that the efforts of the CDO to work with students to improve application presentation and facilitate interviews with various firms was visible and appreciated (CFRs 2.5, 2.11, 2.13).

Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence

Only one program review has been completed to date – the JD – and that was finished only a few months before the site visit was conducted. There has not yet been sufficient time for the faculty and administration to use the results of the program review to inform their decision-making. However, the institution is constantly striving to improve individual classes, and student outcomes, especially using the direct evidence of writing results, GPA, and bar exam scores. They think innovatively, and are willing to make changes in some first-year courses and co-curricular support.

The EEC has committed to tackling one program learning outcome each year, in order to study the state of student learning, and to suggest modifications to the program. Since there are six desired learning outcomes, and this plan started two years ago, it will be several years before the entire assessment loop is closed. This doesn't address the LLM, MSL, or HPL program. The EEC with only four faculty, appointed for only a year, and working with the Academic Dean and ALO, cannot manage the workload needed to move the program review process forward. More faculty and/or more committees will be required.

Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparation for the changing higher education environment

Financial Sustainability: UCH engaged in a comprehensive strategic planning process in 2011 which resulted in a decision to reduce enrollment by 20% over a three year period. This was done to address the decreasing number of law school applications and reduced career opportunities for lawyers. This decision resulted in staff lay-offs for the first time in UCH's history. This reduction in enrollment was successfully managed without destabilizing the financial condition of UCH.

UCH financial condition is stable and it has developed spending plans for the next five years which will continue this stability. Tuition discounting will be reduced to previous levels of 30% beginning with the new class entering in 2019-20. It is anticipated that revenue from private fundraising and auxiliary services units will help to minimize serious financial changes in this period. A major downturn in state funding would seriously disrupt this financial plan.

The institution monitored the implementation of its strategic plan through 2013. However, there does not appear to be any systemic monitoring of plan implementation since that time. There is a need to review progress on the plan and to develop an updated strategic plan that builds upon the facility master plan

UCH developed a Five-Year Facility Infrastructure plan in 2016 which calls for the construction of a new academic building (approximately 57,000 square feet) on a vacant lot owned by UCH. The State of California has committed \$55M to support the new structure. Once this building is completed the building at 198 McAllister will be demolished and replaced by a new campus housing building. This will be followed by the modernization and renovation of 50 Hyde Street and the Tower at 100 McAllister Street to provide updated student housing and other academic and auxiliary facilities. Funding has been obtained from the state of California and private donations for the new academic building at 333 Golden Gate Avenue. The remaining projects will be financed, and revenue generated from student housing and the commercial lease of some space will provide much needed housing space for students at UCH and also UCSF. This creative plan will result in addressing the critical need for quality space and student housing in an area in which housing has become cost prohibitive. UCH is about to launch construction of the academic building. The success of this plan is critical to the long-term success of UCH.

The newly appointed Chancellor articulated a vision for the campus to engage creatively with UCSF, UC Davis, the information technology community and other partners to launch academic partnerships for the future. Interviews with Board leadership confirmed the board's support for this direction. The vision of the new Chancellor offers considerable promise to reinvigorate the mission of UCH. There is a need to more formally articulate his vision into a strategic plan with the support of the campus community

Alignment with Institutional Priorities. There is considerable time and attention being devoted to assessing learning outcomes and to the issue of bar passage rates which have declined in recent years. Addressing these issues are very important to maintain the college's commitments to preparing diverse legal professionals for the future.

The processes for addressing educational effectiveness are in a very early stage of development. There is evidence to suggest that the new UCH leadership is dedicated to the improvement of educational effectiveness. Faculty participation is being sought to build an effective program review process.

UCH has developed a creative master facility plan that will significantly revitalize the campus, and provide much needed reasonably priced housing, some of which will also be available to UCSF students. The success of plan is vital to recruiting students and to the institution's financial stability. The maintenance of State support is also very important to UCH.

