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SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

I.A: Description of Institution and Visit

Santa Barbara & Ventura Colleges of Law (SBVCL) is a private, non-profit public benefit corporation (i.e. created to establish and operate higher education institutions; sponsor and support educational programs; and implement educational, scientific and research programs) with campuses in Santa Barbara and Ventura, California. The Ventura campus was founded in 1969 and the Santa Barbara campus was founded in 1975. In 1978, the two campuses merged into one institution. Both campuses are in California, at 4475 Market Street in Ventura and 20 East Victoria Street in Santa Barbara. Each campus has been separately accredited by the State Bar of California Committee of Bar Examiners (CBE), Santa Barbara in 1979 and Ventura in 1981.

SBVCL’s long-standing purpose has been to provide a legal education to residents of California’s Central Coast who might not otherwise be able to earn a law degree due to geographical, financial, or academic constraints. The recently revised mission of SBVCL is to “prepare leaders, for law and law-related professions, through graduate-level education that emphasizes academic excellence and accessibility.”

SBVCL offers a Juris Doctorate (JD) degree, and graduates are eligible to sit for the California bar examination. In fall 2014, SBVCL had 169 students enrolled in its JD program. The JD student body is 47.5% male and 52.5% female, 63% white, non-Hispanic, 30% students of color, and 7% “other.” Of the JD students, 76 are enrolled in Santa Barbara and 93 in Ventura.

In January 2013, SBVCL began offering a Master of Legal Studies (MLS) program designed to provide working professionals a practical foundation in law without pursuing a law degree. Graduates are not eligible to sit for the bar exam. The 30-unit program can be
completed in just over two years. The initial class had 13 students with 12 completing the first semester. Current enrollment for the MLS program is 14 students.

Since SBVCL only offers evening classes, the campuses are rarely used by students during the day. Most students arrive on campuses after work, as early as an hour or two before classes begin. SBVCL occupies one leased building in Santa Barbara. It consists of four classrooms, a small library, a student lounge, and several offices. All the space is used to capacity. The Ventura campus has one building that SBVCL previously owned and now leases from the Legacy Corporation (see below). This building is much larger with three small and three large classrooms, a library, a student lounge, a large conference room, and several offices. A couple of offices are rented to the Ventura County Bar Association, and there is room for expansion. The two campuses are within 33 miles of each other.

In October 2010, SBVCL affiliated with TCS Education System (TCSES), a non-profit corporation that provides back-operations support. TCSES is based on a consortia model of leveraging resources and support services among several colleges to increase efficiency and effective use of resources. TCSES also includes The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, Pacific Oaks College and Children’s School, and Saybrook University, all WSCUC accredited, and Dallas Nursing Institute, accredited by the Accreditation Bureau of Health Education Schools. Institutions become affiliated with TCSES through a Master Agreement which ties the legal entities together and outlines their relationship and responsibilities. During the affiliation, the Colleges of Law Legacy Corporation was created as a non-profit public benefit corporation for the purpose of holding certain assets transferred from SBVCL, including the Ventura facility and cash assets.
The evaluator review team initially visited SBVCL on March 12 through 14, 2013 for a Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) visit. In preparation for the 2013 visit, the team carefully reviewed the CPR report. The team visited both campuses and met with the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), who at that time carried both the title of President and Dean of the Colleges (President/Dean), administrators, staff, full-time and adjunct faculty, the Board of Trustees, members of the TCSES management, students, and alumni to solicit insights about SBVCL’s capacity to meet its educational mission. The discussions were open, informative, and enlightening. A secure e-mail account was established so that members of the institution’s community could share comments with the team. The team received several messages, all very supportive of SBVCL.

The administration was effective in preparing the SBVCL community for the visit, which was evident from the discussions at the well-attended meetings that the team had with various constituent groups. The team acknowledged and appreciated the collegiality and hospitality of the SBVCL community.

WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) staff worked with SBVCL and the team since the CPR to transition the institution from the previous to the new Seeking Accreditation process, adopted in June 2014. On November 12 through 14, 2014, the team visited SBVCL on a Seeking Accreditation visit. In preparation for this visit, the team carefully reviewed the Seeking Accreditation report and the 111 supporting exhibits. The comprehensive and well-written report was organized in accordance with the 2008 WSCUC Standards of Accreditation and Criteria For Review (CFR).

The team visited both campuses and met with the president, dean, administrators, staff, full-time and adjunct faculty, the Board of Trustees, members of TCSES management (via video conference), students, and alumni to seek insights on SBVCL’s
effectiveness in meeting its educational mission. The discussions were candid, enlightening, and reassuring. A secure e-mail account was established so that members of the institution’s community could share comments with the team. The team received 18 messages, all describing very positive experiences at SBVCL

The administration was again very effective in preparing the SBVCL community for the visit. All the individuals participating in the meetings were well informed, enthusiastic, and confident about the institution and the future. The team again recognizes and appreciates the hard work and attention to details shown by the SBVCL community.

Recent Accreditation History

SBVCL submitted its initial application for WSCUC Eligibility in September 2011. After an evaluation in November 2011, a panel of the WSCUC Eligibility Review Committee found that SBVCL had met all of the WSCUC eligibility criteria. In an action letter dated, December 21, 2011, the panel’s recommendations were as follows:

1. **Criterion 10:** Continue to refine Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs); ensure faculty ownership of curricular and assessment activities (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7)

2. **Criterion 14:** More explicitly define faculty roles to include professional development and inclusion of adjuncts into the academic processes (CFR 3.2-3.4)

3. **Criterion 15:** Continue with efforts to ensure student success, using data-supported strategies (CFR 2.13)

4. **Criterion 17:** Ensure that faculty are prepared to deliver online instruction and to fully utilize online resources (CFR 3.7)

5. **Criterion 21:** Move forward with recent initiatives around assessment; consider the expanded use of rubrics and similar strategies in service of program review (CFR 4.4-4.7)

This is SBVCL’s initial step in its application for WSCUC accreditation.
I.B. **Institution’s Capacity and Preparatory Review Report**

A CPR report submitted by SBVCL in December 2012 was organized around the Standards and CFRs. It was well written and demonstrated the seriousness and determination of the SBVCL stakeholders. The 1697 page CPR report with appendices, included numerous charts, spreadsheets, and supporting documents, and demonstrated that a great deal of time and effort was put into its preparation.

The CPR report reflected the changes instituted by SBVCL to achieve WSCUC accreditation, namely the move towards faculty governance, the development and integration of student learning outcomes and assessment into teaching, the use of data collection and analysis in decision-making, and the strides to ensure financial stability.

The CPR report also described the transition and integration of services provided by TCSES and the revised governance structure of the SBVCL administration and Board of Trustees as a result of the affiliation.

I.C. **Responses to Previous Commission Issues**

As described above, a panel of the WSCUC Eligibility Review Committee granted Eligibility status to SBVCL. During its initial visit, the team found that the five recommendations of the panel were addressed in the CPR report. The team found that SBVCL had made progress in each of these areas. However, at the time of the CPR visit, it was too early to determine to what extent the faculty had taken full ownership of curricular and assessment activities, fully defined its roles, utilized data-supported strategies to ensure student success, or moved forward with recent initiatives around assessment and the use of rubrics and similar strategies in program review.
I.D. Institution’s Seeking Accreditation Report

A Seeking Accreditation report (SA) submitted by SBVCL on October 22, 2014, was organized according to the 2008 Standards and CFRs. The narrative was very well organized, thorough, and supported with numerous reports, charts, and spreadsheets documenting the data collection, analysis, and decision-making processes conducted by the SBVCL. It was clear that extensive thought, time, and effort went into its preparation.

The SA report revealed that the changes instituted by SBVCL to achieve WSCUC accreditation, namely faculty governance, the integration of student learning outcomes and assessment in teaching, the use of data collection and analysis in decision-making, and the plans to ensure financial stability, were well integrated into the daily operations of the institution. The SA report also confirmed that the transition and integration of services provided by TCSES and the revised governance structure of the SBVCL administration and Board of Trustees had resulted in positive outcomes.

