



The State Bar *of California*

**OPEN SESSION
AGENDA ITEM O-400
JUNE 2021
COMMITTEE OF BAR EXAMINERS**

DATE: June 18, 2021

TO: Members, Committee of Bar Examiners

FROM: Natalie Leonard, Principal Program Analyst

SUBJECT: Action on Major Change Request – Addition of Hybrid JD – Lincoln Law School of Sacramento

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Lincoln Law School of Sacramento (Lincoln Sacramento) submits the attached Major Change Request seeking permission to launch a hybrid classroom/online JD program in January 2022, in addition to its current classroom JD program. (Attachment A) Staff recommends granting the request because the school's application appears to demonstrate that the hybrid JD program will comply with the Rules for Accredited Law Schools (Rules) and Guidelines for Accredited Law Schools (Guidelines), and the law school will maintain overall compliance.

BACKGROUND

Historically, State Bar accredited law schools could not include more than twelve credits of online courses in their JD curriculum.

In May 2019, this cap was removed, and accredited law schools may now seek permission to offer JD programs that are taught in hybrid format or fully online.

Here, Lincoln Sacramento plans to continue its classroom JD program and to add a hybrid online/classroom JD program taught 75 percent online and 25 percent in the classroom through monthly sessions.

Under Rules 4.164 and 4.165, "[a]n accredited law school contemplating a major change must notify the Committee . . . [and t]he notice must explain in detail any effect the change might have on the law school's compliance with the rules." (Rule 4.164) Such changes include "instituting a new division," and "offering any new program in law study, whether a degree

program, non-professional degree program, or non-degree program,” as is contemplated here. (Rule 4.165)

DISCUSSION

History

Lincoln Sacramento is a private California accredited law school founded in 1969, and currently enrolling 240 JD students according to their 2020 Annual Report. The law school is also accredited as an institution by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). If the Committee grants the law school’s major change request, Lincoln Sacramento will then submit it to WASC for further approval from that organization.

The law school was last inspected on September 26-28, 2017 and found to be compliant. It is next due to be inspected in fall 2022.

The law school’s Minimum, Cumulative Bar Passage Rate has been well above the 40 percent minimum, with a value of 66.7 percent in 2018, 60.8 percent in 2019, and 60.1 percent in 2020, and a preliminary estimate suggests that the law school’s 2021 MPR will similarly exceed the minimum. The law school’s most recent individual pass rates on the bar exam were 44 percent in October 2020 and 7 percent in February 2021.

Proposed hybrid JD program curriculum and procedures

Lincoln Sacramento requests to launch a hybrid program combining online class study with monthly in-person meetings. This new program would address student interest and also allow the law school to accept students from a wider geography, as well as students who need the time flexibility of online classes.

The hybrid JD proposal was designed by a faculty review committee led by Dr. LeeAnn Stone, an expert consultant in instructional design who has coordinated the creation of a wide range of in-person and online programs in a wide range of academic areas. Her resume is attached as part of the application.

The hybrid JD proposal will have the same overall requirements as the law school’s classroom JD program: 86 credits, the same course titles and content, the same course progression, the same course exams, and the same academic calendar. The courses would be offered 75 percent online and 25 percent in the classroom during monthly weekend sessions that take place in person.

The course format for the online work will consist of a four-step process using on-demand lectures: receive initial input through homework, process the learning through assignments, self-assess through multiple-choice quizzes, and apply through online or classroom interaction.

As with in-person classes, class section size will be limited to thirty students. If more than thirty students register, then an additional section will be opened for the course.

The hybrid program is expected to launch in January 2022 with a first-year cohort and to add an additional year in the progression each year until the full program is implemented.

The law school's plan appears to comply with the Accredited Rules and Guidelines

The hybrid JD program contains the required number of hours, properly verified, including the required practical skills courses and student services, as described below.

Where appropriate, the law school made adjustments to respond to the unique needs of the law student studying from a distance. For example, to allow for additional schedule flexibility, the West Study Aid program will be added to allow for on-demand academic support to provide resources that are readily available while students are reviewing courses on demand. Students will still be able to meet with faculty as well.

The program complies with Guidelines 6 and 7 applicable to the format of online education

Under Division 6 Academic Program Guidelines, the law school “must maintain a qualitatively and quantitatively sound program of legal education” requiring at least 80 credits, with each credit including at least 15 hours of verified academic engagement plus 30 untracked hours of preparation. (Guideline 6.5 A-B)) Lincoln Sacramento’s proposed hybrid JD program exceeds the minimum requirement of 80 credits, requiring 86 credits to earn a JD.

Under Division 7’s Scholastic Standards, the law school must verify at least 1200 hours of academic engagement through reliable means. (Guideline 7.11) Lincoln Sacramento will use a combination of methods to successfully meet this requirement. The law school will take attendance for live classes. It will track online engagement based upon time spent reviewing each element of the program, using estimates derived from standards developed through study at Rice University, as well as verification through tracing in Populi. When taking an exam remotely, students will be monitored via a commercial remote proctoring service.

The online program provides the required opportunity to offer fifteen or more hours of practice-based skills

An accredited JD program “must require that each student . . . satisfactorily complete a minimum of six semester units (or their equivalent) of course work designed to teach practice-based skills and competency training” and must further “provide the opportunity for students in the JD degree program to complete a minimum of fifteen (15) units of practice-based skills and competency training.” (Rule 4.160(F), Guideline 6.9(A)(1))

Lincoln Sacramento’s hybrid JD curriculum will require students to complete fifteen hours of practical skills training, and provide the opportunity to complete more hours through coursework Lincoln Sacramento also plans to allow interested upper class students in the

hybrid JD program to seek out legal internships. These options are similar to the options available to students in the traditional classroom JD program.

The school will support the hybrid JD program with compliant library resources, financing, and infrastructure

Lincoln Sacramento also demonstrated that it would have compliant library resources, financing, and technical infrastructure to support the hybrid JD program.

The law school's current library already fulfills the Division 8 Library Requirements. The law school transitioned to an online library when the Committee made that option available in September 2019, and the school also retained its hard copy volumes. The law school contracts with both Westlaw and LexisNexis in order to offer all required volumes. Students in the hybrid JD program will learn research techniques as part of their Legal Research class as required under Guideline 8.3.

The law schools' infrastructure will continue to be compliant with Division 9 Physical [and Infrastructure] Requirements if a hybrid JD is added. The technical platform in the proposal, Populi, is already in use at the school. During the pandemic, the law school also transitioned its support services to online delivery, including administration, academic support, office hours and counseling. The law school also plans to purchase access to an academic support program available on-demand through West in order to provide support for those whose challenging schedules may make it difficult to attend regular office hours.

Division 10 Financial Resources must be "adequate . . . to support [the school's] programs and operations . . . including all services it claims to provide." Here, because the school has already invested in the technology platform, and designed the coursework there is little additional investment required. The law school may need to hire additional faculty, but cost will be offset by additional tuition as more students enroll in the hybrid JD program. The law school already has a plan to provide targeted support for those teaching online classes.

The school has taken further optional steps to create a successful online program

The school has also taken a number of optional steps to prepare for the successful delivery of an online JD program. In addition to partnering with an instructional designer and using peer-reviewed, industry-standard benchmarks for estimating verified academic engagement, the law school has already created a plan to compare and contrast the results of its classroom program with its hybrid program, adjusting each program as needed. The law school's plan to limit class size to 30 students per individual course ensures that "class size [will] be reasonable to ensure teaching effectiveness." (Guideline 6.5(N))

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Committee receive and file Lincoln Sacramento's Request for Major Change Request to add a hybrid JD program as described in Attachment A and to grant the request, allowing the program to begin operation in January 2022.

It is further recommended that the school be required to confirm its start date or any delay to the Committee within 60 days and that it provide the Committee with an update as to the progress of the hybrid JD program, comparing this program to the classroom JD program, in each of its Annual Reports until the law school is inspected again.

PROPOSED MOTION

If the Committee agrees with this recommendation, the following motion is suggested:

Move that Lincoln Law School of Sacramento's Request for a Major Change adding a hybrid JD program as set forth in Attachment A be received and filed; that the request be granted effective January 2022; and that the following progress reports be required to be filed with the Committee: 1) a letter confirming the start date of the program and initial enrollment within 30 days of the beginning or advising the Committee by February 1, 2022 of any delay in the program's launch; and 2) a progress report regarding the hybrid JD program's enrollment and performance, as compared to the law school's classroom program, be included with the law school's Annual Reports each year until the law school is inspected again.

ATTACHMENT LIST

- A. Lincoln Law School of Sacramento Application for Major Change – Hybrid Juris Doctor Modality

**Lincoln Law School
Major Change Request
Hybrid Juris Doctor Modality**

INTRODUCTION

Lincoln Law School (LLS) seeks approval as required under Rule 4.164 Prior approval of major changes and Rule 4.165 Major Changes to offer a hybrid Juris Doctor (J.D.) modality of study beginning in Spring 2022. This timeline reflects LLS's need to secure approval from its regional accreditor, the Western Association of Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) subsequent to Committee of Bar Examiners approval. LLS is not seeking to make changes to its current fixed facility J.D. program.

BACKGROUND

LLS is a long-standing law school with over 50 years of documented success in providing a high-quality, yet moderately priced opportunity to study for a law degree and the California bar examination. The typical LLS student is balancing multiple responsibilities outside of their law studies that may include raising children, caring for dependents, and working full-time jobs. Proudly, approximately half of the student body comprises students from historically underrepresented groups. LLS maintains a cumulative bar passage rate of 59.83% and claims more than 1,000 graduates who have been admitted to the California Bar. Central to LLS's success is its distinguished faculty of lawyers and judges from the Sacramento legal community who bring practical, up-to-date instruction to the LLS learning experience, keeping students abreast of the constantly changing legal landscape.

To summarize the rationale for this proposed change: The online modality will further LLS's goal of supporting non-traditional law school students in pursuit of their J.D. by lowering barriers to access and persistence. The online modality will expand such access and flexibility without compromising academic rigor. Furthermore, the expanded modality offerings will provide LLS with long-term enrollment levels necessary to ensure institutional sustainability.

DESIGN AND REVIEW

Developing the online modality was a campus-wide initiative. After the initial assessment of feasibility by the leadership team was completed, the results were shared with the Board of Directors. With the approval of that body, the leadership team convened a faculty review committee composed of members from the Senior Faculty Review and Assessment Committees. LLS also contracted an instructional design expert, Dr. LeeAnn Stone, to lead administrative and faculty teams through the process of redesigning the current J.D. program. The goal of the redesign was to create a hybrid modality that would retain the same academic rigor of the existing program while also meeting Academic Engagement and Attendance (Guideline 6.5), Distance-Education Credit (Guidelines 7.11), and the distance education standards set forth by the Western Association of Senior College and University Commission (WASCU). In the process of ensuring the online modality would meet standards, administrative teams conducted reviews of policy and procedures to ensure the LLS experience for online students and faculty

will be equitable. This process culminated in a modality change presentation to the Board of Directors. (Addendum § A)

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The hybrid J.D. modality comprises a combination of online and onsite learning activities that parallel the existing 86-unit J.D. program (Guideline 6.5[A] & [M]). 76 units are required courses and the remaining 10 units are student-selected electives. The curriculum of the hybrid modality and graduation requirements mirror exactly those of the onsite program, as do the student-level, course-level, and program-level learning objectives. As such, graduates will demonstrate competency in the areas identified by the California Bar in becoming effective and ethical members of the legal profession, consistent with an entry-level practitioner. The first two years of study prepare students for more advanced law classes while developing their skills in communication, organization, and articulation. Courses in the third and fourth years continue to develop and refine the students' expertise in interpreting and applying legal theories (*Guideline 6.7*).

A. PROGRAM DELIVERY

The LLS hybrid modality is structured as 75% online and 25% on-ground. The online components are asynchronous and the on-ground requirements are face-to-face class meetings scheduled on a monthly basis. This equates to once-a-month weekend meetings for the typical 16-week course. Six-week, 2-unit summer courses involve one end-of-term full weekend. One-unit elective courses will be taught fully online. This percentage was based on maximizing the flexibility and affordances of online learning while maintaining the benefits of the onsite experience. It represents a general pattern that has a proven record of success for working adults for more than two decades among general graduate programs.(e.g. [Pepperdine University](#), [The Fletcher School](#), [The University of Florida](#)).

Students first meet most of the faculty even before they begin classes in a first-year orientation. Additionally, every hybrid course meets onsite at the end of the first week of instruction, giving students and faculty an opportunity to calibrate expectations, form study groups, and further cohere as a cohort.

To ensure consistency, all sections of a given course-- whether fixed-facility or hybrid-- will employ the same text, curriculum standards, and exam policies. Final exams and any other key assignments mapped to program learning outcomes will also be the same across both modalities for examination and grading calibration, and ongoing program evaluation and improvement purposes.

LLS offers—and requires—a variety of practical skills courses as a part of its curriculum. ***Students are required to complete 15 units of practical skills courses, which include the following:***

- Advanced Legal Research and Writing (2 units)
- Advanced Professional Responsibility (2 units)
- Applied Legal Reasoning (3 units)

- Legal Analysis (3 units)
- Moot Court (2 units)
- Trial Advocacy (3 units).

The School also offers a variety of *practical skills elective courses* which include the following:

- Alternative Dispute Resolution/Negotiations (1 or 2 units)
- Civil Law Pleading and Practice (2 units)
- Criminal Law Pleading and Practice (2 units)
- Law Practice Management (1 unit)
- Statutory Construction and Legislative Intent (1 or 2 units)
- Street Law (2 units)
- Taking and Defending Depositions (1 unit)

The School also encourages its students to acquire practical experience in the legal field by performing legal duties under the supervision of an attorney. Generally, third- and fourth-year students are eligible for Legal Internship units. Second-year students and students on academic probation must receive approval from the dean before registering for these units. A maximum of four units of elective credit is allowed on a credit/no credit basis.

