

4.3 Action on Application for Accreditation – Lincoln Law School of San Jose



The State Bar of California

OPEN SESSION AGENDA ITEM 4.3 MARCH 2025 COMMITTEE OF BAR EXAMINERS

DATE: March 14, 2025

TO: Members, Committee of Bar Examiners

FROM: Natalie Leonard, Principal Program Analyst, Office of Admissions

SUBJECT: Action on Application for Accreditation – Lincoln Law School of San Jose

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Lincoln Law School of San Jose (LLSSJ) is a registered, unaccredited, fixed-facility law school that is in the process of applying for accreditation. In August 2024, the Committee of Bar Examiners (committee) reviewed the law school's initial application and approved the school to proceed to the next step of an inspection to verify the law school's compliance with the Rules and Guidelines for Accredited Law Schools. Based on the results of that inspection, subsequent follow-up meetings, and the materials that the law school submitted, staff recommends that the law school be accredited effective immediately, and its next inspection be set for winter 2027.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve the accreditation of Lincoln Law School of San Jose effective immediately, to offer a four-year part-time fixed-facility JD program, with the next inspection to be set for winter 2027.

DISCUSSION

LLSSJ has been educating students since 1919. It operated as an accredited law school from 1993 to 2022, and then, after termination of accreditation for failure to meet a compliant minimum, cumulative bar exam pass rate in 2020, 2021, or 2022, as an unaccredited, fixed-facility law school starting in 2023.

Unaccredited law schools seeking accreditation follow a two-step process set forth in Rules 4.121 through 4.125.

After reviewing the initial portion of the application for accreditation, the committee determined that the law school's proposed plan in the application appeared to be in at least substantial compliance with the rules and directed that an inspection be scheduled to verify the law school's level of compliance.

This is the first time that the law school has been inspected for compliance with the current Rules and Guidelines for Accredited Law Schools, effective January 1, 2022.

The inspection took place on November 18, December 2, and December 9, 2024, pursuant to Accredited Law School Rule 4.144, and several follow up meetings and communications were conducted. The resulting inspection report is set forth in Attachment A and the law school's response to the inspection report is set forth in Attachment B.

Law schools seeking accreditation must show compliance with the core rules enumerated in Rule 4.147(C)¹; once those criteria are met, schools demonstrating substantial compliance with the remaining rules are appropriate candidates for provisional accreditation, while schools demonstrating compliance with the remaining rules are candidates for accreditation.

LLSSJ appears to have demonstrated compliance with both the core rules, and the remaining rules set forth in the Rules for Accredited Law Schools.

The inspection report's six recommendations fall into two categories: 1) compliance concerns that are now addressed; 2) identifying instances in which the school has implemented plans (program outcomes, faculty training, and inclusion plans supporting licensure), and, upon accreditation, must demonstrate that they also systematically evaluate the plans and take action based on the findings from those evaluations. For example, Rule 4.160 (C) requires that "[t]he law school will assess its progress using well-articulated metrics including examining disaggregated retention and graduation outcomes and adjust programs and policies as appropriate to improve diversity and inclusion outcomes."

A key core rule is the minimum, cumulative five-year bar exam pass rate, Rule 4.160(D)(6). LLSSJ's 2024 MPR was 45.9 percent, above the forty percent minimum required for accredited law schools. Regarding the First-Year Law Students' Examination, though sample size is small, the law school demonstrated positive results with its First-Year Law Students' Examination program implemented for the 2023-2024 school year. The law school has also increased its outreach to graduates who are still working toward passing the bar exam.

¹ Pursuant to 4.147(C) the core requirements for accreditation are 1) payment of all fees; 2) compliance with applicable laws and disclosure communications; 3) compliance with student success standards rules; 4) compliant DEI policies; 5) compliance with practical skills competency rules; 6) financial responsibility; 7) an effective curriculum of legal education compliant with the rules; 8) an MPR of at least 40 percent; 9) compliance with required reporting and 10) compliance with all orders, directions, and notices required by the State Bar pursuant to these rules.

The report also raises concerns about the law school's finances, as has the law school itself, but through the inspection and the law school's response, LLSSJ has demonstrated significant potential to fundraise to close the gap and continues focus in this area. Regarding enrollment, while it did not meet enrollment goals this year, it hopes to increase first-year class enrollment from 4 to 20 in fall 2025. There will also be other expansion opportunities available to LLSSJ as an accredited school, including the option to add a full-time program. In addition, while LLSSJ was required to identify a single primary teaching modality as an unaccredited law school, it can apply to offer multiple or mixed-modality teaching programs as an accredited law school. Any of these changes would be proposed to the committee through the major change process.

If the law school is approved for accreditation, staff recommends that the law school's next inspection take place in 2027. When the law school was last evaluated in 2024, the committee set an inspection two years in the future. With similar financial challenges and administrative tasks ahead, a similar inspection timeline may be appropriate.

The law school seeks an immediate grant of accreditation and has asserted that it is ready and able to work quickly to update its disclosures and other materials, communicate with students and cooperate with staff to implement a smooth transition.

Based on this demonstration of compliance, a resolution granting accreditation and setting the law school's next inspection in 2027 is proposed.