During its SA visit, the team confirmed that the details in the SA report were accurately reported. The team also confirmed that the faculty had taken full ownership of governance, curricular, and assessment activities, fully defined its roles, utilized evidence based strategies to ensure student success, and has moved forward with assessment initiatives and the use of rubrics and similar strategies in student and program review. The previous concerns about these issues are no longer present. The impressive strides that the SBVCL community has taken are discussed in detail in the remainder of this report.
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE 2008 STANDARDS

Standard 1 – Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Outcomes

Institutional Purposes

As a single-purpose college of law, the institutional purposes of SBVCL are clearly stated and communicated, beginning with its website. In 2012, the Board of Trustees adopted a new mission statement, vision statement and strategic plan entitled, *A Renewed Vision for Access and Excellence*. In adopting the new mission statement, the Board retained SBVCL’s long-held purposes, but opened the door to offer law-related degrees in addition to the JD degree. The newly adopted mission statement reads:

*The mission of the Santa Barbara and Ventura Colleges of Law is to prepare leaders, for law and law-related professions, through graduate-level legal education that emphasizes academic excellence and accessibility. The Colleges seek to develop well-prepared graduates capable of integrating knowledge of legal theory, practical skills, and professional values.*

The newly adopted vision statement reads:

*The Santa Barbara and Ventura Colleges of Law will be an accredited, professionally recognized institution of legal education with student-centered outcomes that emphasize the pursuit of excellence in legal fundamentals and preparation for professional service.*

The team found that the mission and vision statements are clearly communicated by SBVCL in printed and electronic publications and that faculty, trustees, administrators, and students are familiar with the statements. The mission and vision statements have also been the driving force behind the creation and content of the strategic plan. The four goals of the strategic plan were clearly written to fulfill the mission and vision adopted by the trustees. The four goals of the strategic plan are:
1. Advance academic excellence to better equip our students with the knowledge, skills, and values essential for effective professional leadership in a global, multicultural, and rapidly-changing environment

2. Foster a learning community that is diverse, creative, service oriented, and supportive

3. Ensure adequate institutional capacity to achieve our mission, vision, and goals

4. Advance the law school’s mission and reputation through new program options, faculty scholarship and service, and community engagement.

The team found that the SBVCL educational objectives are in alignment with the stated purposes of the institution and are clearly stated in the general catalogue and on the website. The institution’s degree requirements, educational objectives, program objectives, and student learning outcomes are among the materials defined in the catalogue, contained in the Student Gateway (password protected resource) and on posters that are prominently displayed in the halls and classrooms of both campuses. (CFR 1.1)

The team reviewed documents that contained the statistics related to enrollment, retention, completion, student learning, and bar passage. SBVCL reported retention and graduation data to accrediting agencies and government entities as required and the institution published the same data in the Student Achievement Data Report available on the website. The institution utilizes disaggregated data collected since 2011 to evaluate its programs and trigger initiatives for improvement. The data was disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity for purposes of measuring both retention, graduation, and bar passage rates. Student learning objectives were measured each year and over three-year cycles.

Additional information gathered on a regular cycle included responses to the Legal Internship Site Supervisor Survey and the Student Legal Internship Survey, and alumni responses to a regularly distributed alumni survey. The SBVCL website contained the Student Achievement Data Report that summarizes student learning outcomes for both the
JD degree and the MLS degree. The report also included retention information, graduation rates, bar pass rates, current student faculty ratios, and overall student satisfaction data.

SBVCL’s first MLS students are now enrolled in the first Capstone course, and evaluations of Capstone projects will be available for summative assessment of that program in spring 2015. (CFRs 1.2, 2.10, 4.3, 4.4) (See additional discussion on measuring learning outcomes under Standard 2.)

SBVCL is governed by a fifteen-member Board of Trustees that meets three times per year. The board annually convenes for a long-range planning retreat, with an agenda that includes review of the strategic plan, institutional assessment, and governance. Currently, the board consists of two judges, seven attorneys, and five members who are engaged in or experienced in higher education, with one vacancy. During its recent visit, the team noted the gender, racial, and professional diversity of the board members. The board members were all very well informed on current SBVCL operations and policies.

The board has an active committee structure including Academic Affairs, Finance, Audit, Institutional Advancement, and Executive committees. Responsibility for administrative oversight is delegated to the president. (CFRs 1.3, 3.9)

The board recently created the position of stand-alone president and appointed the former chair of the Board of Trustees to fill the newly created post. The president started his work on a part-time basis in June 2014 and became full-time in September. This restructuring now allows the president to focus internally on administration and externally on marketing, student recruitment, alumni development, and creating placement opportunities for externships and post-graduate employment. (CFRs 1.3, 1.8, 3.1, 3.10)

The previous president and dean is now the full-time dean and professor. She now provides leadership for improvement of degree programs, including the coordination of
writing and academic support programs. The dean is also ultimately responsible for the 
hiring, supervision, evaluation, and promotion of faculty. (CFRs 1.2, 1.3, 3.2, 3.8, 3.11)

SBVCL has taken major steps to create a working model of shared academic 
governance as detailed in the Faculty Manual and verified by the team in meetings with 
faculty. The team found that primary responsibility for admission standards, academic 
standards, curriculum, and graduation requirements rests with the faculty through its 
committee structure. The two full-time faculty positions each have responsibility for an 
academic program. Each is chair of a degree program, handling instructional quality, 
scheduling, department financial management, preparation for accreditation, assessment of 
student learning, and program improvement. Chairs establish agendas for faculty meetings 
based on program needs, with input from the faculty and dean. Both chairs meet with 
faculty committees and staff to collectively review program policy; develop, assess and 
 improving curricular offerings; and review student academic performance. (CFRs 1.3, 3.8, 
3.11)

The Faculty Council serves as the institution-wide forum for all faculty. The 
Council oversees the work of its four committees, i.e. Academic Standards and Admissions 
(ASAC); Curriculum and Assessment; Hiring and Retention; and Faculty Development. 
Each committee formulates and recommends policy to the Council. The Council’s 
recommendations are reviewed by the President’s Cabinet and recommended to the dean or 
returned to the Faculty Council with comment. The dean has the final authority for all 
matters recommended by the Faculty Council. (CFRs 1.3, 3.8, 3.11)

Integrity

In November 2012, the Board of Trustees approved a new policy on student 
academic freedom that was distributed by the president/dean to the campus community.
The revised mission and vision statements were communicated at the same time. The team, during its initial visit, reviewed the academic freedom policy for faculty and found it consistent with current practices in higher education. SBVCL publicly states that it subscribes to the academic freedom principles of the American Association of University Professors. The institution’s support of academic freedom is published in several documents, including the Faculty Manual. The team found no indication, in meetings with faculty and others, of any violations of the academic freedom policies. (CFR 1.4)

The second goal in the recently adopted strategic plan is, “foster a learning community that is challenging, diverse, creative, service oriented, and supportive”. A future action listed under that goal is, “we will continue our long-standing commitment to broad diversity and expand efforts to recruit students, faculty, trustees, and staff who contribute to diversity.” Demographic data provided by SBVCL indicates diversity of age, gender and race in the student body and on the Board of Trustees. The institution is committed to continuing to diversify its faculty and staff and has plans to do so. (CFR 1.5)

SBVCL has no history of inappropriate influence from any outside entity. The team thoroughly reviewed the agreement and working relationship with TCSES and found that structure does not influence the autonomy of the trustees, faculty, or administration to govern SBVCL in accordance with accepted practices in higher education. (CFR 1.6)

The team found appropriate policies and procedures in place during its review of printed materials, including the SBVCL website, the catalog and various policy manuals. These sources provided a fair and honest representation of programs, curriculum and services. The vast majority of JD students complete the program in 3½ or four years. SBVCL’s credit hour policies are found in the catalog and the website. (CFR 1.7)
The SBVCL catalog details the non-academic grievance process, a process related to ethical violations and grade appeal processes. The faculty’s Academic Standards and Admissions Committee is the final decision-making authority in student academic disputes. A grievance procedure for faculty is found in the Faculty Manual, while provisions for staff grievance procedures are found in the Employee Handbook. The team reviewed grievance files and found actions taken to hear and resolve grievances were in keeping with institutional policies. A student complaint review process was also available on the website. Records of student complaints and resolutions were maintained. (CFRs 1.7, 1.8)

Since committing itself to the accreditation review process in early 2011, SBVCL has demonstrated honesty, seriousness, and candor in its dealings with WSCUC. SBVCL has worked with WSCUC staff to ensure that the institution understands and is following the Commission’s procedures. SBVCL has regularly sent representatives to WSCUC conferences, including Academic Resource Conferences and President/Trustee Conferences, to learn more about the Standards and procedures. One professor completed the WSCUC Assessment Leadership Academy in 2013. (CFR 1.9)

**Standard 2 – Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions**

**Teaching and Learning**

SBVCL is achieving its institutional purpose, i.e. providing a low-cost legal education to students in the middle of the state with the intent of sending graduates back into the local communities, through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning. SBVCL demonstrated
that these core functions are performed effectively and that they support one another in the institution’s efforts to attain educational effectiveness.

SBVCL has a history of self-review to maintain CBE accreditation aimed at producing law students prepared to pass the California bar exam and practice law. (The most recent CBE visit was April 8-11, 2013.) For the JD program, SBVCL offers courses in the subjects tested on the California bar exam. In addition, SBVCL has contracted with Bar/Bri, a well-known commercial bar review company to provide supplemental bar preparation resources that are available to the students at no extra charge. This is critical since the SBVCL found that some students did not enroll in a bar review course, which adversely affected their chance of passing the bar exam. (CFR 2.1)

SBVCL faculty consists of both full-time and adjunct faculty. The majority of courses are taught by a dedicated and experienced adjunct faculty of 69 and two full-time faculty. More than half of the faculty has over ten years of teaching experience at the institution. (CFR 2.1) (See additional information on the faculty in Standard 3.)