LLS has long (even pre-Covid) notified students of internship opportunities electronically, and students are always free to obtain internships independently through other avenues. As such, students taking the program in the online modality will have the same access to those taking on-ground courses.

B. ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT

While each course has its own unique needs, the standard structure of online academic engagement activities will include four primary components: Input (reading, viewing, listening); Processing (identifying, discussing, debating, etc. new “inputted” concepts and content); Self-assessment (formative assessment of new content with robust feedback on responses); Engagement (student output based on application of new content knowledge; whether face-to-face or online, involves substantive student-to-student and instructor-to-student interaction).

It is important to highlight that online legal study does not lessen the required level of commitment and engagement from the student. The fixed-facility J.D. program requires a student to spend minimally 2-3 hours preparation per week for each unit carried by a given course, and an additional hour of class attendance for each unit (e.g. 6-9 hours of prep for a 3-unit course with 3 hours of class meeting

time). These requirements apply equally to the hybrid J.D. modality¹. The difference is in how the attendance hours are validated.

The components of the lessons delivered through the Populi learning management system (LMS) have been explicitly designed to include formative self-assessment and weekly processing and engagement assignments that involve regular, effective communication activities. Students are required to complete these active-learning assignments and activities to qualify for “attendance”. Students receive both holistic and individual feedback on these activities from their instructor. In many assignment cases, required student-to-student interaction also provides peer feedback and supports the development of a community of inquiry within the cohort.

While the curriculum, sequencing of courses, SLOs and PLOs, key assignments and final exams are the same across the two modalities, the hybrid design presents several significant distinctions intended to further support student success. These differences include:

A consistent pattern of the four “learning stages” (input, process, assess, apply) is applied weekly within a course and across all courses in this modality.

Required weekly self-assessments that formatively build students mastery of introduced content while providing learners with additional practice with Bar-style questions. Students do not receive credit for completing these self-assessments until they have reached a score of 85% or higher.

Multiple weekly due dates (typically mid- and end-week) for discussion posts to ensure regular, sustained student engagement with the content and with peers.

The asynchronous, online modality affords (and validates) that *all* students actively participate in every assignment. The time constraints of fixed-facility instruction (non-technology-enhanced) does not provide similar affordances.

C. HYBRID MODALITY CURRICULUM MAPPING

Overview

As a new *modality* (versus a new *program*), the course offerings, sequencing, and graduation requirements for the proposed hybrid delivery option are *identical* to the current, long-sanctioned and accredited LLS program. Both the current and proposed modalities meet or exceed the California Bar requirements as illustrated in the following tables.

¹ Rice University. *How Much Should We Assign? Estimating Out of Class Workload*. Course Workload Estimator. <https://cte.rice.edu/blogarchive/2016/07/11/workload>

Table 1: LLS Curriculum Mapping to Minimum CA Bar Requirements

	CA Bar	LLS On Ground	LLS Hybrid
Min instructional hours 6.5 (A)	1200	1290	1290
Minimum semester units 6.5 (A)	80	86 ¹	86 ²
Minimum semester unit requirement (hours) 6.5 (A)	45	48	48
Definition of 1 hour of instruction 6.5 (D) (3)	50 mins	50 mins	60 mins (for workload estimation purposes)
Required verified academic engagement (VAE) 6.5 (A)	400	430	>430 ³
Form(s) of VAE 6.5 (B)		On-ground classroom meetings 7.11 (C) (1)	Weekly submissions of assignments and exams, and weekend on-ground classroom sessions 7.11 (B) (1 & 4-7) 7.11 (C)(2) ²
Attendance 6.5 (C)	≥80%	≥80%	≥80%
Form(s) of attendance validation		Classroom presence	Instructor- and gradebook-validated submission of assignments and exams ²

D. Verified Academic Engagement

The very nature of instructor-facilitated, student-engaged online learning generally ensures a greater level of validatable accountability in the learning process than does the traditional classroom instruction modality because a student cannot be “present” without submitting quantifiable output. In the LLS online modality, students are weekly required to account for their reading assignments through a “Process” assignment; “Self-Assess” through bar exam-type questions, cases or problems; and “Apply” by presenting briefs, analyzing problems, etc. Almost all (excluding students’ on-ground classroom sessions) student output is captured, documented, and in one or more of many forms (specific, holistic, peer) give and receive feedback, reflection, and assessment.

Calculating workload

Table 2 illustrates the distribution of hours of minimum required workload for the hybrid courses across the 16-week semester. The yellow columns (Weeks 1, 5, 9 and 13) are those in which students and faculty meet on-ground, on campus. Per

² 76 required; 10 elective

³ See Verified Academic Engagement narrative and Distribution of Workload by Unit below for details

Cal Bar guideline 6.5(A), each course unit requires a minimum of 3 hours of workload, with 1 of those hours involving verified academic engagement (33% of workload is verified). In an on-ground course, that verified academic engagement is accounted for by classroom attendance and the remaining 2 hours are typically accounted for through homework assignments (33% of workload is verified). In the LLS hybrid modality, 4 hours per semester for each credit unit is accounted for through class attendance, and the remaining 44 hours through validatable online activities and assignments. In other words, in the hybrid modality, 100% of the minimum required workload is verifiable and verified.

Table 2: Distribution of Workload by Units

Week Units	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
3 Hours	F2F	OL	OL	OL	F2F	OL	OL	OL	F2F	OL	OL	OL	F2F	OL	OL	OL
	3 F2F + 6 OL	9	9	9	3 F2F + 6 OL	9	9	9	3 F2F + 6 OL	9	9	9	3 F2F + 6 OL	9	9	9
2 Hours	F2F	OL	OL	OL	F2F	OL	OL	OL	F2F	OL	OL	OL	F2F	OL	OL	OL
	2 F2F + 4 OL	6	6	6	2 F2F + 4 OL	6	6	6	2 F2F + 4 OL	6	6	6	2 F2F + 4 OL	6	6	6

Rice University's Center for Teaching Excellence first produced a [meta-analysis](#) of student reading and writing rates based on variables such as type/genre of document, page density, writing and reading purposes (scanning, understanding, applying), etc. From that research, they created a [course workload estimator](#), which has been further enhanced by the Center for Advancement of Teaching at Wake Forest University. It is this estimator that LLS typically employs to establish the LLS expectations of academic engagement in the online modality.

Example weekly course workload estimation

Table 3 provides an example of one of many forms of a weekly curriculum and how the associated workload is estimated. This sample represents selected examples for each of the four standard assignment categories: Read, Process, Self-Assess, and Apply. The range of assignment options for these categories, however, includes many options beyond these represented here.

Table 3: Sample 3-Unit Course Workload Estimation

WEEK 2: Online			
Assignment Group/Function	Assignment	Time Estimate	Time Calculations
Read/Input	Read pp. 25-77	3 hours	30 pp @400 wpp @ 17 pp/hour Many new concepts; reading for understanding
Process	Discussion: Key Concept	2 hours	.75 hours writing ½ page argument; no drafting 1.25 hours reading classmates' posts, adding to own outline and posting to discussion
Process Assignment Details	1) Reference a key concept by quoting sentence, term, etc. and formally cite location in text. Describe in your own words the significance of this selection in the context of this week's reading. Alternatively , cite an item that you do not fully understand. Include the questions you have. 2) Review classmates' posts and create a study outline from all of the key points from the assigned reading. 3) Post your outline to DB before end of week.		
Self Assess	Assignment submission: Chapter 2 Self-Assessment 44 questions	1.6 hours	These quiz items are designed to generally reflect the types of questions students will encounter on the Bar exam. <i>LLS starts with the Bar's 33 questions per hour standard in calculating student engagement for this category of assignments and then adds another 20% to account for time to repeat the test to 85%</i>
Self Assess Assignment Details	These weekly self assessments provide students the opportunity to master new concepts, cases, processes, etc. introduced during the week in preparation for both the course summative assessment (typically a midterm & final exam) as well as provide practice for Bar-style questions. To get any credit for this assignment, students must accomplish a score of 85% or higher. They may re-take the quiz as many times as necessary to attain that score. Striving for a score of 100% each week will only serve to better ensure they have mastered the new content.		
Apply	Discussion: Written presentation of a brief	3+ hours	1.5 hours write 1-page brief 1-page and post .5+ hours review selected classmates' posts 1+ hour write minimum 2 minimum ½ page responses to classmates' posts
Apply Assignment Details	Instructor-assign or student-select a case and write a brief in instructor-designated format. Review and comment on at least 2 briefs of cases other than students' own.		

E. FACULTY

The current LLS faculty consists of one full-time and 26 adjunct professors. This high part-time profile is by design to ensure the faculty body has the relevant professional experience to provide context for the substantive material they teach, and provides LLS students with the authentic, real-time application of the law. The Senior Faculty Review Committee endorses recruiting mostly new faculty to teach the online courses, recognizing that the online modality requires a different level of faculty engagement, time commitment, and expertise to ensure a quality student learning experience is maintained.

While there may be some overlap of instructors across the two modalities, it is anticipated that the online courses will be staffed with faculty hired specifically for their interest in and/or experience with online instruction. Current faculty have been extended the opportunity to teach online if they are so inclined; however, it is not expected that many will choose to teach in the online modality.

Online faculty will be oriented into LLS through a meeting with the Dean to discuss teaching practices, textbook selection, grading policies, and other topics of interest. This meeting is supplemented with a copy of the LLS Faculty Handbook. These are the same processes in place for onsite faculty members. All faculty members will be required to participate in Committee of Bar Examiners (CBE) exam answer calibration meetings that ensure bar examination grading is consistent. This is a change policy and will be applied to onsite faculty as well. Although voluntary, prior participation in CME meetings has been good and the change is not in reaction to a concern, but rather is intended to ensure continued quality and consistency of grading across both program forms. Online J.D. faculty will be required to attend the same conferences and faculty meetings as do the current on ground instructors. The expectation that they attend graduation ceremonies and participate in student activities such as mixers, spring dinner dance, faculty/student basketball games, and graduation dinner applies to all faculty, whether they teach online or on-ground.

Online J.D. faculty will also have full standing to participate in faculty committee actions as described in the LLS Faculty Handbook, including:

- The Senior Faculty Review Committee, primarily tasked with curriculum review and development, will comprise both on-ground and online faculty.
- The Assessment Committee, tasked with ongoing review and revision of student learning objectives and outcomes.

Hybrid faculty will have all the same access to and responsibilities for monitoring and assessing student progress as current on-ground instructors do. In both modalities, faculty are expected to work in collaboration with the LLS Registrar and Student Services to track student progress, and note and follow up with

students who are not performing in a manner that will ensure their successful completion of the course.

F. EXPECTED BENEFITS

First, the expansion of the JD program via online offerings will enable LLS to expand access to our J.D. program to a range of qualified candidates who may otherwise-- due to time commitments, learning differences, and other variables⁴ -- be unable to pursue such studies in current on-ground fashion.

Second, online J.D. offerings were increasing prior to the pandemic; the concomitant lockdown has provided a laboratory for highlighting some of the significant challenges that quickly constructed online learning has to offer.⁵ More importantly, though, it has also validated to many institutions and individuals (administrators, faculty and students), the long-term viability-- and indeed some of the unique benefits-- of well-designed online learning. The rise of hybrid and online programs from other law schools is creating an increasingly competitive marketplace that is no longer bound by geography.⁶ As this interest drives enrollments further, LLS anticipates needing to match its offerings to this modality to meet student demand and maintain long-term enrollment sustainability. Indeed, many current LLS students have indicated an interest in switching to an online option if provided.

A third benefit is in the potential of an online modality to *improve* upon the strengths of the current program and student outcomes through the application of best practices in learning theory leveraged through technology.⁷ Traditional J.D. courses consist primarily of lectures, reading, and summative testing. The LLS curriculum has been admirably successful with this approach as the following bar exam results demonstrate⁸:

- Cumulative pass rate: 59.83%
- October 2020 first-time taker pass rate: 59%
- October 2020 repeat takers pass rate: 35%
- July 2019 first-time taker pass rate: 32%
- July 2019 repeat takers pass rate: 25%

As detailed in section 4 below, through thoughtful revisioning of this approach for the online environment, students will reap the benefits of multiple formative

⁴ Rodriguez, Alicita. *Did Some Students Benefit from the Switch to Remote Learning?* Colorado University Denver, July 7, 2020, <https://news.ucdenver.edu/did-some-students-benefit-from-the-switch-to-remote-learning/>.

⁵ Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. *OECD Policy Response to Coronavirus (COVID-19): The Potential of online learning for adults: Early lessons from the COVID-19 crisis*. OECD, July 24, 2020, <https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/the-potential-of-online-learning-for-adults-early-lessons-from-the-covid-19-crisis-ee040002/>

⁶ Olson, Elizabeth. *Law Schools Are Going Online to reach New Students*. The New York Times, June 22, 2016. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/23/education/law-schools-are-going-online-to-reach-new-students.html>

⁷ Kleiman, Glenn M. *We can make online learning a positive force in education*. EdSource, May 18, 2020, <https://edsource.org/2020/we-can-make-online-learning-a-positive-force-in-education/631852>.

⁸ The significant change between July 2019 and October 2020 is in part due to the changes the bar made to the cut score.

assessments, gain more time in the *application* of learned content, and receive more practice and feedback throughout all their courses in practical skills, including writing in particular.