PREVIOUS ACTION

- [Action on Initial Application for Provisional or Full Accreditation – Lincoln Law School of San Jose](#), CBE Meeting, Aug. 16, 2024.

FISCAL/PERSONNEL IMPACT

None

AMENDMENTS TO RULES

None

AMENDMENTS TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES POLICY MANUAL

None

STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS & IMPLEMENTATION STEPS

None – core business operations

RESOLUTIONS

If the Committee of Bar Examiners agrees with the recommendation, the following resolution should be made:

RESOLVED, that the Committee of Bar Examiners receives and adopts the inspection report of Lincoln Law School of San Jose including all of its recommendations as set forth in Attachment A and receives and files the law school's response as set forth in Attachment B; and it is

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the law school submit as part of its 2025 annual report, evidence documenting the implementation of all recommendations included in the inspection report; and it is

FURTHER RESOLVED, effective March 14, 2025, that the law school be accredited by the State Bar of California, with approval to operate a four-year part-time JD program in fixed-facility format consistent with the Rules for Accredited Law Schools, with this decision based upon findings that the law school is in compliance with both the core rules stated in Rule 4.147 (C) and the remaining rules and has attested that it will take the monitoring steps required of accredited law schools as identified in the rules and the inspection report.

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the law school's next inspection be set for winter 2027.

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the law school be directed to cooperate with staff in reviewing its new handbooks, disclosures, student schedules, and related items necessary to ensure a smooth and immediate transition.

ATTACHMENTS LIST

- A. Inspection Report – Lincoln Law School of San Jose, Nov. 18, Dec. 2, Dec. 9, 2024
- B. Response to Inspection from Lincoln Law School of San Jose



The State Bar of California

Lincoln Law School of San Jose

Accreditation Inspection Report

Inspection conducted
Pursuant to Rule 4.144(A) of the
Accredited Law School Rules on:

November 18, December 2 & 9, 2024

Visitation Team:

Dr. James Bolton,
Committee of Bar Examiners Member

David Kelley
Educational Standards Consultant

Theresa Solenski
State Bar of California

REPORT ON INSPECTION OF LINCOLN LAW SCHOOL OF SAN JOSE

384 SOUTH SECOND STREET, SAN JOSE, CA 95113

Introduction

This is the report of the State Bar after an inspection team conducted a remote site visit of Lincoln Law School of San Jose (LLSSJ) to assess the law school's level of compliance with the Rules for Accredited Law Schools as a required part of the law school's application for accreditation.

The purpose of this inspection is to verify the law school's level of current or planned compliance with the Rules for Accredited Law Schools.

The inspection team consisted of David Kelley, Educational Standards Consultant to the Committee of Bar Examiners (Committee), Dr. James Bolton, Committee member, and State Bar staff Theresa Solenski, further supported by State Bar staff.¹

This report summarizes the team's remote visits on November 18, December 2, and December 9, 2024, as well as prior and subsequent research and follow-up communications related to the law school's compliance with the Rules for Accredited Law Schools, pursuant to Accredited Law School Rule 4.144(A). The current Rules for Accredited Law Schools took effect on January 1, 2022. This is the first time that the law school has been inspected under these rules.²

After reviewing the inspection report, the Committee will either: (1) grant full accreditation if full compliance is demonstrated, (2) grant provisional accreditation if full compliance is demonstrated with the core rules identified in Rule 4.147(C) and substantial compliance is demonstrated with the remaining rules, or, (3) deny accreditation if neither is demonstrated, pursuant to Accredited Rules 4.126 and 4.146.

Procedural History

Lincoln Law School of San Jose is a registered 501(c)(3) organization founded in 1919. It offers a part-time evening JD program delivering instruction in person at its site in downtown San Jose California. It is a nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization currently registered with the State Bar as an unaccredited, fixed-facility law school.

LLSSJ operated as an accredited law school from 1993 through 2022, and as an unaccredited law school from 2023 to the present.

In July 2024, the law school asserted that its 2024 Minimum, Cumulative Five-Year Bar Exam Pass Rate was 45.9 percent, over the 40 percent threshold required to begin the process of seeking accreditation, as verified by staff. In August 2024, LLSSJ applied for accreditation. The Committee of Bar Examiners considered that application at its August 2024 meeting. The Committee found sufficient grounds in the application to advance the law school to the next step of the

¹ The law school was most recently inspected for compliance with the unaccredited law school rules in February 2024. Its registration was renewed and the next inspection set for 2026.

² While the law school was previously an accredited law school, it was last inspected in 2018 under an earlier version of the Accredited Law Schools Rules no longer in effect.

accreditation process, which is this inspection, designed to provide the law school an opportunity to demonstrate compliance with the Rules for Accredited Law Schools.

General School Statistics

As of fall 2024, LLSSJ enrolled 27 students, including REDACTED first-year students, REDACTED second-year students, REDACTED third-year students, and 13 fourth-year students. As of fall 2024, the tuition and fees required to earn a JD at LLSSJ total \$88,500.