The MLS is taught entirely online by faculty members who were initially required to spend forty-five hours in training provided by TCSES on online teaching and development of content for online courses. The professors commented that the training program was too long and repetitive and the institution is now seeking alternative training programs. The program chair and TCSES staff are working collaboratively to address other issues as the program matures. (CFR 2.1) [See appendix with form on the MLS].

For the JD and MLS programs, minimum requirements for graduation were clearly published in the catalog and on the website. The catalog is available in print copy at the Administration Office, a downloadable file from TWEN (through Westlaw), or through the institution’s website. The JD requirements include the completion of 84 class units,
achieving a minimum grade point average of 2.0, and completion of 65 hours of pro bono experience. The requirements showed the institution’s expectations for substantive rigor and high performance. The MLS requirements publicized the completion of 30 class units, all completed online. (CFRs 2.2, 2.3)

The faculty Curriculum and Assessment Committee has developed specific educational objectives and student learning outcomes at the institution, program and course levels that reflect the mission of the institution. Three competencies that echo the essential objectives of the institutional mission are: (1) Knowledge of the Law, (2) Practical Skills, and (3) Ethical and Professional Values. These objectives, along with their learning outcomes, are set forth in the Academic Catalog, Faculty Manual, and course syllabi for both the JD and MLS programs. In addition, these educational objectives, along with specific student learning outcomes have been encapsulated in large posters that are displayed in every classroom and throughout both campuses. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 4.4, 4.5)

Both the JD and MLS programs have developed comprehensive curriculum maps for identifying in which courses the student learning outcomes will be assessed. It was clear during the meetings with faculty, students, staff, and the Board of Trustees that all groups fully participated in the establishment of these objectives and outcomes and were committed to achieve the expectations. By the team’s second visit, most of the faculty had readily incorporated the learning outcomes into their courses and some commented on how helpful it has been to teach their courses with defined learning outcomes. One faculty member quipped, “It was painful, but helpful.” (CFR 2.3, 2.4)

The team reviewed dozens of course syllabi and was very impressed with the quality, which clearly identified the learning outcomes and included formative and summative assessment assignments. The use of plain spoken, no-nonsense language that
clearly spelled out the students’ expected professional behavior demonstrated that the faculty appropriately recognized the students as adult learners. The faculty employed a variety of classroom and online teaching techniques keeping students actively engaged, such as traditional Socratic dialogue, class or online discussions, or active learning exercises. These teaching methods were verified through meetings with students and alumni during both visits and at both campuses. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4)

The commitment to learning assessment is expected and well integrated into the faculty culture. Faculty and students reported that many professors have already utilized formative assessment techniques and provided meaningful feedback in their classes. Some techniques included hypothetical questions, multiple choice questions, writing assignments, and quizzes. In addition, feedback and academic counseling were available with full-time faculty, academic advisors, and adjunct professors. Most adjunct professors arrived on campus well in advance of their classes. The small student body and the relatively small size of both campuses easily allowed for interaction between faculty, staff, and students in informal and formal meetings. Students and alumni reported that the institution has created a supportive, non-competitive learning environment for adult learners. (CFRs 2.4-2.6)

Most courses ended with a summative assessment in the form of a final examination or a significant writing assignment. The team reviewed a sampling of the final exams and model answers on the TWEN website. The quality and difficulty of the exam questions were similar to traditional law school and bar exam questions. The model answers displayed the doctrinal knowledge and analytical thinking needed to succeed in law school and on the bar exam. (CFRs 2.4-2.6)
The MLS program culminates with a four-unit capstone course, which provides students with the opportunity to research and analyze the practical implications of legal principles and procedures in the context of a specific professional environment. The course was supervised by a member of the faculty, who approved both the topic and the specific format of the student’s research project. (CFRs 2.2, 2.5, 2.6)

There is no mandatory grading curve at SBVCL, but faculty members are expected to follow established grading ranges. Data on grading was collected for each course and was reviewed by faculty. By all accounts from students and faculty, this is not an institution plagued with grade inflation. It is quite the opposite as one student described it as “grade deflation” and thought that the tough grading undermined student confidence. (CFR 2.5)

SBVCL’s JD assessment projects demonstrate that the faculty challenged its students, student learning was taking place, and the institution was engaged in a process of improvement designed to increase student achievement. During grading of spring 2013 and 2014 finals in Torts, Contracts and Criminal Law, first-year students (1Ls) were assessed on two competencies, Knowledge of Law and Practical Skills with six outcomes: Knowledge of Law; Legal Analysis (ability to identify legal issues); Legal Analysis (explaining how law applies to facts); Written Communications; Problem Solving (ability to link rules and significant facts); and Problem Solving 2 (ability to reach a sound conclusion). First year faculty used a common rubric to assess the target outcomes and applied four assessment standards to rank whether students were at “beginning, developing, proficient or highly proficient” levels. The other 2013 study assessed students in Torts (1L), Civil Procedure (2L), and Remedies (3L) on Knowledge of Law. The
detailed reports highlighted the strengths and weaknesses of this cohort of achieving these outcomes at each level. (CFRs 2.3, 2.6, 2.7)

Faculty have become more engaged with the tools available to help students learn as a result of the institution’s focus on assessment. Assessment reports have been reviewed and approved by the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and Faculty Council. Based on the studies described above, the Curriculum and Assessment Committee (October 2013) and Faculty Council (December 2013/April 2014) concluded there was a need to provide students with more opportunities to perform legal analysis and problem solving, through writing practice. The Faculty Council also decided to increase formative assessments and to provide more meaningful feedback. (CFR 2.4-2.7, 2.10, 3.11, 4.4)

Students can be academically disqualified after their first year if they do not maintain a 2.00 grade point average. Data provided by SBVCL showed the retention/attrition rates for the entering class in fall 2013 as 73% for Santa Barbara and 62% for Ventura. The Academic Standards and Admissions Committee examined the demographic data regarding retention/attrition. While these retention/attrition rates showed the academic rigor and the challenges faced by adult students, such as pre-law education, time management, and socio-economic disparities, the factors of retention and attrition were being fully examined, including both academic and non-academic factors. A benchmark analysis of recent data for the four law schools accredited by bothWSCUC and the CBE shows that SBVCL’s recent retention/attrition figures were within the norms for schools with similar missions and student populations. Nevertheless, the ASAC continues to ascertain the reasons for both voluntary and involuntary (academic disqualification) attrition. (CFRs 2.5-2.7, 2.10)
The Academic Effectiveness Review Committee reported the creation of an Analytical Skills Tutorial program taught during the summer for students with low GPAs after completing their first year. This program reviewed the first year subjects and was able to assess the student’s proficiency in doctrinal knowledge separate from analytical skills. For students encountering difficulty in analytical thinking, the professor was able to work with them resulting in seven of the students continuing with their enrollment and excelling in the subsequent semester. (CFRs 2.3-2.6)

The JD program used a blend of courses designed to equip students with the knowledge and skills necessary to pass the bar exam and the practical skills needed to enter the legal profession as competent attorneys. SBVCL has maintained a first time bar exam passage rate that often exceeds the average for California Accredited Law Schools (CALS). The eventual passage rate for the last five years was 67.35%. The 2014 Bar Success Report provides bar data disaggregated by race/ethnicity for the Classes of 2011 through 2013, in addition to other types of data analysis SBVCL has historically performed (gender disaggregation, pie charts with results by campus, results by quartile based on class rank, and results relating bar pass to law school GPA/rank, pre-law GPA, and pre-law degree status.) Despite this success, SBVCL continues to seek ways to improve the passage rate. For example, the team noted a disparity in retention and bar passage rates between the two campuses. The faculty acknowledged that this is an area of concern, has noted some factors to explore, such as hours worked, and is compiling additional data for analysis. SBVCL has added a required Bar Studies course in fourth year and a customized bar preparation course with Bar/Bri. (CFRs 2.6-2.7, 2.10, 4.4, 4.5)

SBVCL systematically evaluates the institution through two separate processes, Academic Program Review (APR) report and Administrative Effectiveness Review
The APR report provides an overview and discussion of the 2013 Assessment of 1L Students; the 2013 Assessment of Student Learning – Knowledge of Law report for 1L-3L students; Faculty Assessment Survey; Internship Program Review and Recommendations; Academic Advisor Report for Fall 2013; discussion of the First-Year initiative; update and review of the 2012 Analytical Skills Tutorial class; and report on SBVCL’s customized Bar Review Class and Bar Studies courses. Each process included an annual review cycle overarched by a multi-year cycle, and an assessment of the process itself. For the MLS program, the APR report discussed the MLS learning outcomes assessment, student satisfaction survey data, and various improvements to MLS student services. The APR report also provided recommendations for improvement for both programs. (CFR 2.7, 4.4, 4.5)