The bar passage rate will continue to be important to UCH's future and its ability to attract students.

Significant effort is underway to address this issue

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS

N/A

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE REVIEW TEAM

It is clear from the Accreditation Visit that UCH has been working toward meeting the challenges it faces as an urban, stand-alone, public law school with a commitment to inclusiveness and training students to meet the twenty-first century landscape. With this commitment in mind, the team makes the following commendations and recommendations.

Commendations

- UCH faculty and staff are strongly committed to meeting the school's mission, and to providing the best legal education possible. (CFR 1.1; 4.6) The commitment to serving a diverse student body is evident with almost everyone the visiting talked to.
- The university has exciting new visionary senior leadership and Chancellor/Dean in place. (CFR 3.6; 3.7) The Chancellor/ Dean has a very compelling vision which involves strategic partnerships with other institutions and the information technology industry.
- UCH has a committed and involved Board, engaging in their own professional Board development. (CFR 3.9) Board members participate in AGB professional development activities and use AGB materials,

- UCH is a stand-alone law school, yet it is beginning to capitalize on the rich academic environment of the Bay Area for partnerships, such as the Health Policy and Law program with UCSF. (CFR 1.1; 2,1)
- The development and assessment of the co-curricular activities related to career development, looks to be a model that other units might use. (CFR 2.11; 2.13)

Recommendations

- The previous (2011) strategic plan has served UCH well, particularly through difficult times and planned enrollment decreases. Now is the time to develop a new plan that actualizes the vision of the current chancellor and connects to the long-range facility master plan. (CFR 4.6)
- . As part of the JD program review, an external review of the program was commissioned. IT is important that UCH carefully consider the recommendations of the external reviewer The administration should work with the faculty to implement these recommendations, as appropriate. (CFR 4.1)
- Establishment of learning objectives and assessment of courses is underway, but program assessment is still in an early stage. The first JD review has been completed. . The next steps in the process of continuous improvement call for taking what is learned, making indicated changes, and monitoring the outcome. (CFR 4.4; 2.11; 2.7)
- The LLM, MSL, and HPL programs need to undergo periodic program review. (CFR 2.3; 2.7)
- It is recommended that organizational structure be reviewed, with the goal to improve communication within the institution. (CFR 3.7; 3.8)
- Develop infrastructure that permits coordination of the disparate institutional research functions (CFR 4.2)

- It is acknowledged that bar passage rates are important to UCH, and the team recommends that the college build institutional research capacity to track and analyze data, as part of its continuous review process. (CFR 4.1; 4.2; 4.4)

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where is the policy located? http://www.uchastings.edu/about/consumer-info/index.php
	Comments: UC Hastings follows the credit hour policy of the ABA.
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	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)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Monitoring the credit hour is listed in the Faculty Rules as a responsibility of the Curriculum Committee.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? A few random ones
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? HPL is an online program. JD is standard face-to-face.
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? JD and Masters in Health Policy and Law (HPL)
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The ABA is stricter than WASC in this respect.
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) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? a few
	What kinds of courses?
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? JD
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: As with most aspects of legal education, the students spend more than the minimum time on internships, externships, and project-based courses.
Sample program information (catalog,	How many programs were reviewed? Four
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? JD, Master in HPL, Master of Studies in Law (MSL),

website, or other program materials)	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Law
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: **Barbara A. Sawrey**
Date: **10/18.17**

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Information was in printed material and on website
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: **John D. Welty**

Date: **10/18/17**

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? The Student Handbook
	Comments:
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, please describe briefly: The procedure varies, based upon the nature of the complaint
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Team reviewed procedures with General Counsel
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where? Office of General Counsel
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, please describe briefly: General Counsel oversees complaints
	Comments: Record of all complaints filed is in Office of General Counsel.