LLSSJ's Dean, Jason Amezcua, became dean in Fall 2023 and continues in that role. He holds a JD degree from an ABA-approved school, Saint Louis University Law School, and both a bachelor's degree and a Master of Science in Education. Dean Amezcua's experience includes 19 months as LLSSJ's Admissions Director and 20 years in higher education administration at a variety of higher learning institutions. The law school's registrar, Kim Zea, has worked at the law school for approximately eight years.

The law school maintains a staff position for a licensed California attorney to oversee bar preparation. The person who had been serving in this role left LLSSJ four days before this inspection. Interim Associate Dean of Academics and Instruction Carlos Singh, an experienced professor, stepped into the role on an interim basis and is in the process of training Norberto Sandoval to permanently assume the Associate Dean of Academics and Instruction position.

Faculty members are hired to teach on a per-course basis, typically one course per term. LLSSJ currently has 28 faculty members, seven of which were listed as new instructors in the law school's most recent annual report. All instructors either hold law degrees from ABA-approved law schools or those registered or accredited by the Committee. All faculty are licensed by the State Bar of California or, in one case, another jurisdiction.

LLSSJ's 2024 five-year Minimum, Cumulative Bar Passage Rate (MPR) was verified by staff to be 45.9 percent based on a pool of 37 graduates.

Recent individual bar exam pass rates are as follows, from July 2021 through July 2024, 18 LLSSJ graduates passed. Passage rates were as follows: July 2021 – 13.3 percent of 30 takers; February 2022 – 28.6 percent of 14 takers; July 2022 – 14.3 percent of 21 takers; February 2023 – 13.3 percent of 15 takers; July 2023 – 10.5 percent of 19 takers; February 2024 – 18.2 percent of 11 takers; July 2024 – 8.3 percent of 12 takers.

LLSSJ's first eligible cohort of students in its unaccredited JD program took the June 2024 FYLSX. REDACTED LLSSJ students took the June 2024 FYLSX and REDACTED passed. REDACTED LLSSJ student took the October 2024 FYLSX, but REDACTED.

Submission of Self-Study Materials

To prepare for the inspection, the team reviewed the law school's application for accreditation, self-study, 2024 Annual Compliance Report, website, Catalog, Student Handbook, Faculty Handbook, student results on State Bar exams, and standard operational records requested by the State Bar, including syllabi, course examinations, faculty evaluations, and meeting minutes from meetings of the school's governing board. All current students received an email inviting them to submit confidential comments via email and the team reviewed all four comments

received. The law school also submitted additional materials subsequent to the inspection, which were reviewed.

Conduct of Site Visit

Virtual inspections took place from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on November 18, December 2, and December 9, 2024. Members of the inspection team attended a Criminal Procedure class on November 25, 2024, and a Criminal Law I class on December 1, 2024.

The Criminal Procedure class was engaging. The class reviewed cases, highlighting case holdings and the various tests that the courts were using in applying the law to the facts. The professor had a relaxed and conversational approach with students and used additional binary questions to help students focus and clarify their responses.

The inspection team also observed Criminal Law I class. The professor was clear, organized and effective when presenting the relevant cases and their holdings, doing so in a very relaxed and engaging manner.

Inspection Observations and Status Updates

Pursuant to Rule 4.144, the inspection team verified the information submitted by LLSSJ and the extent of the law school's compliance with these rules. The findings below list compliance issues observed during the inspection process.

The team requested additional information to be provided by December 18, 2024, and this information was subsequently provided.

LLSSJ completed five recommendations made in the law school's unaccredited law school inspection report in June 2024 that are also relevant to compliance with accredited law school rules Rule 4.160(A)(6) (forthright and consistent public communications) and Rule 4.160(A)(8)(c) (terms of student probation policy).

Compliance Concerns Observed

1. Rule 4.160(A)(4) – Rule 4.160(A)(4), requires a law school to publish a Statement of Limitation on Bar Examination Eligibility on its home page, consumer information webpage, and application and enrollment agreement.

At the time of the inspection, LLSSJ had not included the required Statement of Limitation on Bar Examination Eligibility on its homepage. After the inspection, on December 30, 2024, the law school updated its webpage to include the required statement. The law school is now in compliance with Rule 4.160(A)(4).

2. Rule 4.160(B)(6)(a) – Rule 4.160(B)(6)(a) requires a law school to have a sound admissions policy ensuring that the law school does not admit students who are obviously unqualified, do not meet pre-legal education requirements, or who do not appear to have a reasonable prospect of completing the degree program or meeting the program objectives, based on the information reasonably available to the law school at the time of admission.

LLSSJ previously experienced issues related to evaluating pre-legal education requirements, the First-Year Law Students' Examination requirement, and use State Bar's Start-Over Forms that impacted progress toward licensure. The law school indicated in the inspection that it now has an improved process to carefully review and evaluate these requirements, and the State Bar has not found additional issues regarding law student study this year.

LLSSJ must continue the steps it has taken to maintain compliance with Rule 4.160(B)(6)(a). At the inspection team's suggestion, the law school created a checklist subsequent to the inspection, and this checklist will be used going forward for each applicant, documenting that prior to enrollment all requirements have been met and transfer criteria and credits awarded have been evaluated.