The team reviewed several academic and administrative assessment reports provided by SBVCL. It was obvious that a great deal of thought and effort had gone into developing these systems for program review. It was also evident that the faculty, full-time and adjunct, and staff have proudly and confidently embraced the implementation and practice of establishing learning outcomes, providing assessment opportunities with meaningful feedback, and collecting, utilizing, and analyzing data in making curricula decisions. (CFRs 2.3-2.7, 2.10)

Scholarship and Creative Activity

SBVCL values the broad range of contributions and experience of its talented faculty and makes every effort to provide resources that support faculty teaching, professional development (described in Standard 3), and scholarship activities. SBVCL has begun to emphasize the contributions of its faculty in legal scholarship. The faculty defined scholarship broadly, viewing scholarship as most helpful when it related to the
specific subject and practice-oriented skills that faculty members were teaching. Faculty were engaged in a broad range of scholarly activities including authoring a law school text, writing articles for legal periodicals, presenting at Mandatory Continuing Legal Education seminars, hosting a radio talk show, *Legal Clarity*, and drafting amicus curiae briefs in appellate matters. Professors also served on statewide committees and in leadership positions in groups that enhance the legal profession. Full-time faculty attended national and regional conferences and shared information with the part-time faculty. They also periodically disseminated articles on pedagogy. Topics of interest have included legal writing, assessment, and bar examination calibration. (CFR 2.8)

Faculty creativity is encouraged. Examples of innovation were the use of formative assessments, creation of rubrics, drafting of course specific student learning outcomes, and the use of classroom technology. Professors also reported using small group collaborations, role-plays, and simulations in the classroom. Promotion to core faculty may be determined in part by scholarship although teaching excellence remains the main imperative. SBVCL recognized faculty scholarship at its annual Awards Dinners and through the “*Sidebar*” newsletter for alumni, faculty, and students. The recent rehiring of a law librarian should facilitate scholarly activity and teaching creativity. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9)

**Support for Student Learning and Success**

Through the robust institutional research capacity of the TCSES Office of Institutional Research (OIR) and the internal position, the Director of Information Management, SBVCL has been able to compile, disaggregate, and analyze data and generate an enviable array of reports. SBVCL is building a database to facilitate the analysis of individualized achievement data for each student, such as whether the student
was ever on probation and if there are relationship traits other than gender and race/ethnicity that may bear upon student performance. Student data on demographics, achievement, and satisfaction have been analyzed to inform planning and generate creative, responsive initiatives to improve SBVCL’s academic policies and practices. One example was the Retention Attrition Analysis JD Class of 2017, described previously. The institution was able to disaggregate data and analyze the retention/attrition rates and determine which factors might have impacted student retention or attrition. SBVCL will continue to monitor data for indications that student subgroups have educational needs that differ from our overall student body. (CFR 2.10, 4.4, 4.5) The team recommends that SBVCL continue collecting and analyzing data including non-academic factors to assess student performance.

A student satisfaction survey is now annually distributed to the students and graduate exit and alumni surveys are being designed. Course/instructor evaluations, completed by the student online, have long been used in the JD program. Parallel efforts are made for the new MLS program. Surveys are being created to develop information regarding graduate achievement and employer perspectives. (CFRs 2.10, 3.3, 4.4, 4.5)

The Academic Advisor Program has contributed to student success. The advisor conducted a series of workshops and provided academic counseling, in one-on-one or group sessions. Services were available to all students. An important aspect of the advisor’s role was the counseling of at-risk students, who were referred to the advisor by faculty for assistance. The materials distributed in the workshops were of good quality. However, participation in the workshops has been inconsistent, which has led to the exploration of alternative methods of delivery. (CFR 2.12)
The Academic Advisor Program was reviewed in 2014 as part of the Academic Program Review process, taking into consideration the advisor’s reports, student satisfaction data, input from faculty, and data about the academic success of at-risk students who consulted with an advisor. Significant changes were made to the program for 2014-15, including the addition of a separate advisor for each campus and expanded reporting requirements. (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.1)

The team met with both advisors and was impressed with their abilities. The advisors identified student challenges to include the inability to perform legal analysis, time constraints, poor study skills, and poor writing skills. Many students were juggling a heavy load by attending school after working full-time and raising a family and could benefit from time management counseling. Faculty also suggested that students could use additional help with their basic writing skills. (CFRs 2.12, 2.13)

Staff members were available before each class session at both campuses to respond to student questions and concerns and provided additional support services. Communication with students, such as updates and reminders about academic requirements, were delivered through email, announcements in classrooms, and electronic conferencing. The Registrar’s Office conducted an interactive “grad check” during the student’s final year to ensure graduation requirements were met. A similar online graduation check was done for MLS students. (CFRs 2.12, 2.13)

SBVCL does not provide financial aid assistance nor are there any formal placement services or career counseling. The institution does not collect placement data. However, students have been able to find jobs through the efforts of faculty and the networks created with the local bar associations, employers, and alumni. (CFR 2.13)
While students have very limited available time, SBVCL partners with them to offer meaningful opportunities to join co-curricular organizations and activities that support their studies and allow them to develop professional identities. Assessment of these activities was conducted in the Administrative Effectiveness Review that parallels the Academic Program Review. (CFR 2.11)

The students did not appear to expect a lot of services from an affordable law school and that most of their needs, including academic advising, were adequately addressed by current faculty, advisors, and staff. (CFRs 2.12, 2.13)

Transfer students, although few, were not disadvantaged by their status. Admissions standards for transfer students were found on the website and transfer credit policies were in the catalog. Once accepted, transfer students received individually tailored course schedules to allow them to complete graduation requirements on time. (CFR 2.14)

During its initial visit, the team met with over 30 students and alumni at Santa Barbara and about 25 students and alumni at Ventura. During its second visit, a similar number of students and alumni turned out for the team’s visits at both campuses. If student satisfaction is an indicator that the students were adequately supported, the depth of student and alumni commitment, even love, for this institution was apparent to the team.

**Standard 3 – Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability**

SBVCL sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures.
Faculty and Staff

The sustainability of SBVCL’s operations has been significantly enhanced by its four-year affiliation with TCSES. TCSES now provides most of the operational infrastructure and backroom functions, including accounting, information technology and data base management, online support, faculty training for online teaching, instructional design, student record keeping and registration functions, legal and compliance support, admissions and marketing support, and institutional research. Team meetings with various staff members confirmed the affiliation has significantly improved the quality of operations and has allowed the SBVCL staff to efficiently serve faculty and students. The Vice President of Finance and Administration (VPFA) commented that the process of transferring mostly paper-based financial records to the TCSES electronic data base system has now been completed. Oversight of the annual staff evaluation process is the president’s responsibility, with assistance from the VPFA and personnel supervisors. (CFR 3.1)

The team confirmed the roles of full-time and adjunct faculty members in the management of the academic programs through the Faculty Council. There are two full-time faculty, both men, one white and one African-American. The adjunct faculty consists of 53 men and 16 women. Eighty-seven percent of the faculty was white/not designated and 13% was non-white. All instructors hold JD degrees with the exception of one who holds an LLB (Bachelor of Laws). All faculty have previous or current experience in the practice of law either as judges or attorneys. In meetings with the faculty members and a review of faculty meeting minutes, the team determined that members are actively engaged in the governance of the institution through the Faculty Council and four faculty committees. During meetings with the adjunct faculty, the team confirmed that there is broad faculty engagement in the governance process. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.11)
The downside of a stable adjunct faculty has been the limited number of opportunities to diversify the faculty. The Faculty Hiring and Retention Committee informed the team that it is well aware of this issue and is working on ways to develop a more diverse pool of candidates in the hiring process. The faculty recruitment efforts have included outreach to the local bar associations and county government offices. SBVCL has also focused on diversity in other ways, including developing faculty skills by creating a classroom climate that maximizes the benefits of diversity and enhancing the curriculum to help students learn how to handle issues of diversity in practice. The issue of diversifying the faculty continues to be a challenge. (CFRs 1.5, 3.2, 3.3) The team recommends that SBVCL develop specific strategies to build more diversity in faculty and administrative positions.