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: **John D. Welty**

Date: **10/18/17**

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy publically available? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? http://www.uchastings.edu/admissions/jd/transfer-students/Transfer%20Checklist/index.php
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

- (1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
- (2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: **Sharlene Sayegh**
Date: **10/18/17**

Distance Education Review-Team Report Appendix

Institution: UC Hastings College of Law

Type of Visit: Accreditation Visit

Name of reviewer/s: John Welty (chair), Barbara Sawrey (vice chair), Michael Waterstone, Sharlene Sayegh, Tamela Hawley (WSCUC liaison)

Date/s of review: 10/16 – 10/19, 2017

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs¹ and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report.)

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

Master of Science (MS), Health Policy and Law

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

UCH offers one fully online degree program, the MS in Health Policy and Law (HPL). It is the only online program at UCH and enrolled its first cohort in Fall 2016. This program is conducted jointly with University of California San Francisco (UCSF) and may be taken as a one- or two-year program. Currently, there are 58 students in the program scattered over two cohorts (34 new, 14 continuing). It use on UCSF's learning platform, Moodle (rather than UCH's Canvas), and all technological development and online training is conducted through the Berkeley Resource Center for Online Education (BRCOE).

3. Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)
During the accreditation visit, the team met with the Directors of the program (one from UCSF and one from UC Hastings), and two staff who coordinate the online programming and teach the seminar courses.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?</p>	<p>The program was championed by the current Chancellor, but UCSF currently handles much of the administrative structure and financing of the joint degree. There are two directors, one from each campus which ensures joint voice.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</p>	<p>Many distance-education students continue to utilize the face-to-face resources of the institution. The first cohort requested to participate in graduation and were able to participate in the UCSF graduation. A member of the staff is dedicated to keeping students "in the loop."</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</p>	<p>The quality of the learning platform's infrastructure is superb. BRCOE's training and templates establish a clear outline for each week's components used uniformly throughout the program. All technological components of the program are supported and received financial support from the UCSF Provost.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services:</i> What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?</p>	<p>There is a faculty/staff mentor in the HPL program who provides advising and ensures that students have access to any in-person student services requested. The program has not yet gathered data on</p>	

	effectiveness of services, but this is part of their 5-year plan	
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?	There are 15 faculty members listed on the program's website, 3 of whom (20%) are adjuncts or lecturers. All faculty who teach in the HPL program receive training and support for distance education from BRCOE	
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)	The program has teamed with the Berkeley Resource Center for Online Education (BRCOE) for platform construction. Courses are rigorous with lecture, discussion, and research component.	
<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions' online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?	The program is only in its second year. Of the 26 students enrolled in the first cohort, 12 enrolled full-time and graduated in Spring 2017. 14 are taking the program part-time and are expected to graduate in Spring 2018. These are in-house numbers.	The only follow-up suggested at this point is to ensure that retention and graduation data become part of a centralized institutional research office.
<i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?	As stated in its institutional report, the institution assesses its online program in the same manner as other programs. Written communication is central to this program as well as the face-to-face programs, and the capstone project has an oral and written component. The HPL Program has a system of formative and summative assessments. Summative assessments are conducted by a committee of faculty. The program also relies on indirect	Ensure that appropriate and sustained direct assessment is taking place at the program level by developing an assessment plan for the HPL Learning Outcomes.

	<p>evidence (midterm surveys, for example) to make changes to the structure of particular courses. These efforts are comparable to standard practices of good assessment. There are 4 Program Learning Outcomes.</p>	
<p><i>Contracts with Vendors.</i> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on <i>Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations</i>?</p>	<p>The only outside vendor used is Moodle, the Learning Management System adopted by UCSF. All other elements for maintaining the online program are completed in-house.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?</p>	<p>The HPL program stated in its substantive change application that as a degree program it will undergo periodic program review every 5 years. According to this schedule, the program is due for program evaluation in 2021.</p> <p>As with face-to-face courses, the online courses receive anonymous student evaluations at the end of each course. In addition, students submit evaluations at the end of their degree program and the program will be instituting an alumni survey.</p>	