3. Rule 4.160(B)(4)&(5) – Rule 4.160(B)(5) states that a law school must engage in ongoing and systematic program assessment and should engage in course outcomes assessment. Under Rule 4.160(B)(4), a law school should state the knowledge, skills and values that each course in each program of the law school's curriculum seeks to provide to, or develop in, graduates of that program.

The law school states its program outcomes in the student handbook.

LLSSJ provided a template for course outcomes entitled "Educational Goals and Objectives" to be included with each syllabus, but this process is not currently implemented. Some syllabi, list course goals only (i.e. Criminal Law I) while others lack course goals but list class-level objectives (i.e. Torts), and still others lack course or class-level objectives. The law school should implement its template or some other method to clearly and consistently state course level goals.

To maintain compliance upon accreditation, the law school must engage in ongoing and systematic program outcomes assessment and should engage in course level outcomes assessment as well. LLSSJ outlined a plan to re-establish a faculty committee "tasked with selecting the method(s) of assessment and apply it to review the Course [and Program] Learning Outcomes to ensure that they are still supporting Lincoln's mission." LLSSJ must implement this or another effective plan to maintain compliance, documenting this in its annual report and as directed by the State Bar.

In its 2022 Annual Report that LLSSJ indicated it was using an Assessment Committee and Faculty Assessment Manual to evaluate its program outcomes. While LLSSJ did not share the charter for an Assessment Committee or a Faculty Assessment Manual in its 2024 accreditation inspection, the law school could re-implement these as a means to complying with Rule 4.160(B)(4-5).

4. Rule 4.160(B)(14) – Rule 4.160(B)(14) requires instructors to continually strive to improve their teaching skills and expertise in the subjects they teach.

In previous inspections the Committee has identified faculty development as an area of focus, both under the prior accredited rules in 2018 and the current unaccredited rules in 2024. The law school agreed to address this in 2018 and provided a plan to re-establish a faculty senate to do so. During the 2024 inspection, LLSSJ acknowledged that it had not re-established the faculty senate but again asserted that it planned to do so.

The sample of faculty interviewed indicated that they had not been given guidance or training on various topics including grade calibration. Such training will be of increasing importance as class size grows and as new faculty are hired. LLSSJ is encouraged to implement a coordinated plan, and, in particular, to offer support and training to the new faculty members hired this year.

LLSSJ advised that it does offer ad hoc faculty support and conducts bi-annual hour-long faculty meetings to discuss administrative matters. They are also building out an asynchronous resource for faculty in their information system. The law school provided documentation of discussions among faculty working to develop faculty support programs.

5. Rule 4.160(C)(3) – Rule 4.160(C)(3) states that law schools must put in place effective diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) policies and practices, work to eliminate bias, and assess its progress using well-articulated metrics including examining disaggregated retention and graduation outcomes.

As metrics to assess outcomes, the law school presented bar passage outcomes of its graduates disaggregated by undergraduate and law school GPA, pre-legal education, LSAT if available, and opportunities required to pass the bar exam trended since 2016. In its annual report, LLSSJ disaggregates attrition, reasons for attrition, and retention by race and gender.

Subsequent to the inspection, to maintain elimination of bias, the law school began tracking completion of at least one hour of implicit bias continuing education for all faculty at the start of their teaching contracts. The State Bar has provided access to its free and publicly available implicit bias course to assist in this initiative.

Subsequent to the inspection, the law school provided updated goals for recruitment, retention, and licensure of diverse law students, analyzed progress to date, and identified areas of planned further focus.

The law school has policies aligned with the requirements of this rule, which are distributed through the faculty and student handbooks. After the inspection, the law school sent the inspection team copies of signed student and faculty handbooks which acknowledge their receipt of these policies. While all students have confirmed receipt, LLSSJ must continue to track receipt from remaining faculty.

To maintain compliance, the law school will need to continue this process, setting clearly defined metrics, assessing progress as it “adjust[s] programs and policies as appropriate to improve diversity and inclusion outcomes” based on insights gained from those metrics, as part of the ongoing compliance process including in the law school’s annual report.

6. Rule 4.160(D)(3) – The rule requires that a law school must use its assets and funds to provide a program of legal education reasonably calculated to lead to licensure in the law and to establish reasonable safeguards against financial fraud and other financial improprieties.

LLSSJ provided the inspection team with financial statements, financial projections, and financial reports. The school has safeguards against fraud and has board members with financial experience.

In June 2024, the Committee reviewed the law school’s financial position as part of its unaccredited law school inspection. While there was significant concern regarding its financial position, the law school also showed strong potential to fundraise. As a result, the Committee renewed the law school’s registration through 2026 with the requirement that it demonstrate it will have adequate financial resources to fund the remaining years of instruction for students currently enrolled, as required by the unaccredited law school rules.

Subsequent to the inspection, the law school received several hundred thousand dollars in grants and donations, some over a three-year period. It also continues to seek ad hoc rent reduction; it benefited from an emergency reduction in spring 2024.

Despite these commitments, the law school projects a 2024-2025 loss of \$255,000 that can be covered with its current reserves. It is focused on stabilizing its finances to reduce or prevent further losses. While it did not meet enrollment projections for this year, the law school is hopeful it will do so in the upcoming year, particularly if it earns accreditation. For the 2025-2026 academic year, the law school projects an increase in its first-year class from 4 students in the fall 2024 to 20 students in the fall 2025. The law school believes that achieving accreditation is critical to meeting its enrollment and continuing fundraising projections.