Faculty policies were set forth in a Faculty Handbook. Faculty hiring and promotion policies were implemented through the Faculty Hiring and Retention Committee. The dean, full-time faculty, and committee participated in the evaluation of all new faculty in their first year of teaching, and all faculty members every third year, in accord with a Faculty Evaluation and Review Process set by the Council. Findings and recommendations from the evaluation process were reported to the dean. (CFR 3.3)

At the close of each term, Course and Instructor Evaluations were conducted to obtain student input about the effectiveness of courses and instructors. Annually, students also completed a Student Satisfaction Survey. The results of the surveys were reviewed by the dean and faculty chair. Information gathered during the faculty review and evaluation processes was also used for mentoring faculty and making rehire and promotion decisions. The course evaluation response rate for JD students in spring 2014 was 66%. A new initiative underway is the development of reports that will permit comparisons of data
related to faculty performance over time, by campus, class cohort taught and individual instructors. (CFR 3.3)

The Faculty Development Committee organized activities for the quarterly Faculty Council meetings. In the spring semester, an extended half-day meeting has been held with themed development presentations, such as student learning assessment, using classroom technology, disability issues, dealing with challenging students, and maximizing the benefits of a diverse classroom. Faculty members, especially those teaching identical courses at the two campuses, often collaborated informally on lesson plans, teaching methods, and assessment techniques. (CFR 3.4)

Members of the staff pursued professional development through their participation in professional organizations and conferences. Professional staff has held membership in such organizations as the California Association for Institutional Research, the National Association of College and University Business Officers, and the registrar regularly attended State Bar Registrar conferences. TCSES provided additional development opportunities for staff members in such areas as recruiting and marketing, using student information software, and online learning. (CFR 3.4)

SBVCL does not maintain a tenure system for its faculty. Instead, full-time faculty are on long-term contracts. Adjunct faculty, with three or more years of experience, can be considered for the status of “affiliate faculty.” Both core and affiliate faculty can vote at quarterly faculty meetings. In order to increase attendance at the spring semester faculty development meetings, the location has been rotated between the campuses. Faculty can participate in the faculty meeting via videoconference. (CFRs 2.8, 3.4)
Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

SBVCL has more than five years of unqualified audits and has invested reserves of approximately $2,000,000 and cash reserves of $500,000. In addition, SBVCL has access to a $15 million line of credit carried by TCSES. The school has incurred deficits in the past three years as a result of the costs related to their affiliation agreement with TCSES and as a result of the costs associated with their quest for regional accreditation. Increased costs have included the addition of two full-time faculty members and additional staff including the creation of the president’s position at the beginning of the current fiscal year. The deficit for the year ending in 2014 before investment growth was $232,698. With the inclusion of the investment growth/income, that deficit was reduced to $9,732. Coming off a fairly steady state, fall 2014 saw a new student enrollment decline of thirty-seven percent over the previous year. That decline created the potential of a deficit of approximately $250,000 for the 2014-2015 fiscal year. Through budget cuts and cost savings, the institution has reduced that potential by approximately $100,000. The institution has also reinstated a spring start date for the JD program with hopes of boosting the enrollment with the spring cohort. The VPFA indicated that the breakeven enrollment number is 200 students and the fall 2014 enrollment dropped to 180 students between the two campuses. (CFR 3.5)

In addition, the Legacy Corporation holds title to the Ventura campus building. Within ten years of the date of affiliation, as noted in the footnotes to the 2012 financial audit, if the affiliation with TCSES remains in place, SBVCL has the right to buy the Ventura campus building from the Legacy Corporation at 25% of market value. Although SBVCL has long-term lease obligations for both its campuses, it currently has no other significant long-term or short-term debt and has no material student bad debt. It therefore
does not currently have any need for lines of credit. The team concluded that SBVCL has adequate resources to continue operating during the next several years. In the meantime, it needs to augment and diversify its revenue stream. (CFR 3.5)

SBVCL, working with the specialist staff at TCSES, developed a comprehensive enrollment management plan that includes new initiatives such as expanded outreach to local colleges and universities, a scholarship program, sponsorship of community events, a new extended payment option, and more events to bring prospective students to the campuses. The president indicated that he and the director of admissions have made numerous visits to the presidents of neighboring four year colleges and universities in order to build SBVCL’s image and invite applications. Both the president and the director of admissions indicated that successfully gaining regional accreditation would provide their students an opportunity to take advantage of federal funding as well as defer payment on the current federally related loans they accumulated during their undergraduate work. Neither option is available to current SBVCL students. (CFR 3.5)

With the support of TCSES, SBVCL is also exploring the use of media in recruiting and they are redesigning their current website to be more useful and attractive to prospective students. SBVCL, in light of dropping enrollments in law schools across the country, is also focusing new recruitment strategies on potential students for its MLS program. Coming on its 45th anniversary, SBVCL, with the active leadership of its president, is launching new fundraising initiatives to better engage alumni in providing financial support and to cultivate community members and solicit their gifts. Among other things, SBVCL has continued its Annual Fund drive, held alumni “friend-raising” events, and created a planned giving guide. In talking with members of the Board of Trustees and particularly with the board chair, the team learned that the trustees are actively engaged in
these fundraising efforts and personally making their own gifts to SBVCL. In light of these carefully crafted recruitment and fundraising plans, SBVCL hopes to restore its enrollment to the 200 and above level and to supplement its income with the proceeds of its fundraising efforts. (CFR 3.5)  *The team recommends that SBVCL continue to look for new strategies to capture more students, not so much for growth but in order to come back to optimal operating size as soon as possible. Strategies could include growth of existing programs and the development of new programs. The team also recommends that SBVCL move forward with the development of a comprehensive fundraising plan, particularly in recognition of its forty-fifth anniversary and its upcoming golden anniversary. In addition, the team recommends that SBVCL develop strategies to better utilize alumni to market and support the institution.*

The team visited the libraries at both campuses. The libraries provide study space and access to legal materials for students completing assignments in research-intensive courses and internships. Both libraries met the standards of the CBE, i.e. 9,000 volumes in Santa Barbara and 13,000 volumes in Ventura. Recent student satisfaction surveys have revealed concerns about the lack of quiet and comfort in the libraries. SBVCL is dependent on Westlaw for legal information and TWEN for course management. Students have “24/7” access to phone and online help at Westlaw. (CFRs 3.6, 3.7)

Advances have been made during 2013-14 with the rehiring of SBVCL’s former law librarian, who works part-time at both campuses to provide service between 4 p.m. and 6:30 p.m., hours when most students are on campus. The law librarian assists students with reference needs, maintains the institution’s print collection, updates its KOHA library system (open source), and designs instructional materials. The library collections are being
weeded to remove older and outdated materials so students can more readily identify current sources. (CFRs 2.13, 3.6 3.7)

In collaboration with TCSES, SBVCL has continued to upgrade and expand its information technology (IT) infrastructure and capabilities. Initial improvements provided SBVCL students with secured wireless access, online access to academic status/grades, financial transaction processing, registration, secured email, GoToMeeting video conferencing capabilities, and access to an online learning platform. New capabilities included voice over internet protocol (VoIP) telephony; video conferencing; offsite data backup and storage; real time student account information (both academic and financial); help desk support; website design, search engine optimization/implementation; and internet portal access for students, faculty, and alumni. (CFR 3.7)

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes

SBVCL has been reorganized from a centrally controlled structure to a decentralized and, with regard to faculty, a more participative structure. SBVCL maintains exclusive control over core functions, such as recruiting and hiring faculty, administrators, and staff; delivery of education; development of all academic programs and curricula; admissions standards, academic progress, and awarding of degrees; and relationships with accrediting bodies and state licensing authorities. Much of the infrastructure is now handled by TCSES and roles and processes have been realigned. TCSES provides support in these areas: human resources; legal, regulatory & compliance; finance and accounting; recruitment and admissions; information technology; institutional research; Canvas and online education support; academic support (academic records, information resources, program implementation and development, and accreditation support); marketing; and other services as mutually agreed. These new roles and processes have been presented in
organizational charts. Recent hires have brought staff and administrative resources up to meet WSCUC standards. The affiliation with TCSES has gone well and SBVCL has learned how to maximize and efficiently use its resources. In meeting with staff, the team noted a high level of cohesiveness and morale. (CFR 3.8)

The current governance structure is fairly complex and is fully specified in the institution’s bylaws. A ten-member Fiduciary Council with members from TCSES and SBVCL has limited reserved powers over fundamental changes, such as approval of appointments for Trustees and corporate officers, significant borrowings and securitization of assets, and changes in corporate purpose or mission. Within the governance structure of the Fiduciary Council is “a deliberative and policy making body to be known as the Board of Trustees.” In the bylaws, the Fiduciary Council has delegated certain powers so that “the Board of Trustees shall exercise general oversight and supervision over, and direction and control of the College.” The bylaws also specify that the Board will “Hire, establish the terms of employment for, evaluate, and remove the President and Dean of the College”. (CFR 3.9)

SBVCL’s fifteen member Board of Trustees has responsibility for day-to-day operations. The Board remains independent, retaining final authority and responsibility for fulfillment of the institution’s mission. All plans, policies, and procedures for significant strategic, operational, financial, academic, and support services in the various functions are reviewed and approved by the Board or its delegates. (CFR 3.9)