PROGRAM DESIGN PROCESS

LLS contracted Dr. LeeAnn Stone to serve as the instructional design expert to guide both administration and faculty in developing the online modality in accordance with best practices for distance education and WASCU standards. Dr. Stone met regularly with administrative leadership regarding the overarching process to develop and implement the online modality. Dr. Stone also presented regularly to the faculty review team to provide expertise on utilizing a technology-leveraged/student-implemented approach rather than a technology-delivered approach. Additionally, she guided the faculty review team on connecting the standards of regular and substantive interaction amongst students and between faculty and students to the delivery components of an online modality. (Addendum § B)

IMPLEMENTATION

LLS plans to begin offering the hybrid elective course, Introduction to Legal Studies, beginning spring of 2022. To ensure the program grows strategically, LLS plans to roll out the full range of online options over a four-year period, as the first cohort proceeds through the program. The intent of this phased approach is to provide sufficient time, faculty and institutional development, and resources to ensure course design and delivery meets the highest standards of best practices in legal online instruction. The phased implementation also allows LLS to build out the hybrid J.D faculty team over time, ensuring each new faculty member is well oriented into the school, its student-centered andrological approach, and the LMS and technical components of course delivery.

LLS has reviewed recent and historical enrollment trends, applicant inquiries, and changes to the school's admission policies to forecast future enrollment projections. LLS conservatively anticipates a fall first-year enrollment cohort goal of 30 students will provide the critical mass necessary to support a robust communities of inquiry cohort, and to sustain the four-year roll out period. For the subsequent two years, 2023 and 2024, LLS conservatively projects a first-year fall cohort enrollment of 45 students.

COMPLIANCE WITH GUIDELINES

Division 1: General Provisions

LLS has reviewed its policies and procedures pertaining to Division 1 and determined no changes are necessary.

Division 2: Honesty and Integrity

LLS has reviewed its policies, procedures, and services pertaining to Division 2. Other than the guidelines noted below, no other changes are necessary.

2.10 Statement of Provided Student Services, Experience, and Activities; Adequate Support and Resources for Provided Services, and Activities.

LLS provides a wide array of student support services that are designed to support student achievement, student persistence, foster LLS's values of inclusion, respect for all people and their ideas, and create an environment where people may achieve their personal and professional goals. The addition of an online modality demands that LLS ensure those services be available to online students in a manner that ensures online students have access to services and that the mode of delivery of services is effective. As such LLS reviewed all student support services to meet its responsibility and ensure the student experience for all its students, onsite or online, is accessible and effective. The review process resulted in LLS' decision to add the West Academic Study Aid Collection to its support services thus offering students 24/7 accessibility to academic resources, student support, and career-based support resources. (Addendum § A, Section 8)

Students begin utilizing the Populi platform from the application stage of their journey with LLS. As they progress from applicant to enrolled student, their access within the system expands and course pages and resource links become accessible. Additionally, LLS provides training to students during first-year orientation to ensure students have knowledge of support services available and ability to access the supplemental resources links within Populi.

Division 3: Governance

LLS has reviewed its policies and procedures pertaining to Division 3 and determined no changes are necessary.

Division 4: Dean, Full-Time Administrator, and Faculty

LLS has reviewed its policies, procedures, and services pertaining to Division 4. Other than the guidelines noted below, no other changes are necessary.

4.1 Law School Dean; full-time Administrator; Registrar Duties.

(A): The current LLS faculty consists of one full-time Dean and 26 adjunct professors. This high part-time profile is by design to ensure the faculty body has the relevant professional experience to provide context for the substantive material they teach and provides LLS students with the authentic, real-time application of the law. Recognizing that the online modality requires a different level of faculty engagement, time commitment, and expertise to ensure a quality student learning experience is maintained, LLS is recruiting mostly new faculty to teach the hybrid courses. In the recruitment of hybrid faculty members, LLS will retain the same standards and processes for review of applicants as it has done successfully for 50 years with its onsite faculty. All faculty are required to be a member in good standing with the California state board or another state bar, holding a J.D. from an accredited institution. (Addendum § A, Section 7)

4.2 Faculty Participation in Formulation, implementation, and administration of Academic and Non-Academic Policies and Programs.

LLS has revised all policies pertaining to faculty participation and made the necessary changes to committee composition and policies to ensure hybrid faculty have equal standing within the institution.

Division 5: Admissions

LLS has reviewed its policies and procedures pertaining to Division 5 and determined no changes are necessary.

Division 6: Academics

LLS has reviewed its policies, procedures, and services pertaining to Division 6. Other than the guidelines noted below, no other changes are necessary.

6.5 (A) Minimum Requirements for the Juris Doctor; time Requirements for Completion of Course of Study.

The hybrid J.D. offered at LLS as designed complies with time requirements standards in both academic units and hours of verified academic engagement. (Addendum § A, Section 5)

6.5 (B) Academic Engagement

The design and efficacy planning for the hybrid J.D. modality includes an instructional structure that ensures course planning and implementation for online courses maintains appropriate levels of academic engagement and rigor. (Addendum § A, Section 5)

6.5 (C) Attendance

Current attendance policies include the hybrid J.D. modality. Attendance in these online courses is validated through participation in and completion of specified course assignments.

6.5 (D) Curriculum

The academic calendar at LLS will be the same for the hybrid J.D. modality. As LLS pursues eligibility to participate in Title IV Federal Financial Aid Programs, a uniform academic calendar eases administrative burden. LLS will continue to utilize a semester system with two academic semesters each year of 16 weeks in length and a summer term of 6 weeks.

Credit hour policy remains unchanged, and the instructional structure ensures online course components maintain appropriate levels of academic engagement and rigor.

6.5 (E-M)

LLS has reviewed its policies and procedures pertaining to Division 6.5 (E-M) and determined no changes are necessary.

6.5 (N) Class Size

It is the policy of LLS to limit the number of enrolled students to ensure teaching effectiveness. Consideration for class size includes the physical facilities, faculty loads, and interaction among students. LLS anticipates it may need to divide a hybrid class into multiple sections or groups not exceeding 30 students to allow for substantive student interaction with fellow classmates and the professor.

As mentioned earlier, to ensure consistency, all sections of a given course-- whether fixed-facility or hybrid-- will employ the same text, curriculum standards, exam policies. Final exams and any other key assignments mapped to program learning outcomes will also be the same

across both modalities to ensure consistency in examinations and grading and ongoing program evaluation and improvement.

Guideline 6.7 Content of Curriculum

The hybrid J.D. modality mirrors the current fixed facility J.D. program and thus meets the curriculum offerings, units per course, and graduation requirements as set forth in rule 4.160(E) and Guideline 6.7. (Addendum § A, Section 5)

Guideline 6.8 Balanced and Comprehensive Course of Study

The hybrid J.D. modality mirrors the current fixed facility J.D. modality and thus meets the curriculum offerings, units per course, and graduation requirements as set forth in rule 4.160(E) and Guideline 6.8. (Addendum § A, Section 5)

Guideline 6.9 Practical Skills

The hybrid J.D. modality mirrors the current fixed facility J.D. program and thus meets the curriculum offerings, units per course, and graduation requirements as set forth in rule 4.160(E) and Guideline 6.9. (Addendum § A, Section 5)

The School requires and offers a variety of practical skills courses, as a part of its curriculum. Students are required to complete 15 units of practical skills courses. The School also offers an additional 11-16 units of practical skills elective courses, including Legal Internships, which are optional. All 2- or more-unit hybrid courses will meet monthly for on-ground sessions. One-unit elective courses (with the exception of Legal Internships), will be administered fully online.

Guideline 6.10 Student Interaction

Regular and substantive interaction between faculty and students and amongst students is key to student persistence and achievement. LLS's approach to supporting and facilitating student engagement is built into the hybrid J.D. through policy, syllabi requirements, and standards for formative assessment (Addendum § A, Section 5). Furthermore, LLS has reviewed all student support services to ensure supportive interaction is also accessible and effective for hybrid students (Addendum § A, Section 8).

Guidelines 6.11 - 6.14 Examinations and Grading

LLS has long utilized ExamSoft to administer its examinations; this is the same software utilized to administer the October 2020 and February 2021 California Bar Examinations. When COVID-19 introduced the need to deliver proctored examinations remotely, the bar approved the additional use of ExamSoft's ExamID and ExamMonitor features.

Use of these features precipitated the establishment of several new administrative policies, coordinated by the Registrar. Students are required to complete an *Acknowledgment and Acceptance of Testing Conditions from and Release of Liability* and an *Acknowledgement & Acceptance of Testing Conditions* form prior to taking their exams each semester.

Once on-campus classes resume, LLS will continue the use of ExamSoft as per pre-COVID-19 policy, and with the current remote processes (ExamID and ExamMonitor with the Acknowledgment and Acceptance of Testing Conditions from and Release of Liability,

Acknowledgement & Acceptance of Testing Conditions form) for hybrid J.D. student examinations.

Division 7: Scholastic Standards

LLS has reviewed its policies and procedures pertaining to Division 7 and determined no changes are necessary.

Division 8: Library Requirements

LLS has reviewed its policies and procedures pertaining to Division 8 and determined no changes are necessary.

The School had previously maintained a hard copy and online library through Westlaw. However, in September 2019 it added the online library LexisNexis in addition to Westlaw.

Division 9: Physical Resources

LLS has reviewed its policies, procedures, and services pertaining to Division 9. Other than the guidelines noted below, no other changes are necessary.

9.1 Physical and Infrastructure Requirements

LLS will retain its physical presence in Sacramento, CA and utilize such facilities for administrative purposes as well as fixed facility instructional needs. The learning management system that will be utilized for the hybrid modality will be administered from the Sacramento location.

9.3 Instructional Equipment; Resources and Procedures to Address Technology-related Problems

After extensive review and consideration, it was determined that the current Populi platform, which provides LLS with a comprehensive and fully-integrated college management system, has the necessary functionality to support online course delivery. The course functionality within Populi supports the full range of learning objects and functionalities necessary to deliver a robust online course including lesson delivery, discussion boards, tests and assignments, embedded syllabi, in-course chat, and resource links. As Populi is currently widely used across LLS as both an LMS and an administrative management system, there is a high level of institutional comfort and knowledge with utilizing the platform. By building upon this institutional knowledge and familiarity, LLS will be able to meet the needs of online course offerings without the burden of a steep learning curve for faculty, staff, and administrators (Addendum § A, Section 10).

Division 10: Financial Resources

LLS has already invested in the technology, facilities, and library infrastructure to support our existing students, leaving few additional costs to be incurred by offering the J.D. in the hybrid modality. The primary additional costs are in course development, payroll expenses for the hybrid faculty members, and additional marketing expenditures. The current administrative staff has the capacity to support all back-office functions needed to support the modality expansion. Lincoln projects there is significant potential to increase revenue over the long term through the growth of this program.

LLS administration has performed an analysis of the anticipated revenues and expenses for the hybrid modality's initial years. The enrollment estimates utilized are very conservative and are derived from historical trends, applicant inquiries, and changes to admissions policies. Expenses, especially when compared to operations during the pandemic, are considerably lower. This is due to leveraging investments already made as well as the ability to plan for the transition.

Revenue projections assume a starting class of 30 which generates revenue sufficient to cover all *direct costs* in the first year, resulting in a *revenue neutral* start to the program. Projected enrollment growth is limited to 15 students in each subsequent year of the programs' initial budget. Even under this conservative approach to the growth of the program, it is anticipated that the program will generate net profit by the end of its 2nd year.

LLS has a robust cash reserve component that has been built over 50 years of operations. Should any unexpected costs arise, LLS has the resources and reserves to support arising needs the hybrid modality may require from its ongoing operations.

Division 11: Records and Reports

LLS has reviewed its policies and procedures pertaining to Division 11 and determined no changes are necessary.

Division 12: Minimum, Cumulative Bar Examination Pass Rate

LLS has reviewed its policies and procedures pertaining to Division 12 and determined no changes are necessary.

Reporting and tracking of passage rates will include disaggregated analysis between the modalities of study to support continuous improvement cycles and institutional effectiveness reviews.

Division 13: Awarding of Professional Degrees in Addition to the J.D. Degree

LLS does not award degrees other than the J.D.

Division 14: Equal Opportunity and Non-Discrimination

LLS remains committed to its policies and procedures to ensure equal opportunity and non-discrimination. All policies and procedures have been reviewed to ensure applicability to hybrid students and faculty.

Division 15: Opening and Operating a Branch or Satellite Campus

Not applicable at the current time. LLS does not operate, nor does it plan to operate, a branch or satellite campus.



Lincoln Law School of Sacramento Hybrid Juris Doctor Program Proposal

April, 2021

1 BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

Lincoln Law School of Sacramento (LLS) seeks approval to add an online modality to its current Juris Doctor (J.D.) program. Two inextricable purposes-- expanding access and meeting students' interests-- drive this change. The typical LLS student is balancing multiple responsibilities outside of their law studies that may include raising children, caring for dependents, and working full-time jobs. Approximately half of the student body comprises individuals from historically underrepresented groups. LLS was founded on a mission of offering access to a high-quality, accessible law school to working adults in an era when night school was essentially the only viable option. Given the ubiquity of digital technologies, and the proven ways in which they can be leveraged to advance teaching and learning, an online program is now another viable option for LLS's student demographic. Prospective students know this and are seeking programs that offer this additional flexibility¹.

Once it became evident that an increasing number of potential students were interested in online options for completing their J.D., the LLS Administration began a market study to make an initial assessment as to the feasibility of such at LLS. This included a review of existing models of hybrid and online offerings, and research into best practices in online teaching and learning with a deeper dive into computer-assisted legal instruction. The goal was to discover models that ensured students acquired basic skills necessary for the successful practice of law and maintained a focus on preparing students for the bar exam.

As this document will detail, the addition of an online modality will provide LLS with several benefits. First, the expansion of the J.D. program via online offerings will enable LLS to expand access to our J.D. program to a range of qualified candidates who may otherwise-- due to time commitments, learning differences, and other variables²-- be unable to pursue such studies in current on-ground fashion.