Conclusion

The observations and findings above take into account the law school's efforts leading up to the inspection and subsequent through the publication of this report, presented to the Committee of Bar Examiners for further consideration as part of Lincoln Law School of San Jose's application for accreditation.



March 6, 2025

The State Bar of California
 c/o Ms. Natalie Leonard, Principal Program Analyst, Office of Admissions
 180 Howard Street
 San Francisco, CA 94105

RE: November/December 2024 Accreditation Inspection of Lincoln Law School of San Jose

Dear Ms. Leonard:

I am in receipt of the report memorializing the findings of the Accreditation Inspection of Lincoln Law School of San Jose ("LLSSJ") conducted by the State Bar of California inspection team on November 18, December 2, and December 9, 2024, and I have shared the same with LLSSJ's Board of Trustees.

LLSSJ would like to thank Dr. Bolton, Mr. Kelly, and Ms. Solenski for their professionalism and thoroughness throughout the inspection.

We will address below each of the " Compliance Concerns Observed " in the order they were provided in the inspection report. As set forth below, Lincoln Law School of San Jose accepts this report and will clarify in any section where we believe we are compliant. We have provided updates or compliance enhancements that have occurred since the inspection visit. The progress of any continued compliance enhancements will be provided in our annual report, if not sooner.

1. Rule 4.160(A)(4):

LLSSJ appreciates the acknowledgement in the inspection report that we are in compliance with this rule.

2. Rule 4.160(B)(6)(a):

LLSSJ will continue to ensure that its admissions process is compliant. We acknowledge that the findings of this inspection indicate that no additional issues were found because of our actions to eliminate and alleviate prior concerns. The current process as detailed in the documentation submitted prior to, during, and after the inspection serves both LLSSJ's mission and its respect for the laws, rules and policies that govern its accreditation.

Additionally, LLSSJ recently submitted a letter of inquiry to participate in the AccessLex Institute's Admission Innovation Project (AIP), which supports and funds efforts by law schools to implement and assess novel approaches to selecting first-year students. The central goal of the project is to increase knowledge about the impacts of deemphasizing standardized tests (e.g., GRE, LSAT) in the context of law school admission. While this is a competitive process which may not come to fruition, LLSSJ hopes it will show our continued intentionality in the improvement process. *Please see <https://www.accesslex.org/grants/admission-innovation-project>*

3. Rule 4.160(B)(4)&(5):

LLSSJ accepts and understands its responsibility to provide evidence of its readiness to comply with these rules. We also understand the need to show consistency in the execution of a program that identifies and facilitates student learning through effective alignment and assessment of institutional and course level outcomes. We appreciate the Inspection Report's acknowledgement that, if implemented appropriately as an accredited institution, LLSSJ's Student Learning Outcomes currently meet this standard and must be effectively evaluated. It is well researched truth in graduate-level higher education that solid institutional learning outcomes are an indication of high educational standards and intentionality in curriculum design. They also provide a clear pathway toward alignment with instruction and the institutional mission and values. This helps LLSSJ understand that it does indeed have a firm foundation from which it has built a competent program for legal education and has the readiness to show its compliance if given the approval to transition back to an accredited institution.

LLSSJ acknowledges that the Inspection team encountered inconsistencies at the instructional level and when speaking with faculty. Since the completion of the inspection LLSSJ's academic administrators and experienced faculty have been reviewing fall semester exams and noting the immediate needs of the current faculty in preparation for holding a midsemester faculty meeting to cover important guidance in grading and the use of exam rubrics. This meeting will be conducted live and recorded for faculty members who are not able to attend the meeting. Those that do not participate live, will be required to watch the recording and certify that they have done so. This will help ensure that the faculty understand our efforts to show consistency in grading and the understanding of the calibration process. LLSSJ will have this meeting as evidence of improvements made to show its readiness for compliance prior to Spring 2025 exams.

To further address the concerns articulated in Inspection Report, LLSSJ has included in the appendix its "Instructional Policies and Procedures." This document was included in LLSSJ's application for accreditation self-study documents, but its purpose was not clearly identified. This document provides a more detailed course-level structure by which LLSSJ's faculty facilitates the implementation of both its institutional and instructional outcomes in service to the more aspirational tenants in the "Educational Goals and Objectives." Given the inconsistency observed, LLSSJ is also providing in the appendix the "Course Syllabus Template" it will incorporate to provide a more consistent alignment of course instruction with outcomes. Lastly, LLSSJ is also providing in the appendix a "Course Learning Outcomes Assessment and Action Plan" form along with an instruction sheet for completing the form. This form is provided as an example of the First

LLSSJ will also introduce these documents in the midsemester faculty meeting and help the faculty understand their importance in improving instruction moving forward. For Summer 2025 courses all the above content will be covered in training any faculty teaching summer courses. Finally, LLSSJ will hold a comprehensive summer instructional training with all Fall 2025 faculty to provide thorough coverage of faculty material, including the Faculty Handbook, and properly ensure preparation for the 2025-2026 academic year. **Please see APPENDIX A, B, and C.**