SBVCL has made substantial changes in its organizational structure and engagement with the Board to ensure appropriate academic and administrative support for student and organizational learning. As described before, the institution now has a president and a dean. In addition, the assistant dean/registrar has many years of
experience. The full-time Vice President of Finance and Administration came to his position with a Master in Business Administration degree and many years of experience in the fields of finance, technology and project management. SBVCL also employs full-time directors of information management, student services, and admissions. This group, together with the dean and two full-time faculty members, makes up the President’s Cabinet. Support services are provided by a full-time facilities manager, an assistant to the dean, and administrative coordinators at both campuses. The team was impressed with the level of communication, collegiality and commitment to the SBVCL mission among the staff. (CFR 3.10)

**Standard 4 – Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement**

**Strategic Thinking and Planning**

The team found that SBVCL was implementing the strategic plan recently adopted in 2012 by the Board of Trustees. Progress toward the plan is reviewed each year, and the plan itself is reviewed every five years with contributions from at least as many constituents. The team learned in its conversations that trustees, administrators, and faculty are familiar with the strategic plan and with the accompanying vision and mission statements. (CFR 4.1)

The mission of the Santa Barbara & Ventura Colleges of Law is to provide accessible and excellent legal education. To that end, the goal of the strategic planning process was to align the institution’s academic programs, support personnel, physical and technological needs with the mission. Both the current and future needs of the students have been the drivers of the planning process. The strategic planning process has included the analysis and use of data from the ongoing academic program review process which
included the use of student learning outcomes for each program and the results of program assessments. The institution, in its planning process, has considered changes based on both internal assessment and an ongoing review of the broader external environments of higher education in general and legal education in particular. SBVCL explained that its affiliation with TCSES and its quest for regional accreditation have been pursued in response to changes on the educational scene that are making it increasingly difficult for smaller freestanding law schools to compete for and appropriately support students. The team learned that SBVCL’s partnership with TCSES has provided increased technological capacity, for instance, and regional accreditation will allow students greater access to student loan funding to finance their legal education. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2)

In response to changes in the legal profession and legal education and to develop an additional source of revenue, SBVCL added the online Master of Legal Studies program. This additional program offered online is also providing an opportunity for the institution to gain experience in utilizing an online venue. SBVCL foresees increasing competition when the California Bar Examiners begin to accredit online JD programs. (CFR 4.2) The team recommends that SBVCL remain focused on its unique market’s needs and its commitment to access and service to the community.

As described previously, the team found that SBVCL was actively utilizing student course evaluations and input from instructors to make decisions about programs, policies and personnel. In talking with faculty, administrators and members of the Board of Trustees, the team confirmed that SBVCL was utilizing retention data, graduation data, and bar exam results, as well as external analysis data, to chart its course for the future including program and service improvements and long-range planning. (CFR 4.3)
Commitment to Learning and Improvement

The team also confirmed that SBVCL was a learning institution committed at all levels to continuous improvement for the benefit of its students. SBVCL engaged in an ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning in various ways. It was clear during both visits with faculty, trustees, students, and staff that all groups have participated in the establishment of outcomes and learning objectives and were committed to the attainment of the expectations. (CFRs 4.6-4.8)

SBVCL has expanded its institutional research (IR) function to support systematic improvement of programs and operations. With assistance from the TCSES Office of Institutional Research and other departments, the institution has regularly collected, analyzed, disseminated, and utilized data for planning, budgeting, and quality assurance. SBVCL now conducts program reviews according to the Academic Program Review Plan. The Administrative Effectiveness Review Plan was similarly fulfilled with the issuance of the 2014 Administrative Effectiveness Report. A summary overview of these reports, the 2014 Institutional Effectiveness Review, was compiled and presented to the Board of Trustees at a Special Meeting in June 2014. (CFRs 4.3-4.5)

The team found that SBVCL was utilizing student evaluations of courses, faculty members, and instructors to assess both program and instructor effectiveness and make decisions about programs, policies, curriculum and personnel. Faculty committees that oversaw academic standards, admissions, curriculum and assessment utilized retention data, graduation data, and bar exam results to inform their decisions. (CFRs 4.4, 4.6, 4.7)

Assessment is ongoing at SBVCL and a number of methods have been employed to involve the institution’s stakeholders in the assessment of its programs. Alumni focus groups held in conjunction with the strategic plan and the CPR phase provided a wealth of
feedback about the JD program; additional information was gathered in the first alumni survey in December 2013. The team confirmed in meetings with alumni from both campuses that they were in favor of the recent changes and very optimistic about the future of their alma mater. They further confirmed that the institution fulfilled its mission by giving them an opportunity to become lawyers. Legal internship site supervisors, also local practitioners, have contributed their views in the Legal Internship Site Supervisor Survey. Most impressive was the role that the SBVCL alumni have taken in its respective legal communities. As a testament to the SBVCL alumni, many are leaders in local, regional, and statewide bar associations. (CFR 4.8)
SECTION III – FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS

The team commends SBVCL for:

1. Its thoroughness of their preparations for the visit. Written materials were complete, the meeting schedule was well structured and participants were well prepared for this visit. (CFR 1.9)

2. Its level of engagement and active participation of the Board of Trustees in the proactive leadership of the institution. (CFR 1.3, 3.8)

3. Its look to the future—for consideration of trends, characteristics of its students, and the needs of the communities served. (CFR 4.2)

4. Its improvement in academic advising brought about by the expansion of advising services and the team approach established with the faculty for identification of students who can benefit from extra attention. (CFR 2.12, r2.13)

5. Its ability to effectively accommodate the needs of its particular students. (CFR 2.13)

6. Its high level of evidence of the effective implementation of student and program learning outcomes. (CFR 2.3, 4.5, 4.7)

7. Its Board’s action to divide the dean’s responsibilities by creating the position of president. (CFR 3.10)
RECOMMENDATIONS

The team recommends that SBVCL:

1. Remain focused on its unique market’s needs and its commitment to access and service to the community. (CFR 1.1, 4.2)

2. Continue collecting and analyzing data including non-academic factors to assess student performance. (CFRs 2.10, 2.11)

3. Develop specific strategies to build more diversity in faculty and administrative positions. (CFR 3.2)

4. Continue to look for new strategies to capture more students, not so much for growth but in order to come back to optimal operating size as soon as possible. Strategies could include growth of existing programs and the development of new programs. (CFR 3.5)

5. Develop strategies to better utilize alumni to market and support the institution. (CFR 3.5)

6. Move forward with the development of a comprehensive fundraising plan, particularly in recognition of its forty-fifth anniversary and its upcoming golden anniversary. (CFR 3.5)
TEAM REPORT APPENDIX: DISTANCE EDUCATION SUMMARY

Institution: Santa Barbara and Ventura Colleges of Law
Type of Visit: Capacity and Preparatory Review
Name of reviewer/s: Jenni Parrish/Rodney Fong
Date/s of review: March 12-14, 2013

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 are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (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)

The Master of Legal Studies Program (MLS) began in January 2013.

2. Background Information:
In 2011, two courses, the Uniform Commercial Code and Selected Topics in Criminal Procedure were offered as electives in the JD program at SBVCL. The MLS program is SBVCL’s first fully online program. The MLS program began in January 2013 with 13 students enrolled and two had withdrawn for financial reasons by the time of the CPR visit.

The platform used is eCollege and the course is supported technologically by TCSES.

3. Nature of the Review:

While the MLS program was referenced in the CPR report, most of the printed material on it was supplied by the College at the visit, and team members interviewed Professor Craig Smith who serves as the program’s chair, Alana Pepich, Director of Student Management, and James Wallace, AVP Online Admissions (via phone), both TCSES employees who assisted with the development of the program.

¹ See Protocol for Review of Distance Education to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.
### Observations and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit with Mission.</strong> 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 (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 3.8, 4.1)</td>
<td>The MLS is a two-year part-time program designed to enhance understanding of certain areas of the law without leading to a JD or the expectation of bar licensure.</td>
<td>The Student Advisor should proactively reach out to the MLS online student instead of waiting for the student to contact him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection to the Institution.</strong> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution? (CFR 1.2, 2.10)</td>
<td>At this very early stage, integration plans are not entirely clear. One possible concern is that in the Student Welcome Guide on the Student Services page, it states: “Student Advisors are vital to your educational success. Students are expected to reach out to the Student Services Department each term as you navigate through your program.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</strong> 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? (CFRs 2.1, 2.5, 3.7)</td>
<td>The limited interaction with the site by the team members looked promising, but it is still too early to answer these questions.</td>
<td>Subsequent WASC teams should look carefully at the efficacy of student-faculty interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Support Services.</strong> CPR: What is the institution’s capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? EER: What do data show about the effectiveness of the services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</td>
<td>The institution provides minimal student support services to its onsite JD students and appears to put the burden on the online MLS students to ask for help if needed.</td>
<td>Data on the effectiveness of support services should be reviewed during the EER visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty.</strong> 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? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</td>
<td>“For the first cohort of the MLS program, the four instructors currently engaged represent three seasoned SBVCL adjuncts, and one with online experience hired specifically for the MLS program.” Faculty are trained via the TOPS (Teaching Online Pedagogy and Standards), an online course offered by TCSES.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Curriculum and Delivery

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? (CFRs 2.1-2.3, 4.6) (Submit credit hour report.)