Second, online J.D. offerings were building prior to the pandemic; the concomitant lockdown has provided a laboratory for highlighting some of the significant challenges that quickly-constructed online learning has to offer.³ More importantly, though, it has also validated to many institutions and individuals (administrators, faculty and students), the long-term viability-- and indeed some of the unique benefits-- of well-designed online learning. The rise of hybrid and online programs from other law schools is creating an increasingly competitive marketplace that is no longer bound by geography.⁴ The pandemic of the last year has advanced this shift further as schools have had to create viable ways to continue preparing their previously site-bound enrolled

¹ Inquiries and feedback from prospective students in recent years have demonstrated an interest in online options to provide additional flexibility in meeting their needs and helping support their law school persistence and completion.

² Rodriguez, Alicita. *Did Some Students Benefit from the Switch to Remote Learning?* Colorado University Denver, July 7, 2020, <https://news.ucdenver.edu/did-some-students-benefit-from-the-switch-to-remote-learning/>.

³ Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. *OECD Policy Response to Coronavirus (COVID-19): The Potential of online learning for adults: Early lessons from the COVID-19 crisis*. OECD, July 24, 2020, <https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/the-potential-of-online-learning-for-adults-early-lessons-from-the-covid-19-crisis-ee040002/>

⁴ Olson, Elizabeth. *Law Schools Are Going Online to reach New Students*. The New York Times, June 22, 2016. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/23/education/law-schools-are-going-online-to-reach-new-students.html>

students.⁵ As this interest drives enrollments further, LLS anticipates needing to match its offerings to this modality to meet student demand and maintain long-term enrollment sustainability. Indeed, many current LLS students have indicated an interest in switching to an online option if provided.

A third benefit is in the potential of an online program to *improve* upon the strengths of the current program and student outcomes through the application of best practices in learning theory leveraged through technology.⁶ Traditional J.D. courses consist primarily of lectures, reading, and summative testing. The LLS curriculum has been admirably successful with this approach (exceeding the minimum bar pass rate)) across its 50+ years. As detailed in section 4 below, through thoughtful revisioning of this approach for the *online* environment, we anticipate students reaping additional benefits from multiple formative assessments and gaining more time in the *application* of learned content.

To summarize the rationale for this proposed change: The online modality will further LLS's goal of supporting non-traditional law school students in pursuit of their J.D. by lowering barriers to access and persistence. The online program will expand such access and flexibility without compromising academic rigor. Furthermore, the expanded modality offerings will provide LLS with long-term enrollment levels necessary to ensure institutional sustainability.

⁵ DiChello, Taylor. *Coronavirus conversion: Will online law school classes become a permanent change?* ABA For Law Students, March 26, 2020. <https://abaforlawstudents.com/2020/03/26/will-online-law-school-classes-become-a-permanent-change/>

⁶ Kleiman, Glenn M. *We can make online learning a positive force in education.* EdSource, May 18, 2020, <https://edsource.org/2020/we-can-make-online-learning-a-positive-force-in-education/631852>.

2 PROCESS

Overview

Developing the online program was a campus-wide initiative. After the initial assessment of feasibility was completed, the administrative team agreed to proceed, a faculty review committee composed of members from the Senior Faculty Review and Assessment Committees was formed, and an instructional design expert, Dr. LeeAnn Stone, was contracted to lead administrative and faculty teams through the process of adapting the current J.D. program to an online one that would retain academic rigor and meet distance education standards set forth by the Committee of Bar Examiners of the State Bar of California and the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). In the process of ensuring the online modality would meet standards, administrative teams conducted reviews of policy and procedures to ensure the LLS experience for online students and faculty will be equitable. This initial feasibility research culminated in a presentation to the board of directors.

Timeline

In 2019 an idea and discussion between the Executive Director and Chief Executive Officer began in response to a noticeable increase in the number of prospective students inquiring about online or online offerings at LLS. This led to the administrative team undertaking a market study to form an initial feasibility assessment. The inquiry was shaped to determine how the emergence of online and online J.D. programs were influencing the marketplace currently served by LLS. The findings indicated increasing levels of competition within the market which could ultimately result in LLS facing competition from law schools beyond the geographic boundaries of its traditional service area.

The market analysis led to a deeper study of the delivery models being utilized by various law schools. In this process, the focus was on comparing the range of existing models with the current LLS model. The goal was to identify the options for programmatic delivery that would best align with the LLS mission, educational objectives, and institutional culture. It was concluded that a fully online modality would eliminate one of the differentiating qualities of the LLS experience, which is face-to-face interaction with a faculty body comprising working (and recently retired legal professionals such as judges, advocates, district attorneys, etc. Furthermore, multiple research studies have proven that *hybridizing* the online learning experience provides students the “best of both” (online and on-ground) learning experiences in terms of outcomes and retention.⁷ Thus, a curriculum comprising mostly online instruction combined with regular (later defined as monthly) on-campus meetings was deemed the instructional model that would best meet student’s needs, support enrollment sustainability, better ensure retention in an instructional mode that typically reports high attrition, and maintain foundational components of the LLS student experience.

⁷US Department of Education Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development. *Evaluation of Evidence-Based Practices in Online Learning: A Meta Analysis and Review of Online Learning Studies*, Washington, DC, 2009.

In January 2021, the faculty review committee team composed of James Schiavenza (Dean, Torts), Robert Gold (Criminal Law), Hon. Marcie Larson (Administrative Law and Real Property), Hon. Jill Talley (Remedies), William Wright (Constitutional Law), and Filomena Yeroshek (Professional Responsibility and Advanced Professional Responsibility) was convened. The idea of an online modality was presented by James Smolich (CEO) and Brittney Adkins-Neuman (Executive Director) along with reference materials of programs offered by competing institutions. The faculty review team was asked to provide feedback on how closely the proposed online program should mirror the onsite program and what an effective online program for LLS would look like.

At the same time, LLS contracted Dr. LeeAnn Stone to serve as the curriculum design expert to guide both administration and faculty in developing the online program modality in accordance with best practices for distance education, the Committee of Bar Examiners of the State Bar of California and WSCUC standards. Dr. Stone met regularly with administrative leadership regarding the overarching process to develop and implement the online development and the concomitant training, support, and other functions required to deliver a viable online option. Dr. Stone also presented regularly to the faculty review team to provide expertise on utilizing a technology-leveraged/student- implemented approach as opposed to a “canned” technology-delivered approach. Additionally, she guided the faculty review team on connecting the standards of regular and substantive interaction among students and between faculty and students in substantive, engaging, and meaningful ways that provide a parallel to the successful activities presented in the on-ground courses. Dr. Stone’s expertise provided a clear pathway for LLS’s professional, full time legal practitioners to deliver meaningful and effective learning and attain expected learning outcomes, through a student-centered, faculty-facilitated approach.

With fundamental planning questions such as program delivery and faculty utilization determined, the administrative team worked to develop planning for student services, technology infrastructure, and financial models as the final piece for online feasibility.

The resulting plan envisions using the current program as the foundation and leveraging instructional technology in the design of a parallel set of course options to further open access, advance LLS viability in an era where online offerings are rapidly growing, and potentially even improve student success.

3 DESIGN AND EFFICACY

LLS's online modality shares all the same curricular and programmatic foundations as the "parent" on-ground program, including course offerings, sequencing, admission by cohort, graduation requirements, key assignments, student learning objectives, and program learning objectives. Online course design adapts LLS's long-successful instructional approach (average 59.83% first-time bar passage rate) by leveraging the affordances of online learning technologies and strategies in a hybrid model.

Research has consistently suggested that the hybrid format combines the best features of both the classroom and online learning environments.⁸ By harnessing the multiple affordances of face-to-face, online resources, discussion forums, etc., hybrid online learning experiences extend the ability of the individual learner to work with, take in, process, and create meaning around the content across time, rather than forcing the bulk of it into short weekly class meetings.^{9 10 11} The online portion of the course creates greater opportunities for students and instructors to have more frequent and meaningful interaction throughout the course while extending writing practice. Additionally, the responsibilities students are held to in terms of their own learning and intellectual discourse with their classmates further contributes to their preparation for future professional responsibilities.

At the top of the hybrid program's design structure is a general androgogical framework that comprises four sequential sections:

- **Input:** Reading, viewing and/or listening content introducing the new content, concepts, terminology, etc. of the lesson.
- **Process:** An assignment- typically in post-first discussion forum form- in which students identify, discuss and/or debate the value, meaning, application, etc. of details from the Input assignment. Advances "regular effective contact" in the online environment.
- **Self Assess:** Formative assessments with rich feedback. Students receive credit for completion of these unlimited-attempt quizzes once they attain at least 85% correct, further ensuring their acquisition of the lesson's content and providing continuous testing practice in preparation for the Bar exam.
- **Application:** Whether online or face-to-face during the monthly on-site class sessions, this stage always involves regular, effective contact as students engage with the lesson

⁸ US Department of Education Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, 2009.

⁹ Garnham, C., and Kaleta, R. (2002) *Introduction to hybrid courses. Teaching with Technology Today*, 8(6)
<http://www.uwsa.edu/ttt/articles/garnham.htm>

¹⁰ Garrison, D.R., and Vaughn, N.D. (2008). *Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

¹¹ Merriam, S.B., Carafella, R.S., and Baumgartner, L.M. (2007). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide*, 3rd edition. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

materials by putting the learned content into legal application as appropriate to the course.

Courses are designed through the collaboration of a subject matter expert (typically internal to the institution such as a current or newly-hired instructor) with an instructional designer. As the modality is developed, the Dean is also involved at both the design and authorization phases, providing an element of the faculty and institutional development. The curriculum designer guides the process, not just of course design, but of faculty and institutional development in terms of the needs, requirements, and affordances of online program delivery. In the initial online program development, the Dean, Executive Director, and Instructional Designer make final course approval.

4 CURRICULUM AND DELIVERY

The LLS hybrid program is structured as 75% online and 25% on-ground. This equates to once-a-month weekend meetings for the typical 16-week course. Six-week, 2-unit summer courses involve one end-of-term full weekend. One-unit elective courses will be delivered in a fully online modality.

This percentage was based on maximizing the flexibility and affordances of online learning while maintaining the benefits of the onsite experience. It represents a general pattern that has a proven record of success for working adults for more than two decades among general graduate programs.(e.g. [Pepperdine University](#), [The Fletcher School](#), [The University of Florida](#)).

The curriculum of the hybrid program and graduation requirements mirror exactly those of the onsite program, as do the student-level, course-level and program-level learning objectives. The difference lies in the technology-leveraged structure of the learning process for the online program. Given the explicitly designed learning structure, inclusion of required formative self-assessment, and weekly processing and engagement assignments that involve regular, effective communities of inquiry communication activities, the institution anticipates potentially higher levels of student achievement in the hybrid program. Although there is not yet significant research on the topic, the thoughtful imposition and oversight of proven strategic learning strategies on hybrid and online programs (such as formative activities and assessment; instructor facilitation of student understanding vs. lecturing; and communities of inquiry) may do more in informing improvement of onsite courses than carry-over of onsite practices does to improve learning in online courses.^{12 13 14}

The hybrid J.D. will follow the same curriculum plan as the [current onsite J.D. program](#) listed in the LLS catalog. For quick reference courses are listed on the following page. Additionally, to ensure consistency, all sections of a given course—whether fixed-facility or hybrid—will employ the same text, curriculum standards, and exam policies. Final exams and any other key assignments mapped to program learning outcomes will also be the same across both modalities to ensure consistency in examinations, grading, and ongoing program evaluation and improvement.

¹² Rodgers, Michael L. & Talbut, Mary Harriet. *Can Online Teaching Improve Face to Face Instruction?* Posted on Tomorrow's Professor Postings, Stanford University. <https://tomprof.stanford.edu/posting/1321>

¹³ Scagnoli, Norma I., Buki, Lydia P., & Johnson, Scott D. *The Influence of Online Teaching on Face-to-Face Teaching Practices*. University of Illinois at Urbana Champagne. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ862351.pdf>

¹⁴ Andres, D'Nita. *The Effect of Online Teaching on Faculty After Returning to the Traditional Classroom*. University of West Georgia Distance Education Center, Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, Volume XXI, Number 4, Winter 2018. <https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdl/winter214/andrewsgraham214.html>

First Year Electives

These electives are available only to students first enrolling in either spring or summer.

Course	Units
Introduction to Legal Studies	2
Laws & the Judicial System	2

First Year

Course	Units
Contracts	6
Criminal Law	4
Legal Writing	2
Professional Responsibility	2
Torts	6

Students take 2-4 units of elective courses during summer term.

Second Year

Course	Units
Civil Procedure	6
Criminal Procedure	4
Legal Research	2
Real Property	6

Students take Moot Court (2 units) and 2 units of elective courses during summer term.

Third Year

Course	Units
Community Property	2
Business Associations	4
Constitutional Law	6
Evidence	6

Students take 2-4 units of elective courses during summer term.

Fourth Year

Course	Units
Advanced Professional Responsibility	2
Legal Analysis	2
Remedies	4
Applied Legal Reasoning/Semantics	3
Trial Advocacy	3
Trusts	2
Wills	2

5 ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT

The curriculum at LLS -- whether onsite or online-- is designed to offer students a strong foundation in a variety of legal principles. The first two years of study prepare students for more advanced law courses, while developing skills in communication, organization, and articulation. Courses in the third and fourth years continue to develop and refine the students' expertise in interpreting and applying legal theories.

Students may begin study at LLS in spring, summer, or fall. Students entering in either spring or summer enroll in specially selected electives and begin the full First-Year curriculum the following Fall Semester. The Spring and Summer elective courses are designed to introduce law study and provide an opportunity for students to develop legal background and study skills before entering the more rigorous full First-Year curriculum.

Graduation Requirements

Students are eligible for the degree of Juris Doctor (J.D.) when they have completed the following: 1. A minimum of 86 semester units in accordance with the LLS' prescribed curriculum; 2. A grade point average of 2.00 or better during their final academic year and have a cumulative grade point average of 2.00 or better; and 3. A petition for graduation in their final semester.