4. Rule 4.160(B)(14):

LLSSJ acknowledges the findings in the inspection report that its efforts to reconstitute the Faculty Senate have not come to full fruition. The inspection report made clear, and LLSSJ agrees, that the consistent operation of the Faculty Senate and thus its ability to properly inform and impact faculty development has not been observed in the context of an Accredited inspection. We would like it to be clear, however, that LLSSJ has previously provided evidentiary documentation that, following its Accreditation inspection of 2018, the Faculty Senate did in fact operate as intended from 2018 until the beginning of 2022. This was shown through the provision of Faculty Senate meeting agendas and minutes through 2022 as well as the evidence of its involvement and guidance which was shown in providing the WASC accreditation reports to the State Bar in LLSSJ annual reports and Unaccredited inspection. Nevertheless, the slow progression since Fall 2023 of LLSSJ's current effort to re-envision a more modern approach to faculty engagement and development through this body is noted. LLSSJ also appreciates the Inspection Report's acknowledgement that, lacking this body, it has still made noticeable efforts to appropriately support, coach and develop its less experienced faculty

through one-on-one engagement and regular touchpoints. The Inspection Report also noted the more recently documented improvement and growth of the asynchronous resource hub for faculty in the LLSSJ information system. It is LLSSJ's hope that the Committee of Bar Examiners can observe its readiness to comply with the Accredited expectations given the improvements already in progress, the more intentional training coverage of instruction that will occur with the current faculty immediately, as well as more regular and comprehensive faculty training moving forward.

5. Rule 4.160(C)(3):

LLSSJ appreciates that the Inspection team has indicated its compliance with this rule as it truly sits at the heart of the institutional mission. The Inspection Report also recognizes that the data submitted by LLSSJ shows its ability and commitment to quantify its positive progress in reaching its goals as well as the improvement needed. The data and documentation submitted during this inspection supports the intentional diversity of our admissions pipeline as well as our ability to create an inclusive environment which is supportive of the resilient students that persist through graduation and eventual Bar success.

To provide further context for LLSSJ's continued assessment in this area, we have included in this response an additional set of data analysis of our institution attrition. LLSSJ is well positioned to provide opportunities for legal education in its diverse community. We are also cognizant of the responsibility that this places on the institution to use clearly defined metrics in closely evaluating when the students we enroll do not complete the program. **Please see APPENDIX D.**

LLSSJ also recognizes that we must remain diligent in ensuring that our faculty also fulfill their role in our DEI Plan goals. This plan includes monitoring our faculty's completion of the State Bar's Minimum Continuing Legal Education requirement for attorneys in implicit bias. Doing this creates a meaningful alignment between LLSSJ's and the State Bar's efforts. To that end, it was very helpful for the State Bar staff to expand our awareness of the tools that exist for California attorneys through its e-learning portal.

6. Rule 4.160(D)(3)

Since the remote site visit by the Inspection Team, the Board of Trustees has revisited topics discussed with the four board members who participated in the virtual meetings on December 2, 2024. One or more agenda items during the regular Lincoln board meetings in December, January and February were related to questions and observations from Dr. James Bolton, David Kelley and Theresa Solenski.

Lincoln is operating financially within the parameters set by the budget that was revised as of August 22, 2024. The cash flow projection for the 2024-2025 fiscal year that utilizes actual numbers for the first seven months of the year predicts that budgeted revenue of \$650,000 will be exceeded by projected revenue of \$780,477. Also, the projected expenses of \$901,139 will be less than the budgeted expenses of \$905,626. Further, the projected end of year bank balance of \$32,244, when augmented with deposits and prepaid expenses, will be close to the \$52,007 year-end net cash amount budgeted.

We are confident that the two large, budgeted donations pledged for this fiscal year will be received as scheduled. The first donation of \$100,000 was verbally pledged by trustee REDACTED, who has already donated a total of approximately \$250,000 to LLSSJ from her personal foundation. The second donation of \$125,000 was pledged as the second of three equal installments by the Davidson Foundation. The first \$125,000 installment was made as scheduled in May of 2024.

Another Trustee is currently monitoring positive gains in their portfolio and has shared an intention to make a sizable financial commitment to LLSSJ in the next fiscal year, should current projections be realized. While the Trustee cannot make a firm commitment at this time, their conservative estimate is that their donation could equal \$100,000. Further the Trustee intends to structure their potential donation in a manner which could eventually augment operational revenue and fund scholarships.

LLSSJ is confident that the conservative 1L enrollment goal of twenty students for fiscal year 2025-2026 can easily be achieved and likely exceeded if full accreditation is granted. The record low number of only four 1L students this year is primarily a consequence of the loss of accreditation. Another major factor was that the process did not start until the beginning of June, after board fundraising provided pledges for donations that when received would facilitate keeping LLSSJ in operation for at least two more years. These pledges did not materialize until late May, leaving only two months to recruit.

As necessary funding is realized, a full-time director of development will be recruited to establish staff capability for fundraising and event hosting.