TCSES has instructional designers who work with the SMEs (subject matter experts) who typically are the professors in the courses. Course content is prepared in advance of the course’s offering and is approved by the program chair.

### Retention and Graduation

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? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)

The program just started in January 2013, had 13 students at the beginning and had lost two students at the time of the CPR visit. No other data is available. SBVCL should track, review, and analyze the data to determine why students are not retained in the program.

### Student Learning

**CPR:** How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? **EER:** 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? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)

The student must complete discussion posts and online assignments on a weekly basis. At the end of the two-year program, the student completes a 4-unit Capstone course over the last two sessions of enrollment as a summative assessment.

### Contracts with Vendors

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 *Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations*?

TCSES and SBVCL have an affiliation agreement to provide all such infrastructure support.

### Quality Assurance Processes

**CPR:** How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? **EER:** What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)

The College plans to use course and instructor evaluations, faculty evaluations, student learning assessment data and student satisfaction data to improve instruction and course content.

For the EER, the visiting team should review evidence of the program’s effectiveness.
Team Report Appendix

OFF-CAMPUS SITE

Institution:
Kind of Visit:
Date:

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. Site Name and Address

Ventura Campus
The Santa Barbara and Ventura Colleges of Law
4475 Market St.
Ventura, CA 93003

2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a regional center or off-campus site by WASC)

One graduate program (Juris Doctor) is offered; current enrollment is approximately 110 students of 200 institution-wide. Ventura campus was founded as a separate institution in 1969; merged with Santa Barbara campus in 1978.

3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

Ventura campus was visited. All materials submitted for the CPR were equally applicable to both campuses, including the Ventura campus, except for certain campus-specific documents: site maps (one per campus), campus lease documents, and course syllabi.

The law school follows consistent processes and procedures at both campuses, except as necessary to address differences in physical facilities.

An interview was conducted with President/Dean Heather Georgakis and Assistant Dean/Registrar Barbara Doyle, who has worked at the Ventura campus for more than 30 years.

---

2 See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.
## Observations and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit with Mission.</strong> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</td>
<td>Wholly consistent. Campuses are co-equal parts of one institution, and share one mission, all operations, and one administrative structure. Most staff perform their roles for both campuses, except Administrative Coordinators who staff the front desk at each location, and a facilities manager who works almost exclusively at the much larger Ventura facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection to the Institution.</strong> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</td>
<td>Highly connected. Site is not viewed as “off-campus” by institution or its students, but is a co-equal campus with a coherent campus culture connected to a larger institution and a sister campus in Santa Barbara. Students at both campuses may cross-enroll for Summer elective courses at their option. Since 2009, institution has been working to build a unified institutional culture by referring to sites as “campuses” (Ventura campus, etc.) rather than as separate “colleges” (Ventura College of Law).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Learning Site.</strong> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</td>
<td>Ventura campus is larger (20k sq. feet v. 8k at SB campus); physical environment is equally attractive and functional. Student lounge, patio, library and classrooms are well-maintained, appropriate in size, and conducive to student co-curricular activities; office spaces and classrooms are functional and room for growth is available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Support Services. CPR:</strong> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? EER: What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</td>
<td>Capacity is equal to or greater than at SB campus. Library is larger; computing services equal. One Director of Student Services and Academic Advisor serve students at both campuses. Educational technology is equal, subject to needs of varying classroom sizes. Cumulative Bar Pass Rates are slightly lower (2% lower) than SB campus; student satisfaction is as high or higher for most items.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One full-time faculty member teacher 2 courses at this campus; adjuncts teach others (Exactly equal to SB campus.) Faculty members are equally qualified; more judges teach at Ventura due to larger size of judiciary. One Faculty Council shares governance at both campuses; affiliate faculty from both campuses vote on all governance issues. One Curriculum and Assessment Committee makes recommendations to Faculty Council to curriculum decisions applied to both campuses. Curriculum is the same at both campuses except that different electives are offered in Summer and sometimes in final semester, to meet student interests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) [Also submit credit hour report.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Curriculum and Assessment Committee designs program and courses for recommendation to and approval by Faculty Council. New courses are reviewed and evaluated in same manner for both campuses. Credit hour policy is in CPR Appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention and graduate rates are somewhat higher at Ventura campus. Disaggregated data are now being collected but have not been available in past. Differences are viewed as attributable to lower socio-economic profile of Ventura students; differences in pre-law education (more UC grads at SB v. Cal State grads at Ventura); higher percentage of English as second language speakers at Ventura; higher pre-law GPA of commuting students at SB (due to more law school options available to students in Ventura, with LA schools much closer).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning. CPR: How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? EER: What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning is assessed according to the same process as used at the SB campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR: How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? EER: What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Institutional Effectiveness Review and its component parts (Academic Program Review and Administrative Effectiveness) evaluates both campuses separately thru the same process and then results are compared and used as basis for curriculum, budget, and other decisions. Process is just starting to be implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CREDIT HOUR REVIEW - TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: The Santa Barbara & Ventura Colleges of Law
Type of Visit: CPR
Date: March 12-14, 2013

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</th>
<th>Verified Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on credit hour</td>
<td>Does this policy adhere to WASC policy and federal regulations?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Written policy was reviewed and discussed with the Faculty Chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process(es)/ periodic review</td>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>Yes. Through periodic audits and new course reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution adhere to this procedure?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: See note above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet</td>
<td>Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: On ground schedules were reviewed going back several terms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses</td>
<td>What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? On-line</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many syllabi were reviewed? Masters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What discipline(s)? Legal Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Syllabi and schedules were reviewed. Verified by Faculty Chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated)</td>
<td>What kinds of courses? Internships</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many syllabi were reviewed? Four internships were reviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What degree level(s)? Juris Doctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What discipline(s)? Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Reviews demonstrated all were in compliance and regularly monitored by the institution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on credit hour</td>
<td>Is this policy easily accessible?  ☑ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where is the policy located? In the General Catalog, located on <a href="www.collegesoflaw.edu">School’s website</a>: J.D. Section 6.2B here, MLS section 16.1B here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
Meets DOE definitions for both programs. (Linked info above is detailed below.)

1. **JD program:** 1 unit of credit is 15 clock hours of instruction with generally an additional 45 hours of outside preparation/study. Policy provides (Catalog, section 6.2B, para. 2):
   - “Each unit of credit requires 15 clock hours of instruction (or equivalent, as determined by the School). Each regularly scheduled 3-hour class constitutes 3 clock hours of instruction. One clock hour of classroom instruction is defined as 50 minutes of instruction, consistent with the CBE Guidelines for Accredited Law School Rules, Guideline 6.5(1)(3). Each clock hour of instruction presumes substantial outside study and preparation by the student—between 2 to 3 hours of outside preparation for each hour of class time. Legal Internship and Directed Study are considered practicum courses and require 65 hours of participation to equal the 15 clock hours of instruction required for 1 unit of credit. Partial credits are not granted. Thus, for the 84-credit hour JD program, 1,260 clock hours of instruction are required and an additional 3,780 hours of outside study are expected for the degree.

   **Face to Face Lecture or Seminar Course**
   - Each course conducted as a face to face lecture or seminar constitutes the following:
     - a. 3 unit course: 45 clock hours of instruction and, generally, an additional 135 hours of outside preparation/study.
     - b. 2 unit course: 30 clock hours of instruction and, generally, an additional 90 hours of outside preparation/study.
     - c. 1 unit course: 15 clock hours of instruction and, generally, an additional 45 hours of outside preparation/study.

   **Distance Online or Hybrid Course**
   - For distance online or hybrid courses, the total hours of work typically required for any class of work reflects:
     - 1) synchronous and asynchronous components that facilitate faculty-student and student-student interaction (virtual classrooms, discussion boards, and chats) and 2) independent learning components (readings, recorded lectures, written assignments, and quizzes).
   - Each course conducted as a distance online or hybrid courses constitutes the following:
     - a. 3 unit course: 45 clock hours of synchronous/asynchronous interaction and up to 135 hours of independent learning.
     - b. 2 unit course: 30 clock hours of synchronous/asynchronous interaction and up to 90 hours of independent learning.
     - c. 1 unit course: 15 clock hours of synchronous/asynchronous interaction and up to 45 hours of independent learning.”