Required Courses

Students are typically required to take a minimum of 9 units in both Fall and Spring Semesters and typically take 2-4 units in Summer Semesters. A total of 86 units are required for graduation, including 76 units of required courses (listed in the previous section) and 10 units of elective courses.

Credit Hour Policy

LLS operates under a semester credit hour, or "semester unit" system for both on-site and online courses. The credit hour is the unit of instruction used to quantify intended student learning outcomes and a way of measuring the academic time to which a class is equivalent. It represents the number of hours per week a student will be in class. Fall and Spring Semesters are 16 weeks in length with each on-site course meeting once a week for 3 hours of attendance. Summer Semester is 6 weeks in length with courses meeting twice a week for 3 hours each class night. This policy conforms with Federal, State, and Accrediting Agency Guidelines for credit hours and applies to all courses.

In the hybrid courses, attendance is demonstrated and validated through active participation in online class assignments, which have been calibrated for time-on-task equivalencies.¹⁵ These equivalencies are based primarily on research by Rice University.¹⁶ The institution's LMS

¹⁵ The "Apply" assignment group will typically be tagged for validating attendance as it incorporates "regular, effective" interaction and has similar time and tasks requirements for both online and F2F meeting options. This may vary depending on the nature of the course.

¹⁶ Rice University Center for Teaching Excellence. *How Much Should We Assign? Estimating Out of Class Workload*, 2016. <https://cte.rice.edu/blogarchive/2016/07/11/workload>

system, Populi, provides readily accessible data and reports on student progress, readily available to instructors and designated administrators at any time. Such tracking is useful not just for verifying student attendance, but more importantly perhaps, for identifying bumps or roadblocks to individual students' success, and to facilitate helpful remediation and support.

A hybrid syllabus template provides the framework within which each course develops the four-stage learning process (input, process, assess & apply) and the Master Course Syllabus for each course designates the curricular specifics of time-and-workload distribution.

* This space intentionally left blank *

WEEK 2: Online			
Assignment Group/Function	Assignment	Time Estimate	Time Calculations
Read/Input	Read pp. 25-77	3 hours	30 pp @400 wpp @ 17 pp/hour Many new concepts; reading for understanding
Process	Discussion: Key Concept	2 hours	.75 hours writing ½ page argument; no drafting 1.25 hours reading classmates' posts, adding to own outline and posting to discussion
Process Assignment Details	1) Reference a key concept by quoting sentence, term, etc. and formally cite location in text. Describe in your own words the significance of this selection in the context of this week's reading. Alternatively , cite an item that you do not fully understand. Include the questions you have. 2) Review classmates' posts and create a study outline from all of the key points from the assigned reading. 3) Post your outline to DB before end of week.		
Self Assess	Assignment submission: Chapter 2 Self-Assessment 44 questions	1.6 hours	These quiz items are designed to generally reflect the types of questions students will encounter on the Bar exam. <i>LLS starts with the Bar's 33 questions per hour standard in calculating student engagement for this category of assignments and then adds another 20% to account for time to repeat the test to 85%</i>
Self Assess Assignment Details	These weekly self assessments provide students the opportunity to master new concepts, cases, processes, etc. introduced during the week in preparation for both the course summative assessment (typically a midterm & final exam) as well as provide practice for Bar-style questions. To get any credit for this assignment, students must accomplish a score of 85% or higher. They may re-take the quiz as many times as necessary to attain that score. Striving for a score of 100% each week will only serve to better ensure they have mastered the new content.		
Apply	Discussion: Written presentation of a brief	3+ hours	1.5 hours write 1-page brief 1-page and post .5+ hours review selected classmates' posts 1+ hour write minimum 2 minimum ½ page responses to classmates' posts
Apply Assignment Details	Instructor-assign or student-select a case and write a brief in instructor-designated format. Review and comment on at least 2 briefs of cases other than students' own.		

Attendance Policy

An absence from class participation for 3 consecutive weeks (20% of a 16-week course) without consultation with the instructor or administration will result in Administrative Disqualification.

Verified Academic Engagement

LLS has employed *ExamSoft* for delivery and management of all course assessments for many years. Remediations applied to augment exam invigilation during the current pandemic-driven emergency move to online instruction have proven secure, safe, and relatively problem -free for students. These remediations have been so successful, in fact, that once on-ground courses reconvene, exams will continue to be delivered remotely, providing an even field for comparing on-ground and online student exam outcomes.

Verification of academic engagement for other, lower stakes, non-summative assessments is much less challenging in a well-designed course that includes multiple low-stakes and formative assessments as in the LLS hybrid design. Assignments such as discussion forums involving processing, debating, confirming, etc. in multiple steps throughout the week, significantly reduce the opportunities for cheating.

And it is precisely these types of learning activities that ensure regular, effective and substantive interaction among students and instructors. Two of the four assignment groups (Process and Application) typically require meaningful student-to-student communication with instructor guidance and facilitation.

6 STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT

The ultimate objective of the LLS J.D. program is to produce students who can pass the California bar exam and have attained the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to competently enter the practice of law. These outcomes are designed, measured, and tracked at the following levels:

- Institutional: [Program requirements](#) include the standard and necessary array of courses to provide students with the procedural knowledge, skills practice (writing, research, reasoning, oral communication) and values (professional and ethical responsibilities).
 - To measure the outcomes at the institutional level, program learning objectives are mapped to key assignments at their highest and most comprehensive level of performance and distributed across all 4 years of the curriculum.
 - Key assignments are all summative assessments represented by a range of formats (such as bench memo, final exam, mock trial, appellate brief, oral argument, and performance tests).
 - Key assignments are the same for on-ground and online courses and are an immutable component of the Master Course Outline for any course containing a mapped key assignment.
- Course level: Course-level student learning objectives are assessed by any of a variety of formative and summative assignments.
 - Course-level student learning objectives (SLOs) are mapped to their associated assessed assignment in their respective Master Course Outline.
 - Summative exams in the form of midterms and finals typically mimic bar exam question types and thus serve the dual purpose of validating student outcomes *and* providing ongoing practice and preparation for the bar exam.
 - Summative assignments mapped to course-level SLOs also may take the form of written briefs, research results, and oral presentations.
 - Formative assessments, such as weekly, multiple-attempt, rich-feedback quizzes provide students the opportunity to ensure competency and (like the summative exams), offers additional practice of bar exam-like question items.
 - Weekly discussion forums provide another form of formative assessment and may be mapped to course-level SLOs. Discussions provide students with the regular and effective student-to-student and student-instructor communication necessary to co-process new content and concepts with instructor facilitation.

To ensure continuous improvement, multiple (at least 3) course-level outcomes are tracked for *each* course *each* semester, and all program-level outcomes are tracked and documented at the end of each academic year. The achievement bar for both course- and program-level objectives is currently set at 75% of students achieving 80% or higher on the key indicators. The improvement process for objectives that do not meet these outcomes bars are as follows:

- The instructor and Dean meet to review the assignments mapped to the given “failed” objective and devise remediations for improvement. Such remediations may involve adjusting the assignment itself, improving instructions, providing additional preparatory assignments, etc. Remediations are implemented for the subsequent delivery of the course and re-assessed then.
- For program-level objectives, remediations may involve multiple courses; that is, augmenting preparatory materials in one course that provide students the foundation they need for success in the next.
- Records of SLO and PLO outcomes will be reported annually and longitudinally.

This is a more comprehensive plan than currently exists for the on-ground program and will be rolled out across those courses as well. Such tracking will provide further comparative data on the efficacy of the two program modalities (on-ground and online).

7 FACULTY

What Remains the Same

The current LLS faculty consists of one full-time and 26 adjunct professors. This high part-time profile is by design to ensure the faculty body has the relevant professional experience to provide context for the substantive material they teach, and provides LLS students with the authentic, real-time application of the law. The Senior Faculty Review Committee endorses recruiting mostly new faculty to teach the online courses, recognizing that the online modality requires a different level of faculty engagement, time commitment, and expertise to ensure a quality student learning experience is maintained.

In the recruitment of online faculty members, LLS will retain the same standards and processes for review of applicants as it has done successfully for 50-years with its onsite faculty. All faculty positions, other than the Dean, are part-time adjunct positions. All positions are defined in accordance with the needs and requirements of LLS and the intended course assignments for the faculty member. Regardless of course assignments, all faculty are required to be a member in good standing with the California state board or another state bar, holding a J.D. from an accredited institution.

Online faculty will be oriented into LLS through a meeting with the Dean to discuss teaching practices, textbook selection, grading policies, and other topics of interest. This meeting is supplemented with a copy of the LLS Faculty Handbook. These are the same processes in place for onsite faculty members. All faculty members will be required to participate in Committee of Bar Examiners (CBE) exam answer calibration meetings that ensure bar examination grading is consistent. This is a change policy and will be applied to onsite faculty as well. Although voluntary, prior participation in CME meetings has been good and the change is not in reaction to a concern, but rather is intended to ensure continued quality and consistency of grading across both program forms. Online J.D. faculty will be required to attend the same conferences and faculty meetings as do the current on ground instructors. The expectation that they attend graduation ceremonies and participate in student activities such as mixers, spring dinner dance, faculty/student basketball games, and graduation dinner applies to all faculty, whether they teach online or on-ground.

Online J.D. faculty will also have full standing to participate in faculty committee actions as described in the LLS Faculty Handbook, including:

- The Senior Faculty Review Committee, primarily tasked with curriculum review and development, will comprise both on-ground and online faculty.
- The Assessment Committee, tasked with ongoing review and revision of student learning objectives and outcomes.

LLS utilizes direct feedback from faculty, students, and institutional effectiveness assessment processes to identify areas for faculty development. These same practices will apply equally to online J.D. faculty per the policies currently in place for the onsite J.D. program.

What Differs

While there may be some overlap of instructors across the two modalities, it is anticipated that the online courses will be staffed with faculty hired specifically for their interest in and/or experience with online instruction. Current faculty have been extended the opportunity to teach online if they are so inclined; however, it is not expected that many will choose to teach in the online modality.

In any case, as part of their onboarding process, all faculty scheduled to teach online will receive orientation and training specific to the delivery and facilitation of online learning. This training includes elements such as (selected examples; not comprehensive):

- Course management: Using the Populi LMS system
 - Navigation
 - Communication
 - Gradebook
 - Where to find support
 - Where to send students for support
- The LLS online curricular structure: Theory and Best Practices
 - LLS's Input-Process-Assess-Apply model
 - Leveraging the cohort as a community of inquiry
 - The online instructor as facilitator
 - The purpose and practice of regular, substantive, and effective S2S and T2S interaction
 - The role of formative assessments in advancing student outcomes
- Continuous improvement: Student Learning Outcomes tracking and reporting
- Instructor time management
 - Discussion and feedback participation expectations
 - Response and feedback turn-around time expectations
 - Leveraging cohort communications

8 STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

LLS provides a wide array of services that are designed to support student achievement, student persistence, foster LLS's values of inclusion, respect for all people and their ideas, and create an environment where people may achieve their personal and professional goals. Many of these services have been provided or facilitated electronically even prior to the pandemic remediations; all have been converted since. In the list that follows, we outline how these services are made accessible and effective for all its students, on-ground or online.

Access to library, research, student support and other student success resources have been made easily available through a link in the student Populi portal. Additionally, LLS is adding 24/7 accessibility through the utilization of the West Academic Study Aids Collection, which provides access to academic resources, general student support, and career-based student resources.

Counseling and Tutoring

One-on-one academic counseling is serviced through appointment requests with LLS faculty, and an open-door policy maintained by the Dean. The same process applies for online counseling, tutoring, and office hours. Currently, on-ground students and instructors have the option of physical office meetings in addition to other meeting forms, including by phone, asynchronous (such as email) communication, and synchronous video (such as Zoom). The only difference for online students and faculty is their dependence on digital technologies for hosting these meetings. In either modality, students will reach out to their instructor, Dean, or other support personnel, to request a meeting. The process of doing such, and the instructor response time, is articulated in every course syllabus. On-ground instructors will typically establish office hours that wrap around their and their students' time on campus (before or after class). Online instructors have the option of designating blocks of available office hour availability and/or providing a "By appointment" option (also available to on-ground instructors).

Library Services

Library services were in the process of converting from site-based to online prior to the pandemic. They are now fully converted and thus fully available to both onsite and online students. Library services are supported by a qualified LLS employed librarian as well as additional remote services and resources including West Academic Study Aids Collection. Students have online access to all the law library materials as defined by The Committee of Bar Examiners (Guideline 8.2) and more.

Students with Disabilities

We do not know to what degree the online modality may increase enrollment by students requesting reasonable accommodations. In anticipation of such interest, and to ensure students feel comfortable self-advocating for support, LLS has implemented the following processes:

At the institutional level

- Information about disability services is communicated during enrollment and orientation processes for incoming students.
- Student Success Center/Student Services informational pages include a list of services and technology available to students.
- Designated accessibility coordinator.

At the course level

- Syllabi include the statement on how students can request accommodations.
- Instructors address course expectations in the syllabus
- Syllabi include detailed dates and assignment expectations.
- Assignments in Populi include detailed assignment directions.
- Uniform formatting and submission procedures are implemented for assignments throughout given courses and across the program.

Friday Review Program

As a remediation due to the pandemic, the Friday Review Program (FRP), which had previously been an on-ground activity, was converted to a remote one. Once students return to campus (anticipated Fall 2021), this program may revert to on-ground delivery; however, on-ground students will be polled to determine which format they prefer. An online version will remain in place for students in the online modality.

Study Groups

Study groups are formed directly between students or through student government organizations. Online program students will have both a dedicated digital student discussion forum in addition to the course-specific fora within the Populi platform. This will serve as a central communication hub for students to form study groups and other group interactions outside of individual course pages.