Only one trustee has been added to the Board since it was reconstituted in February of 2023. To bolster Board governance, capacity, and continue a path of growth, one Trustee has taken the lead to solicit candidates for Board membership. The goal is to add members from the Silicon Valley business and legal communities to increase the board to nine members and yield a ratio of two local members to each remote member. **Please see APPENDIX E & F**

INSTRUCTIONAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

APPENDIX A

BACKGROUND

Lincoln Law School of San Jose (LLSSJ) exists to provide a quality legal education to an historically underserved portion of the population. They are adults whose personal commitments or full-time careers might otherwise preclude them from pursuing a graduate level degree.

Our goal is to have our graduates ultimately pass the California Bar exam as early as possible after graduation but, that is not all. We want our graduates to contribute positively to the legal profession and to the community at large

Studies have shown that adults want what they are learning to be applicable to their everyday lives, instead of being general learning about a subject. They want to learn practical skills that help them solve problems and work better. Our faculty, as practitioners, are well suited to lead that learning.

INSTRUCTIONAL POLICY

The focus of instruction at LLSSJ will be on learning and not simply on teaching. It is not what we teach; it is what they learn. Powerful teaching and learning can only be accomplished through a partnership of LLSSJ administration, faculty, and students.

It is the policy of LLSSJ to implement guidance, training and resources to faculty to assist them in providing the most effective teaching and instruction of students, thus permitting students the opportunity to improve the learning of law and succeed at LLSSJ. Placing students in such a position will, if students are diligent in their studies, enhance their opportunity to succeed at LLSSJ, on the bar examination, and in the practice of law. LLSSJ staff shall develop processes, procedures and guidance to accomplish the purpose and intent of this policy.

As part of this partnership, Faculty will be observed (evaluated) regularly by school administration and will be offered feedback to improve instruction.

PURPOSE

Powerful teaching and learning are the products of extensive pre-instruction planning, dynamic and engaging instruction, and the assessment of learning as well as the use of assessment results to adjust instruction.

Teaching style is a personal choice of the instructor, and this document is not intended to be a “how to teach” manual. It is intended to assist our faculty in these areas to meet the needs of our unique population of students.

PRE-INSTRUCTION PLANNING

Class Materials

For all courses, other than special seminars, each student should be required to obtain one or more specified books. A law school must use current, recognized books or other materials in each of its courses. You should select currently recognized casebooks in common use by accredited law schools or other similar materials for your course. If you use materials that are not in current general use by many accredited law schools, the burden is on the instructor to justify in writing to the Dean that such materials: (a) are consistent with a sound legal educational program; (b) provide a reasonably equivalent teaching and learning resource, and (c) that students have substantial and reasonable access to the materials. If the course is a bar-examined subject the material covered must include that which is covered by the General Bar Examination. The scope of the exam can be found on the State Bar website.

Outline Of the Course

A general outline of the course must be provided to the Administration at the time of submitting your Syllabus for the class. A general outline is a good road map for both you and your students. A helpful way to organize and

prepare such an outline is to use both the abbreviated and analytical table of contents provided by some publishers, such as Foundation Press, for their casebooks.

Teaching Methods

LLSSJ generally uses the casebook and Socratic Method of teaching. Both are frequently supplemented by the lecture method. In elective classes, wide discretion is permitted as to teaching methodology, always however, consistent with the objective of providing as much useful legal knowledge to the student as possible. Thus, in an elective course, the Professor may initially choose a casebook, or other legal materials such as articles, forms, and statutes. A course in tax might use the tax form and instructions applicable to the tax form or the current Internal Revenue Code as the central teaching document. In any case, we know that learning requires frequent and full student participation. Electives should consist of material that operates to fortify substantive “bar” course knowledge. Thus, a class in “Sports Law” will present contract and tort elements, as well as possible constitutional issues. The syllabus is the basic instrument for pre-instruction planning.

Essential Elements of a Syllabus

The Syllabus is one of the most important communications made by you to your students. It should contain the following elements:

1. The name, author, edition, and ISBN of the casebook to be used with any supplement(s). Please note whether any previous editions of the book may be used.
2. Complete identification of any other printed material to be required or used.
3. **LLSSJ Student Learning Outcomes:** The student learning outcomes, also referred to a “program learning outcomes,” are what inform the J.D. program curriculum. They essentially outline the essential skills, knowledge, and competencies that graduates are expected to achieve through successful persistence to their degree in preparation for the practice of law.
 - I. Doctrinal Knowledge of
 - a. Substantive and Procedural Law
 - b. Legal philosophy and principles
 - c. Understanding of the legal system
 - II. Critical Thinking
 - a. Analysis of statutes and case law
 - b. Issue spotting
 - c. Application of law to new facts and problems
 - d. Creative application, problem solving and analogizing
 - III. Communication
 - a. Effective factual, analytical and persuasive communication, both in oral and written presentation
 - IV. Professionalism and Ethics
 - a. Knowledge and understanding of applicable rules of ethics, civility, and ethical obligations
 - b. Professionalism in the practice of law
4. **Course Learning Outcomes:** The course learning outcomes are essentially the “course goals” for the subject matter learning which should take place in each course. These may be determined by the instructor with the appropriate guidance of the academic administrators. There should be enough to effectively demonstrate student mastery of the content. There should not be so many that students would have difficulty meeting all the goals by the end of the course. For effective institutional program assessment, they should have a relevant tie to one or more Student Learning Outcome and thus
 - I. Minimum Learning Outcomes: *At the conclusion of each course, the successful student will:*
 1. Demonstrate an understanding of the rules and requirements of [class subject] under the United States Constitution.
 2. Identify and explain underlying public policy concerns as it relates to the topic.
 3. Demonstrate the ability to analyze cases and/or statutes.