   **Note:** As of 2014-2015, students participating in the revised Legal Internship and Directed Study programs now earn 1 unit of credit for 50 hours of work, plus an additional 5-hour training program on initial unit of Legal Internship.

2. **MLS program:** 1 unit of credit is 15 clock hours of synchronous/asynchronous interaction and up to 45 hours of independent learning. Policy provides (Catalog, section 16.1B, para. 2):
   - “A credit hour for an online course represents 15 hours of instructional activity (e.g., engagement with web-based instructional materials) based upon a 50-minute hour (“clock hour”) toward achieving specified student learning outcomes, therefore 360 clock hours of instruction are required for the degree. For online courses, the 15 hours of instructional activity may include but are not limited to synchronous or asynchronous lectures or webinars, interactive tutorials, and online discussions. A credit hour also assumes an additional 30 hours of homework, studying, and/or research. A credit hour for practicum, fieldwork, or internship coursework represents 45 hours of applied practice and weekly seminar/overhead. Partial credits are not granted.

   **Distance Online or Hybrid Course** (All MLS courses are online.)
   - For online or hybrid courses, the total hours of work typically required for any class of work reflects:
     - 1) synchronous and asynchronous components that facilitate faculty-student and student-student interaction (virtual classrooms, discussion boards, and chats) and 2) independent learning components (readings, recorded lectures, written assignments, and quizzes).
   - Each distance online or hybrid course constitutes the following:
     - a. 3 unit course: 45 clock hours of synchronous/asynchronous interaction and up to 135 hours of independent learning.
     - b. 2 unit course: 30 clock hours of synchronous/asynchronous interaction and up to 90 hours of independent learning.
     - c. 1 unit course: 15 clock hours of synchronous/asynchronous interaction and up to 45 hours of independent learning.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)?  ☑ YES ☐ NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the institution adhere to this procedure?  ☑ YES ☐ NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- JD: Definition of clock hours of classroom instruction conforms to Guideline 6.5(1)(3) of the
<p>| Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet | Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? | ☒ YES ☐ NO |
| Comments: | Schedules of Classes for each campus are filed as document E117 and posted on Gateway; these show dates for the semesters, with evenings and hours for each course (each held one night per week for 3 hours for 15 weeks during Fall and Spring). Website (JD Program, JD Program Overview) here lists Fall/Spring semester class hours for each campus. General Catalog Section 6.2D here lists class hours. Detailed attendance records for each class session are kept and monitored; these are available for review onsite. Each student signs roll at end of each class session and a staff member records attendance the next business day. All class sessions are taught as scheduled or rescheduled to another date; class sessions are never cancelled. |
| Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses | How many syllabi were reviewed? Exhibit 118 includes 1 JD and 3 MLS online course syllabi. |
| Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level. | What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Online |
| | What discipline(s)? Law |
| | What degree level(s)? Graduate (JD and MLS) |
| | Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? | ☒ YES ☐ NO |
| Comments: | The School has offered very few JD online courses. Exhibit 118 includes the syllabus for the most recent, Juvenile Law, taught in Summer 2013. MLS syllabi are posted on Canvas (LMS). These are reviewed by Program Chair Craig Smith. Exhibit 118 includes the syllabi for 3 MLS courses taught in 2014: American Legal System, Employment Law, and Health Care Law. |
| 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) | How many syllabi/other materials were reviewed? Two. |
| Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level. | What kinds of courses? (JD Legal Internship Directions/Log; MLS Capstone Course Information) |
| | What discipline(s)? Law |
| | What degree level(s)? graduate (JD and MLS) |
| | Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? | ☒ YES ☐ NO |
| Comments: | JD program: Exhibit 071 (Legal Internship Materials) sets forth in numerous places the requirement that students complete either 65 hours (former program) or 50 hours plus a 5 hour training (new program). In addition to the JD Legal Internship Directions, Program Chair Steve Underwood is developing an Internship handbook. MLS program: Exhibit 077 includes the MLS Capstone Course description, Exhibit 119 details the Capstone Course requirements requiring a substantial original research project. This information is included in the Course materials for the Capstone Course. |
| Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials) | How many programs were reviewed? Two |
| | What kinds of programs were reviewed? Graduate (JD, MLS) |
| | What discipline(s)? Law |
| | What degree level(s)? Graduate |
| | Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? | ☒ YES ☐ NO |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JD program:</strong> on website under <a href="#">JD Program Overview</a>, in Catalog Section 6.6. At 84 units, program meets licensure requirement for CA State Bar Exam (exceeds minimum by 4 units.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MLS program:</strong> on website under <a href="#">MLS Program Overview</a>, in Catalog Sections 15.2 and 16.5. At 30 units, program is consistent with similar Master’s Degree programs (See, e.g., University of Denver Sturm College of Law (30 units); Arizona State University (30 units); University of San Diego (26 units))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review Completed By: [Signature]
Date: 11-14-14
2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW CHECKLIST
Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MaterialReviewed</th>
<th>Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.</th>
<th>Verified Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal regulations</td>
<td>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comments:  
Yes, the Colleges of Law follows Federal requirements. No incentives, commissions, bonuses, etc. are paid for successfully enrolling students in either the JD or MLS programs. Moreover, the law school adheres to Guideline 2.5 of the Committee of Bar Examiners Accredited Law School Rules, which prohibits compensation to any person based on the number of persons enrolled in any class, applying for admission, or registering to enroll (other than compensation paid a student or associate for reading or correcting papers or similar activity.) The law schools regularly states its adherence to Guideline 2.5 in its self-study reaccreditation reports filed with the CBE. The CBE has never questioned the School’s adherence to this provision. | |
| Degree completion and cost | Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree? | YES |
| Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree? | YES |
| Comments:  
Our web site, collegesoflaw.edu, contains both length of time to complete and total cost information for both the JD and MLS programs.  
Length of program is addressed 1) for the JD program on the website under JD Program Overview and in Catalog Section 6.6 and 2) for the MLS program on website under MLS Program Overview and in Catalog Sections 16.2 and 16.6. Total cost information is provided for the JD program here and for the MLS program here. | |
| Careers and employment | Does the institution provide accurate information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? | YES |
| Does the institution provide accurate information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? The School does not provide specific information about the employment of its graduates. | YES |
| Comments:  
Our marketing information addresses the question of occupational fields that benefit from the achievement of MLS or JD degrees. For a JD student who successfully passes the California Bar Exam the legal profession defines the type of jobs available or suitable. We do not provide specific employment information about our graduates at this time.  
For the JD program the website accurately states here that JD graduates are academically eligible to site for the California Bar Exam and provides the required CBE disclaimer that study at SBVCL may not qualify a student to take the bar exam or be admitted to practice outside California. For the MLS program the website accurately states here that the MLS program does not qualify graduates to site for the California Bar Exam nor does it satisfy requirements for admission to practice law in California, and includes additional qualifying language precisely as required by the CBE. | |

*§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:  
Date: 1/13/14
### 3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW CHECKLIST

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</th>
<th>Verified Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on student complaints</td>
<td>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? General Catalog, Section 3.9 (Student Complaint and Grievance Procedure), available through the website here.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Catalog is on Student Gateway and on website here; section 3.9 is here.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process(es)/procedure</td>
<td>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly:</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution adhere to this procedure?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: In General Catalog Section 3.9C, subsections 1-6, here. Additional information about procedures is provided in document E116. Section 3.9 describes the formal policy and procedures for resolution of student complaints. As detailed in E116, student complaints are handled by the Registrar/Assistant Dean (Ventura) and Director of Student Services (Santa Barbara). Staff work with students to attempt informal resolution with other parties, which is effective in almost all instances. If a student files a formal written complaint/grievance, the formal process is followed and documentation is maintained in the permanent file at the Ventura campus. The informal resolution process is effective and few formal complaints are pursued.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records</td>
<td>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where? In the Registrar's Office at the Ventura campus.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly:</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: So few written complaints are received that it is easy to track and monitor them. One or two individuals are typically responsible for resolving complaints, or making sure that they are resolved by the appropriate committee or administrator.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)
See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: [Signature]
Date: 11-14-14
4 – TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW CHECKLIST
Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</th>
<th>Verified Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Credit Policy(s)</td>
<td>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the policy publically available? If so, where?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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? Including the maximum number of units and the minimum grades accepted.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>As to both the JD and MLS programs, the School’s policies are publicly disclosed in the General Catalog on the School’s website and clearly state the criteria for transfer of credit from another institution. In both programs, transfer credit is given only for grades at the good standing level or higher at the transferring institution; up to 30 credits may be granted in the JD program and up to 6 units may be granted in the MLS program. Other criteria apply as well. The JD transfer policy is in General Catalog Section 6.10 <a href="#">here</a>. MLS transfer policy is in General Catalog Section 16.7 <a href="#">here</a>. The Catalog is on the website, <a href="#">here</a>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*§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: [Signature]
Date: 11-14-14