Additional Student Services

LLS provides a range of additional student support services including legal internships, judge mentorship, student organizations, career resources, and social events to help foster student success. Some services are available only to third- or fourth-year students, however, these services are available to students regardless of program of study modality.

9 QUALITY ASSURANCE

The Institutional Effectiveness Plan (IEP) LLS developed will include review and evaluation of the online J.D. program to ensure program effectiveness, continuous improvements, and alignment with the institutional mission. The assessment processes outlined in the IEP address learning outcomes at the course level, programmatic level, and institutional level. The IEP defines six main areas of focus:

1. Student Learning Outcomes
2. California Bar Examination Pass Rate
3. Student Satisfaction
4. Alumni Support
5. Employer Relations
6. Employee Satisfaction

Student learning assessment was covered in detail in section 6 and is viewed by LLS as a continuous process of collection, review, and use of information to improve student learning and development. The assessment cycle is a school-wide effort and involves the board of directors, students, faculty, staff, and committees.

The California bar passage rate is a fundamental indicator of program effectiveness as significant components of the curriculum are intended to prepare students for bar exam success. This is a key data point where analysis will disaggregate students by program modality, demographics, times attempted, and GPA. The current goals of 60% bar passage by 2022 and 75% blended bar passage by 2022 will apply to the online J.D. modality. This analysis is conducted annually and incorporates the review of retention rates, graduation rates, and supporting activities such as the Friday Review Program, utilization of counseling and mentorship programs, and student survey results.

Student surveys provide LLS with direct feedback from students regarding their educational experiences and the effectiveness of an individual course. Reporting functions in Populi allow LLS to review results at the school level and/or drill down to an individual course or faculty member. With the relatively small sample size of the LLS faculty and student body, the institution seeks to ensure student response rates are 65% or higher for the data results to be actionably meaningful.

Alumni support, employer relations, and employee satisfaction evaluations speak to the long-term effectiveness of LLS. As the online J.D. option will be rolled out over a four-year period, it will be at least 6 to 8 years before these measures of effectiveness and quality will be meaningful. At that time, it will be important to retain disaggregated analysis by program modality into future review processes.

10 INFRASTRUCTURE & TECHNOLOGY NEEDS

After extensive review and consideration, the current Populi platform which provides LLS with a comprehensive and fully-integrated college management system, has been deemed through careful analysis more than sufficient to support online course delivery. Populi supports the full range of learning objects and functionalities-- such as lesson delivery, discussion fora, tests and assignments, embedded syllabi, in-course chat, and resource links-- necessary to deliver a robust online course. Additionally, Populi manages the course data for student enrollment and grading feeds directly into transcript and GPA records.

The discussion boards and chat provide user-friendly, asynchronous forums within which students can maintain regular, substantive, and effective interaction with classmates and with their instructor. Discussion board assignments built around instructor-facilitated, student-to-student processing of content, comprise one of the key learning tools across all online courses in the proposed program. The lesson function provides clear weekly “chunking” of content to facilitate students’ progress through the courses. The functionality of in-platform tests, ranging from automatically graded multiple-choice to short answer, essay submission, and file uploads, provides for both formative and summative assessment as well as easily-delivered direct feedback to students. The platform also allows for ready integration of publisher-provided learning resources and assessments through external links.

The Populi platform is cloud-based and hosted by Populi. This scope of service reduces the burden on LLS internally to implement, manage, and maintain IT systems. Populi retains its servers in an SSAE Type II compliant data center that is secured by compartmentalized and biometric access controls in addition to infrastructure redundancies to secure power supply. Furthermore, Populi provides daily, weekly, and monthly backup data transmissions in a fully-encrypted cloud in real-time.

As Populi is currently widely used across LLS as both an LMS and a management system, there is a high level of institutional comfort and knowledge with utilizing the platform. By building upon this institutional knowledge and familiarity, LLS will be able to meet the needs of online course offerings without the burden of a steep learning curve for faculty, staff, and administrators.

Effectiveness of the Populi platform, specific to serving as the LMS, is measured by student utilization and engagement data; faculty and student feedback; overall student success in the course, and student progression towards completing their legal studies. All student learning objective assessment processes will utilize disaggregated reporting to analyze and compare student learning outcomes in each of the onsite and online modalities.

11 FINANCIAL

LLS has already invested in the technology, facilities, and library infrastructure to support existing students, leaving few additional costs to be incurred by offering the J.D. in the hybrid modality. The primary additional costs are course development, payroll expenses for the Hybrid faculty members, and additional marketing expenditures. The current administrative staff has the capacity to support all back-office functions needed to support the modality expansion.

LLS administration has performed an analysis of the anticipated revenues and expenses for the hybrid modality's initial years. The enrollment estimates utilized are very conservative and are derived from historical trends, applicant inquiries, and changes to admissions policies. Expenses, when compared to the historical brick and mortar operations are considerably lower in recognition of the cost savings the school realized during the pandemic without students on campus daily. This is due to leveraging investments already made as well as the ability to plan for the transition.

Revenue projections assume a starting class of 30 which generates revenue sufficient to cover all *direct costs* in the first year, resulting in a *revenue neutral* start to the program. Projected enrollment growth is limited to 15 students in each subsequent year of the programs' initial budget. Even under this conservative approach to the growth of the program, it is anticipated that the program will generate net profit by the end of its second year. Additionally, should the need arise, LLS can draw on its cash reserves to cover initial shortfalls.

DR. LEEANN STONE

CORE COMPETENCIES

- | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| ◆ Higher Ed Administration | ◆ Program Development | ◆ Constituent Development |
| ◆ Student Success | ◆ Change Management | ◆ Evaluation & Assessment |
| ◆ Strategic Planning | ◆ Adult learning/Andragogy | ◆ Professional Development |
| ◆ Curriculum Development | ◆ Accreditation | ◆ Distance/Online Pedagogy |

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS

- ✓ Lead academic administrator in successful, first-time accreditation (ACCJC) bid for 2-year performing arts college
- ✓ Directed instructional redesign of 26-campus, 200+ course, 800+ faculty institution, program and course redesign and faculty training.
- ✓ Created Brandman University's signature, student-centered model of instruction, which remains the backbone of the program today.
- ✓ Initiated and managed Rosetta Stone's Custom division, creating learning and training materials for corporate and organizational clients.
- ✓ Advised, trained, and assessed University of Tennessee, Knoxville's transition to blended, task-based modes of instruction.
- ✓ President, International Association for Language Learning & Technology (IALLT).

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Instructional Design Consultant, Rancho Santiago Community College District, 2017- Present (Contract)

Working with subject matter expert faculty to develop "model online courses" in Blackboard and Canvas towards the goal of fully online ["Pathways"](#) programs and California Virtual College online courses ([CVC-OEI](#)).

Instructional Design Consultant, City Colleges of Chicago, 2019- August 2020 (Contract)

Redesigned Adult Ed ESL program to hybrid mode of delivery; teacher training

Dean of Instruction, [The Young Americans College of the Performing Arts](#)), 2013-July 2020

Oversee faculty, curriculum, and the library; train faculty in best practices for instruction, assessment, and curriculum design across studio, classroom, and online modes. Serve as lead academic advisor in the institution's accreditation process. Partner with the President to establish, inculcate, and document a community of educational excellence.

Lead Instructional Designer, Cengage Learning, 2016-2017 (Part time)

Managed the instructional design of multiple parties (Cengage, third-party instructional design contracting company, and Excelsior College partner personnel) in the development of [Courxam programs](#), a new curriculum-supported, credit-by-exam product.

Head – Custom Curriculum, Rosetta Stone, 2013-2016

Established and managed the Custom Curriculum unit to respond to corporate learning needs. Built academic credibility of Rosetta Stone through national and international academic and governmental networks and developed teams from disparate national / international sources.

Associate Faculty – Online Educators Program, Saddleback College, 2010-2015

Inculcated best online teaching practices, establishing quality expectations for online teaching and learning. Introduced teachers to effective pedagogies, skills, and techniques for online teaching. Taught Certificate Program in Online Instruction, including "Effective Interaction for Online Courses," "Introduction to Online Teaching and Learning," "Teaching Models of Online Education," and "Technology for Online Instruction."

World Language Market Specialist, John Wiley & Sons, 2011-2013

Designed and deployed on-ground workshops to train instructors in effective implementation of technology resources. Trained sales representatives in use and sales of print- and technology-based products. Created online courses using a variety of learning management systems. Delivered synchronous online training via WebEx, Elluminate, and Adobe Connect.

Instructional Designer, Cengage Publishing, 2010-2011, 2013

Developed online and blended learning courses across the curriculum, including in accounting, humanities, education, business, cosmetology, pharmacy tech, history, law, and paralegal studies.

University Instructional Design Administrator, Brandman University, 2009-2010

Designed signature blended instruction model, which was implemented across the university system and remains the hallmark of the Brandman educational experience. Led intensive course redesign and faculty training.

World Language Specialist, Houghton Mifflin/Cengage Publishing, 2003-2009

Created the faculty development consultant role, a new function in the publishing industry (and a model since adopted by other publishers). Developed "Board of Consultants" series, a new editorial input that was also recognized as a value-add and implemented industry-wide. Built user-to-editorial bridges to inform product development.

Faculty Development, Foreign Services Institute

Designed and facilitated a program to train 500+ language instructors in the effective use of electronic teaching and learning resources. Published a manual of instructional practices.

Interim (Founding) Chair, Soka University

Established this new institution's language department. Recruited and hired full- and part-time faculty, provided advice on the design and installation of the Language Technology Center, and finalized the program curriculum.

Director – Humanities Instructional Resource Center and Language Learning Center, UC Irvine

Led analog-to-digital transition, broadening Center's capabilities to encompass multiple classroom and drop-in labs, media production facilities, and faculty development. Educated faculty and graduate students in applications of digital teaching tools.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Ed.D., Educational Technology and Leadership, Pepperdine University

Business Officer Training Course, University of California

Management Services Assessment Program, University of California

M.A., Art History (Emphasis in Pre-Columbian Art) UCLA

B.A., Art History, UC Irvine

B.A., Spanish (Emphasis in Linguistics), UC Irvine

PROFESSIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP

2017-now	Institutional Review Board , CSU Fullerton
2015-now	National Advisory Board , Center for Urban Language Teaching & Research (CULTR), Georgia State University
2013-2015	Chair, 50th Anniversary Committee, IALLT
2011-2017	Young Americans Academic Advisory Committee, Young Americans College of the Performing Arts
2007- 2010	IALLT Council, Publications Committee
1999-2003	Academic Coordinator, IALLT/ACTFL <i>Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology</i> workshops
1998-99	President, UCI Staff Assembly
1997-98	Vice President, UCI Staff Assembly
1997	Interim IALL Board liaison to Regional Affiliates (now IALLT)
1995-2002	IALL Representative to the Japan Association for Language Education and Technology (LET)
1994-95	"Spreading the Word", American Council on Education/NEH grant project.
1994	"Computer-Assisted Instruction in the Japanese Classroom" Committee for Instructional Development (CID) grant project
1993-95	Past President/Elections Chair, IALL
1992-94	Minor Capital Improvement Grant, "School of Humanities Teaching Laboratory" renovation project
1991-93	President, IALL
1991	Conference Planning Committee, IALL '91, UCLA
1990-99	Languages Other Than English Task Force, UC Irvine
1990-92	IALL Conference Chair, Foreign Language Education and Technology (FLEAT II) Conference, August 4-7, 1992
1990	Coordinator, Job Placement Center, AECT Annual Conference
1989-91	President-elect, IALL
1989-91	Editor, <i>IALL News Review</i>
1989-90	Professional Priorities Conference, ACTFL. Task force member
1989	Chair, Southern California Language Lab Directors' Consortium (now SWALLT)

LEEANN STONE

1988-91	Chair, International Committee, IALL
1988-89	Task force member. National Initiative for Developing Voluntary Standards for Applications of Technology to the Teaching and Learning of Languages, CALICO , American Society for Testing and Materials, and the U.S. Department of Education.
1988	Co-founder, Southern California Language Lab Directors' Consortium
1987-90	Reviewer, <i>Journal of Educational Techniques and Technologies</i> (IALL)
1987-88	Computers in the Classroom Journal and Symposium Rep, CALICO
1986-89	Copyright Committee, AECT

CONSULTANCIES- INSTRUCTIONAL AND FACILITIES DESIGN

Instructional Designer (April 2019- present)- City Colleges of Chicago. Developing a blended Advanced English and model for roll-out of a fully-blended (hybrid) ESL program.

Online Instructional Designer (2017-present) - Santa Ana College, CA Design and develop model online courses for OER integration, Pathways, and California Community Colleges (CCC) Online Education Initiative (OEI).

Lead Instructional Designer (2016-2017)- Cengage Learning. Managed multiple parties (Cengage, third-party instructional design contracting company, and Excelsior College partner personnel) in the development of Courxam programs, a new curriculum-supported, credit-by-exam product.

Instructional Designer (2010- 2011, 2013)- Cengage Learning. Online and in-class curriculum development in Law, Pharmacy Technician, English, HVAC, Cosmetology, Human Development, Diagnostic Coding, Developmental English, Composition, College Success, Beginning & Intermediate Algebra, and other disciplines. November

Program Assessor (2012, April)- University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Assess implementations of blended, task-based instruction across in institution's language programs.

Curriculum and instructional design consultant (2009)- University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Design strategies to transition language curriculum to blended task-based modes of instruction.

Learning Center Design Consultant (2009- 2010)- Irvine Valley College, Design, layout, specs and utilization of planned Language Learning Center.

Teacher technology training and curriculum design (2002-May 2003)- Foreign Services Institute, Washington, D.C.

Bilingual Exam - County of Orange Personnel Department Exceptional (1988-2002). Assessment development and design, coordination of evaluator training, testing and evaluation for all county employees seeking verification of bilingual Spanish skills.

Learning Center Design Consultant- Wittenberg University, Ohio. Design, layout, specs, and utilization of planned Language Learning Center.

Learning Center Design Consultant- Harvard-Westlake Schools, CA. Design, layout, specs, and utilization of Language Learning Center.

Learning Center Design Consultant- Santa Monica Community College, CA. Design, layout, specs and utilization of Language Learning Center.

Language Learning Center planning consultant- Mount San Antonio College, CA.

TEACHING

2009-14 **Online instructor**, Certificate Program in Online Instruction, Saddleback College (*Effective Interaction for Online Courses, Introduction to Online Teaching and Learning, Teaching Models of Online Education, Technology for Online Instruction*)

2001 **Online instructor**, *Leadership in Technology*, Masters Program in Educational Technology, Pepperdine University

1999 **Online Graduate Teaching Assistant**, *Leadership in Technology*, Masters Program in Educational Technology, Pepperdine University

1984-85 **Spanish instructor**, UC Irvine

1976-77 **EFL Instructor**, Mexico City

PUBLICATIONS

Stone, L (2017). The Challenge of Multi-Level Learners in the Classroom. Blog: <https://www.rosettastone.com/k12/resources/content/the-challenge-of-multi-level-learners-in-the-language-classroom/>

Stone, L. (2017). The Role of the Language Center in a Languages for Special Purposes (LSP) Future in *From Language Lab to Language Center and Beyond: The Past, Present, and Future of the Language Center*, F. Kronenberg, Ed. International Association for Language Learning and Technology.

Stone, L. & C. Wilson-Duffy (2009). *Task-Based III: Expanding the Range of Tasks through the Web*. International Association for Language Learning & Technology.

Stone, L. (2005). Practical Strategies for Online Language Teaching, Proceedings of SOCALLT 2005.

Stone, L. (2005). Not Just an Electronic Equivalent of a Print Workbook, *Proceedings of Digital Stream 2005*. March 2005. California State University, Monterey Bay.

Warschauer, M., M. Knobel & L. Stone (2004). Technology and Equity in Schooling: Deconstructing the Digital Divide. *Educational Policy*, Vol.18, No. 4. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Stone, L. (2004). The 'New Wave' for Technology Integration in California Schools. *Proceedings of Selected Research and Development Paper Presentations, Vol.2*. Association for Educational Communications and Technology.

Warschauer, Mark, Michele Knobel, and LeeAnn Stone (2004) "Technology and Equity in Schooling: Deconstructing the Digital Divide." *Educational Policy*, Vol. 18 No. 4 September 2004 562-588.

- Stone, L. (2003). Technology-enhanced learning modules for the classroom. Introduction to *Multimedia lab-based Activities* (Teacher Manual). Foreign Service Institute, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.
- Stone, L. (2003). Beyond DHS: Continuing barriers to technology integration in selected California high schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pepperdine University.
- Stone, L. (2003). The many roles of the director: Selected strategies for Managing and leading the language center. In U. Lahaie (ed.) *The IALLT Lab Management Kit* (3rd ed.).
- Stone, L. (2003). Creating web-based lessons with TrackStar. In Y. Saito-Abbott, R. Donovan & T. F. Abbott (eds.) *Emerging Technologies in Teaching Language and Cultures*. San Diego: LARC Press.
- Knobel, M., Stone, L., & Warschauer, M. (2002). *Technology and Academic Preparation: A Comparative Study* (UCOP & UC-ACCORD research report). Berkeley: University of California Office of the President.
- Stone, L. (2001). Variations on a theme: Different centers for different needs. In M. Ledgerwood (ed.) *The IALL Lab Design Kit* (3rd ed.).
- Stone, L. (2001). New technologies. In *Teaching Foundations* [On-line]. Available: Houghton Mifflin Faculty Development programs, http://college.hmco.com/instructors/ins_teachtech_foundations_module_newtech.html
- Stone, L. (2001). Integrating technology. In *Teaching Foundations* [On-line]. Available: Houghton Mifflin Faculty Development programs, http://college.hmco.com/instructors/ins_teachtech_foundations_module_integtech.html
- Stone, L. (2001). Integrating foreign language and tech-based resources. In *Teaching Foundations* [On-line]. Available: Houghton Mifflin Faculty Development programs, http://college.hmco.com/instructors/ins_teachtech_foundations_module_foreignlang.html
- Stone, L. (2000). Defining Globalization- The Lexus and the Olive Tree. Book review. http://www.amazon.com/Lexus-Olive-Tree-Understanding-ebook/product-reviews/B002F0X0LY/ref=cm_cr_dp_hist_5?ie=UTF8&showViewpoints=0&filterBy=addFiveStar
- Stone, L. (2000). Escaped Inmate Reviews the System. Book review. http://www.amazon.com/Inmates-Are-Running-Asylum-Products/product-reviews/0672326140/ref=cm_cr_pr_hist_5?ie=UTF8&showViewpoints=0&filterBy=addFiveStar
- Stone, L. (1996). A case study in space design: The Humanities Instructional Resource Center University of California, Irvine. In *The IALL Lab Planning Kit*. (2nd ed.) (pp. II 9-II 23). (Available from the International Association for Language Learning and Technology, <http://iall.net/Pub.html>)
- Stone, L. and P. Lamb (1996). Staff development. In *Administering the Learning Center: The IALL Management Manual*. (Module IV, pp. IV 1 – IV 37). (Available from the International Association for Language Learning and Technology, <http://iall.net/Pub.html>)
- Stone, L. (Ed.). (1993). *Task-based II: More communicative activities for the language lab*. (Module IV, pp. IV 1 – IV 37). (Available from the International Association for Language Learning and Technology, <http://iall.net/Pub.html>)
- Stone, L. (1992). Language labs and communicative language learning: drawing parallels with CALL. *CAELL Journal*. 3 (3). 10-14.
- Stone, L. (1992). It's not so much the equipment, but what you do with it: The importance of methodology in language lab use. In I. Shinjo, K. Landahl, M. Macdonald, K. Noda, S. Ozeki, T. Shiozawa & M. Sugiura (Eds.) *The proceedings of the second international conference on foreign language education and technology, Nagoya, Japan* (pp. 311-320). (Available from The Office of the Language Laboratory Association of Japan, C/O Chubu University Language Center, 1200 Matsumoto-Cho, Kasugai, Aichi, 487, Japan)
- Stone, L. (1991). Task-Based Activities: Making the Lab Interactive, *ERIC Digest* (ED343407).
- Stone, L. (1990). Foreign language education: Major changes into the 21st Century? A perspective from UC Irvine. In A. Kennedy (Ed.), *Designing the Learning Center of the Future Language Laboratories: Today and Tomorrow* (pp.39-42). (International Association for Language Learning and Technology: Out of print)
- Stone, L. (1990). Applying instructional technologies. *Foreign Language Annals*. 23. 421-422.
- Stone, L. (1988). *Task-based activities: A communicative approach to language laboratory use*. (Available from the International Association for Language Learning and Technology, <http://iall.net/Pub.html>)
- Stone, L. (1983). The tassal headdress at Tetitla, Teotihuacan and Monte Alban: A diagnostic of socio-political relations between the two sites. *Sun Trails* 1 (1). New World Anthropological Society.
- Stone, L. & M. deHerrera (Producers). (1980). *The Murals of East Los*. [video]. Aired KTLA Los Angeles.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

- 2017 *Bridging the Gap in Competency-Based Learning: An Industry/Higher Ed Partnership*. OLC Innovate 2017, New Orleans.
- 2016 *Taking Action: Next Steps in Supporting an LSP-Dominant Future*. With Mary Riser and Maria Carreira. LSP 2016 Arizona State
- 2016 *Languages for All: Leveraging Technology to Make it Happen*. LLAS 2016 U. Southampton, UK.
- 2016 *Multiculturalism & LfA: Addressing the Challenges*. AULC Cambridge University, Cardiff, Wales
- 2015 *50Years and Beyond: Drawing on Our Past to Predict Our Future* FLEAT 6/IALLT 2015 closing plenary. Organizer/Moderator. Harvard
- 2015 *Advanced Spanish for Medical Communication and Interpretation*. CALICO (Computer Assisted Language Instruction Consortium). U Colorado, Boulder.
- 2014 *Reaching Professional Competence: Language for Specific Purposes* ACTFL (American Conference for the Teaching of Foreign Languages). San Antonio, TX
- 2010 *The iDEAL Makeover: A University-Wide Transition to Blended Courses*. ELI 2010 Fall Focus Session. Online. With Maria Cesario.
- 2009 *Expanding the Range of Tasks through the Web*. IALLT '09 Georgia State University, Atlanta.
- 2009 *Integrating Culture: Meaningful Activities for Digital Natives*. Accommodating Change in World Language Education Today. Costa Mesa, CA.

LEEANN STONE

- 2008 *Practical Strategies for Integrating Technology into the Language Teaching Practice*. Expanding Language Teaching & Learning Capacity through Technology. San Diego, CA.
- 2008 *The Blurring Line Between Face-to-face and Hybrid Learning Environments*. DigitalStream. CSU Monterey Bay.
- 2008 *That's Hot! Google Earth, YouTube and Other New Technologies*. Baltimore World Language Forum.
- 2007 *Putting Electronic Resources to Task*. Key Issues & Strategies in Language Teaching Today. Glendale, CA.
- 2007 *Technology: It's Not Just for Homework Anymore!* American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). San Antonio.
- 2007 *Managing Online Communicative Activities with Wimba*. DigitalStream. CSU Monterey Bay.
- 2007 *Programmatic Integration of Technology in New Hybridized Language Courses*. DigitalStream. CSU Monterey Bay. With Dr. Juliet Falce, Arizona State University.
- 2006 *Nexos Media Edition: A Technology-Enriched Intro Spanish Program for the Varied Teaching and Learning Environments of the 21st Century*. ACTFL. Nashville.
- 2006 *The Nexos Media Edition: An Intuitive Model for Hybrid and E-Learning Environments*. Computer Assisted Language Instruction Consortium (CALICO). U. Hawaii.
- 2006 *Nexos Media Edition: Content and Technology for Media-Rich Instructional Environments*. DigitalStream Conference.
- 2005 *Integrating Media and Technology for Spanish Classrooms of the 21st Century*. ACTFL. Baltimore.
- 2005 *Selected Strategies for Managing and Leading the Language Learning Center*. FLEAT 5, BYU.
- 2005 *Are you Still Listening? Audio in the 21st Century*. FLEAT 5, BYU.
- 2005 *The Online Workbook as a Tool to Address Student Learning Styles and Needs*. DigitalStream Conference, CSU Monterey Bay.
- 2005 *Practical Strategies for Online Language Teaching*. South Central Association for Language Learning Technology. Southeastern Louisiana University.
- 2004 *Enhancing Instruction of Language and Culture*. ACTFL. Chicago.
- 2004 *Practical Strategies for Facilitating the Transition from Face-to-Face to Online Teaching*. Southwest Association for Language Learning Technology. BYU-Hawaii.
- 2003 *Lab workouts: Building Language Skills with Digital Technology*. ACTFL Philadelphia.
- 2003 *The 'New Wave' for Technology Integration in California High Schools*. AECT Anaheim.
- 2002 *Spanning borders, contextualizing culture via technology*. ACTFL Salt Lake City.
- 2002 *Beyond the classroom: Using technology to teach language and culture in context*. ACTFL Salt Lake City.
- 2002 *Active-ating the Computer Lab for Language Instruction*, Southwest Association for Language Learning and Technology (SWALLT), U. of Nevada, Reno
- 2002 *Creating Web-Based Lessons with Track Star*, Digital Stream 2002, CSU Monterey Bay, Monterey.
- 2001 *The new IALLT lab design kit*. IALL '01, Rice University.
- 2001 *Introducing the newly revised IALLT lab management kit*. IALL '01, Rice University.
- 2000 *Strategies for Online Team Teaching*, California Virtual College conference, Lake Tahoe.
- 1999 *Administering the Learning Resource Center: The IALL Management Manual and Beyond*, IALL '99, University of Maryland, College Park.
- 1997 *Lab Design and Planning Essentials*, (Half-day workshop) IALL '97/FLEAT III, University of Victoria, Canada.
- 1997 *Administering the Learning Resource Center: The IALL Management Manual and Beyond*, (Half-day workshop) IALL '97/FLEAT III, University of Victoria, Canada.
- 1996 *Classifying Technologies & Moving towards Internationalizing Language Education via the Internet*, Language Laboratory Association of Japan annual conference, Tokyo, Japan.
- 1996 *Meaningful Technological Communication- Something to Fit in Your Lesson Plans!* 1996 TESOL Roundtable, Kansai Gaidai College, Hawaii.
- 1995 *Navigating the Net*, SALT Fall meeting, CSU San Bernardino, CA.
- 1995 *Planning a Humanities Lab: From Basics to Strategies for Change*, (Full-day workshop) AECT.
- 1993 *Designing Effective Task-Based Activities for the Language Lab*, (Half-day workshop) IALL, U. Kansas.
- 1993 *Language Lab Use: Designing Activities that Work* (Half-day workshop) TESOL, Atlanta. April 13
- 1993 *Recruiting, Training and Retaining Productive Student Workers* (Panel), AECT, New Orleans. January 13.
- 1992 *Using Technologies Communicatively: Activities for the Language Lab*, FLEAT II, Chubu University, Japan.
- 1992 *Language Labs in the 90's: Issues and Options* (Colloquium), TESOL, Vancouver. March 6.
- 1990 *Creating a Communicative Environment with the Language Laboratory*, ACTFL, Nashville.
- 1990 *Using the Language Laboratory- From a Teacher's Perspective and Managing the Language Laboratory- Practical Tips Gleaned from Experience*, Southern California Language Lab Directors Association, Los Angeles.
- 1989 *Making the Lab Interactive- It's in the Task*, TESOL, San Francisco.
- 1988 *Task-Based Activities for the Language Laboratory: A Communicative Approach to Language Lab Use*, AECT, Nashville, TN.

WORKSHOPS, FORA & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DELIVERED

- 2019 Advanced ESL Hybrid Instruction. November 22 (Workshop)
- 2019 Pacing Classroom Instruction. City Colleges of Chicago. November 21 and 23 (Workshops)

LEEANN STONE

- 2009 *Task-Based Learning with Student-Centered Production Using Social Networks*. LARC Summer Virtual Institute Going on Safari with Digital Natives (San Diego State). August 10-14, 2009. (Online workshop).
- 2009 Learning through Doing: Creating Meaningful Tasks with Web-Based Resources. IALLT '09, Georgia State University, Atlanta. (Workshop)
- 2009 Accommodating Change in World Language Education Today. Costa Mesa, CA (Full-day forum)
- 2009 Where Do I Start? Practical Strategies to Prepare for Hybrid and Online Teaching. McGraw Hill. Dallas, TX. (Full-day workshop)
- 2008 Expanding Language Teaching and Learning Capacity through Technology. San Diego, CA (Workshop)
- 2007 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. San Antonio College (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 2007 *Publishing 101*. DigitalStream. CSU Monterey Bay. (Pre-conference workshop)
- 2007 Graduate Teaching Assistants training. *Integrating Task-Based Approaches into the Intermediate Spanish Curriculum*. U. Kansas.
- 2007 Key Issues and Strategies in Language Teaching Today. Glendale Hilton. (Full-day workshop)
- 2007 World Language: Transforming Teaching and Learning with Technology, Hilton Anatole Hotel, Dallas, TX (Full-day forum)
- 2007 World Language FLEX Forum. American River & Sierra Colleges, Sacramento. CA (Full-day forum)
- 2006 *Maximizing the Teaching & Learning Advantages of an Electronic Workbook*. University of Kansas. (GTA training)
- 2006 *Invigorating Language Learning through Technology*. University of San Francisco. (Full-day faculty in-service)
- 2006 *Web-based Resources for Language Teaching and Learning*. Foreign Language Association of Northern California, UC. Berkeley. With Ed Sterling, CC San Francisco. (Workshop)
- 2006 Gonzaga University. (Full-day faculty in-service)
- 2006 *Building Teaching Strategies for Introductory Italian*. University of Washington. (Full day GTA training)
- 2005 Harvard-Westlake School. North Hollywood, CA. (Full day faculty in-service)
- 2005 Technology and the Heritage Speaker. Denver, CO. (Online forum)
- 2005 Second Annual World Language Forum. Yorba Linda, CA
- 2004 Castilleja School. Palo Alto, CA. (Full day faculty in-service)
- 2004 Head-Royce School. Oakland, CA. (Full day faculty in-service)
- 2004 The Principia School. St. Louis, MO. (Full day faculty in-service)
- 2004 Aspen High School, CO. (Full day faculty in-service)
- 2004 Cherokee Trail High School, CO. (Full day faculty in-service)
- 2004 Changing Needs of Spanish Language Learners in Southern California. Long Beach, CA (Forum)
- 2003 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. Swarthmore College. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 2003 *Teaching with Technology*. Ben Davis High School, Indianapolis, IN.
- 2003 *Teaching with Technology: Practical Applications for Classroom Instruction* Defense Language Institute, Monterey, CA.
- 2003 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. Louisiana State University. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 2003 *Creating Technology-Supported Materials for Gente 3*. Vanderbilt University. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 2003 *Web-based Resources for Language Instruction*. World Languages Professional Development Conference. South Texas CC.
- 2003 Workshop. *Web-based Resources for Language Instruction*.
- 2003 K12 Teacher In-service workshop. Grand Valley State University.
- 2003 Faculty development workshop. Grand Valley State University.
- 2003 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. Maricopa Community College. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 2003 In-service region-wide technology training for language teachers. Foxborough, MA.
- 2003 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. Baylor University. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 2002 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. Salt Lake Community College. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 2002 In-service district-wide technology training for language teachers. Rochester Unified School District, MN.
- 2002 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. U.C. Davis. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 2002 *Developing Task-Based Lessons for the Language Center*. Foreign Service Institute, Washington, D.C.
- 2002 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. Pacific Lutheran University. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 2002 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. Goucher College. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 2002 Methodology workshop, *Foreign Language and Technology*, Wichita State University, Kansas.
- 2002 *Track Star: Creating Your Own Web-Based Lesson*, University of Houston,
- 2002 *Project COACH Technology Workshop*, Los Alamitos High School.
- 2001 *Project COACH Technology Workshop*, UC Irvine.
- 2001 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. Catholic University (D.C.) (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 2001 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. St. Thomas University (TX) (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 2001 Methodology workshop, *Foreign Language and Technology*, Wichita State University, Kansas.
- 2001 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. Chaffey College. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 2001 ACTFL workshop, *Integrating Internet Resources*, Mount San Antonio College.
- 2001 ACTFL workshop, *Integrating Internet Resources*, U. Texas, Austin.
- 2001 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. University of North Florida. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 2000 Methodology workshop, *Foreign Language and Technology*, Imperial Valley College, CA.
- 2000 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. CSU San Marcos. (2-day faculty development workshop)

LEEANN STONE

- 2000 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. Wright State University. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 1999 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. Purdue University. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 1999 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*, Raritan Valley Community College. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 1999 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. San Jose State. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 1999 ACTFL workshop, *Integrating Internet Resources*, U. Maryland, College Park.
- 1999 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. Catholic University. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 1999 ACTFL workshop, *Integrating Internet Resources*, UC Irvine. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 1999 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. La Sierra University. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 1999 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. St. Lawrence University. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 1999 *Languages: Teaching with Technology*. CSU Northridge. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 1999 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. SUNY Stony Brook. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 1998 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*. UC Irvine. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 1998 *Foreign Languages: Teaching with Technology*, University of Maryland. (2-day faculty development workshop)
- 1997 *Task-Based Technologies for the Foreign Language Classroom*, Cal State San Marcos. (Full day faculty in-service)
- 1997 *Developing a Proposal for a Comprehensive Language Learning Center and Internet Resources for Language Learning*, Santa Monica College, Santa Monica, California. (Workshops)
- 1997 *Creating Communicative Activities for the Language Lab, and Language Activities via the World Wide Web*, The Lovett School, Atlanta, Georgia. (Teacher In-Service workshops.)
- 1996 *Effective Activities for the Language Laboratory*, Point Loma Nazarene College. (Workshop)
- 1996 *The Internet as a Flexible Resource for Foreign Language Learning* Pepperdine University. (Workshop)
- 1994 *Integrating Technology Resources into Foreign Language Instruction*, Haverford College, PA. (Workshop)
- 1994 *Teacher In-Service: Using the Language Laboratory*, Mira Costa College, CA. (Workshop)
- 1992 *Effectively Using and Integrating Language Lab Work into the ESL Curriculum*, Mills College (Workshop)
- 1990 *Expanding Applications for Language Lab Use*, Lewis and Clark College. (Workshop)
- 1990 *Designing and Implementing Task-Based Activities for Language Lab Use*, University of Michigan. (Workshop)

KEYNOTE ADDRESSES

- 2009 *Less is More? A Comparison of the Effects of Hybrid versus Traditional Course Design*. Day-long forum on navigating an NCAT course re-design project for state of Tennessee English, Math and Science post-secondary programs. Nashville, TN.
- 2006 *Technology in Language Learning: Delivered or Connected? Implications for Teacher Training*. International Association for Teaching English as a Second Language. Online discussion forum for teacher education professionals.
- 2003 *The Collaborative Power of Technology*. Keynote address. World Languages Professional Development Conference, South Texas Community College.
- 2003 *Teaching with Technology*. General session. World Languages Professional Development Conference. South Texas Community College.
- 2002 *Why Learn Language in a Computer Lab?* Grand Valley State University, Grand Rapids, MI,
- 2002 *Taking the Lead with Technology*, Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, New York City.
- 1997 *New Technologies in the Classroom: How are they being used? How do manage them? and What are the directions of the future*, for "Accessing the Global Village through New Technologies and Teaching Techniques", SUNY New Paltz conference for foreign language and ESL teachers.
- 1997 *Delivering Language Instruction via the WWW, Planning and Managing a Language Lab, and Exploring Web-Delivered Language Learning Activities and Materials*, for the Swedish National Committee on Languages and Technology, the University of Victoria, Canada.
- 1996 *Re-Defining the Lab (Through Space Not Place)*, Ingenious Methodologies through Technology (sponsored by the Culpeper Foundation), Washington and Lee University.
- 1991 *Murder and Mayhem- Using the Lab Communicatively*, for "Taking the Byte out of the Bit", Washington and Lee University.
- 1991 *Murder in the Lab: Communicative Activities for the Language Lab*, AATSP, Southern California Chapter, University of San Diego.
- 1990 *It's Not Just for Individual Work Anymore- The Lab as a Multi-purpose Teaching Tool*, Regents College, London.
- 1989 *Interact '89: Using Technology in the Modern Language Classroom*, Satellite teleconference panelist, CSU Chico.
- 1985 *Do You Hear What I Mean*, California Court Interpreters Annual Conference, Fresno.
- 1984 *Assessing Your Listening Comprehension Skills*, Greater Los Angeles Court Interpreters' Annual Conference, UC Irvine.
- 1984 *International Communications Resources for the Orange County Business Community*, World Trade Association of Orange County International Resource Seminar. Orange County, CA.

GUEST LECTURES

- 2017 *Publishing, Language Educators, and Non-Academic Career Options*. U. Nebraska, Lincoln (Prof. Liz Enkin)
- 2013 *Publishing, Language Educators, and Non-Academic Career Options*. U. Nebraska, Lincoln (Prof. Liz Enkin)
- 2007 *Publishing 101 and Language Technology Today and Into the Future*. CSU San Marcos, November 30. (Prof. Darci Strother)
- 1998 *Technology in Language Instruction: Focus on the Internet*. Spanish 106B Methodology in Secondary Education, UC Irvine, May 28. (Prof. Juergen Kempff).

LEEANN STONE

- 1997 *Technology and the Curriculum*, Spanish 399 graduate methodology course, Spring '97, UC Irvine (Prof. Juergen Kempff). Five lectures: *The Audio Lab and Non-traditional Approaches*, *Video in the Classroom*, *Using the Internet as a Learning Tool: An Introduction*, *Using the Internet as a Learning Tool: Applications*, *The Computer Lab: Writing with a Purpose*.
- 1993 *Visual Realia and Media in Communicative Language Teaching*, Methods in ESL Teaching (Prof. Robin Scarcella). U.C. Irvine. Feb. 17.
- 1989 *Media in Language Education*, Kansas State University. (Via teleconference) April.



Program Curriculum Mapping

Program Learning Objective	Student Learning Objective	Course	Key Assignment
Legal Foundations 1. Cite foundational legal theory, rules, facts and processes	a. Identify the public policy from which the law is derived	Constitutional Law	Final exam
	b. Identify the processes of federal and state courts in the United States and the function of precedent	Civil Procedure	Final exam
	c. Identify key legal issues	Torts/Criminal Law	Final exam
	d. Identify each potentially applicable theory as it relates to the facts	Torts/Criminal Law	Final exam
	e. Identify each legal rule relevant to each potentially applicable theory	Torts/Criminal Law	Final exam
	f. Identify the legally significant facts relating to each applicable legal rule	Torts/Criminal Law	Final exam
Legal Reasoning and Application 2. Interpret and apply law accurately through effective fact, case law, and theory analysis.	a. Critically read the applicable authority, including identifying the key rules within each authority	Legal Analysis	Performance Test #8
	b. Identify those facts in an actual or hypothetical scenario which are legally significant to the application of each potentially relevant legal rule	Legal Analysis	Performance Test #8
	c. Analogize the facts to and distinguish the facts from those of precedent cases	Legal Analysis	Performance Test #8
	d. Draw appropriate conclusions based on the applicable law and facts and evaluate potential counterarguments to predict the likely outcome	Legal Analysis	Performance Test #8
	e. Apply the fundamental terms, rules and principles of law including significant alternative formulations	Legal Analysis	Performance Test #8
Legal Research 3. Engage in effective legal research	a. Design and implement a logical research plan	Advanced Legal Research	Bench Memo
	b. Employ appropriate resources and technologies to retrieve, use, and manage research materials	Advanced Legal Research	Bench Memo
	c. Identify applicable legal theory	Moot Court	Appellate Brief
	d. Distinguish binding from persuasive authorities	Advanced Legal Research	Assignment #1



Program Learning Objective	Student Learning Objective	Course	Key Assignment
Communication 4. Deliver effective written documentation and oral advocacy in a legal context	a. Communicate effectively in both objective and persuasive styles as appropriate to the circumstances	Moot Court	Oral argument
	b. Argue appropriate authority including any relevant contrary authority	Moot Court	Oral Argument
Client Representation 5. Employ professional practices associated with client representation	a. Determine the steps necessary to obtain and investigate facts relevant to client's case	Trial Advocacy	Mock Trial
	b. Identify appropriate methods of both oral and written discovery	Civil Procedure	Final Exam
	c. Apply rules of basic statutory construction	Trial Advocacy	Mock Trial
	d. Prepare pretrial motions, conduct jury selection, conduct direct and cross examination, draft jury instructions, prepare post-trial motions and employ post-trial remedies	Trial Advocacy	Mock Trial
Ethics 6. Manifest professional and ethical behaviors as an officer of the court	a. Identify professional and ethical dilemmas when presented in actual or hypothetical situations	Adv PR	Final exam
	b. Explain the applicable laws governing legal ethics	Adv PR	Mock trial
	c. Act ethically in the representation of clients, performance of duties as an officer of the court, and resolution of ethical dilemmas	Trial advocacy	Mock trial