4. Demonstrate the ability to apply the law to new factual contexts using the traditional IRAC format.
5. **Objectives** in meeting Course Learning Outcomes over the course of the semester(s).
 - I. A statement of subject matter and themes for each week of the course for the semester(s). This will be the objective statement by which the course outcomes are served through the in-class lecture in combination with:
 - a. Reading assignments over the semester. If supplemental materials are to be used, it is recommended they be distributed at least one week prior to the class at which it will be discussed.
 - b. Additional Assignments and/or activities (“Assessments” discussed below), if necessary, to be completed at periodic intervals of the semester(s).
6. The scope of the material to be covered by each assignment, and its applicability to specific Student Learning Outcomes and Course Learning Outcomes.
7. A precise statement as to how the course grade will be determined, including the weight of each element used to calculate the grade. Under the Unaccredited Law School Guidelines, the student must be provided with a written statement explaining what elements are used in determining their final grade. The grading scheme should be reviewed with the Registrar within 2 weeks before its submission to the students so our grading software can be programmed to accommodate it. If the Registrar with the approval of the Dean deems your formula too complex, you may be obliged to calculate your grades and submit the formula, calculation, and grades to the Registrar and Dean. Your formula must include the weighting to be assigned, any scaling, and all factors to be utilized in computing the grade, including but not limited to the final course grade. Both the Professor and Registrar are to sign off on the formula if the Registrar is to calculate any grade.

See the appendices in the Faculty Handbook for the syllabus templates for graded and pass/fail courses.

An added benefit for students would be the inclusion of guiding or essential questions for assigned reading. Reading for a purpose and not simply doing the assigned reading.

ENGAGING AND SUPPORTING ALL STUDENTS IN LEARNING

While teaching style is a personal choice, instructors should be flexible enough to meet the learning needs of their students. Instructors should take time to get to know their students, focusing on what assets and funds of knowledge they bring to the class as well as their learning styles and needs.

To support student success, faculty must first create a safe learning environment. A safe environment is one in which faculty shares the responsibility for the learning with students, allows a free exchange of ideas, and permits mistakes to be made

For a lesson to be successful, the focus must be on what is learned rather than simply on what is taught. It is not enough to simply “cover” the material.

A successful lesson begins with students knowing explicitly what it is they are to learn. The learning objective(s) for the class session should be aligned with the course learning outcomes outlined in the syllabus. They should be specific and measurable avoiding terms like “students will understand”.

The use of multiple instructional methods to engage students in problem solving, and critical and independent thinking are hallmarks of dynamic and engaging instruction.

To fully engage students in the learning, Faculty should consistently connect the lesson to students’ future roles as attorneys as well as to passing the Bar exam. There should be consistent, rigorous, and purposeful checking for understanding (CFU) throughout the lesson. Simply asking the class if there are any questions is not sufficient. CFU should be not only done so students can show what they do know, but so instructors can evaluate what parts of the lesson weren’t digested

ASSESSMENT

There are two types of assessment. **Formative** assessments are commonly said to be for learning because educators use the results to modify and improve teaching techniques during an instructional period, while **summative** assessments are said to be of learning because they evaluate academic achievement at the conclusion of an instructional period.

- **Formative assessments**

These in-process evaluations of student learning are typically administered multiple times during a unit, course, or academic program. The general purpose of formative assessment is to give educators in-process feedback about what students are learning or not learning so that instructional approaches, teaching materials, and academic support can be modified accordingly. Formative assessments are usually not scored or graded (but can be) and they may take a variety of forms, from more formal quizzes and assignments to informal questioning techniques and in-class discussions with students. Continuous, rigorous, and purposeful checking for understanding should occur throughout each lesson. If formative assessments are used regularly, there should be no surprises on the summative assessments. In general, there should be a formative assessment administered every three to four weeks.

- **Summative assessments**

These are used to evaluate student learning at the conclusion of a specific instructional period—typically at the end of a unit, course, semester, program, or school year. Summative assessments are typically scored and graded tests, assignments, or projects that are used to determine whether students have learned what they were expected to learn during the defined instructional period.

An assessment plan minimally schedules regular or semi-regular formative assessments. These assessments (as well as summative assessments) accurately reflect the expected learning and are designed to provide a reasonably accurate appraisal of each student's ability.

An exemplary assessment plan outlines processes for using the results to drive instruction. This would include extending the lesson if appropriate, reteaching if necessary, or referring the student to academic intervention.

Template Codes:

Blue = information that can be pre-populated by administration

Green = information needed to be reviewed or inputted by professor

APPENDIX B

COURSE:	[COURSE NAME]
TERM:	SEASON/YEAR
INSTRUCTORS:	[PROFESSOR(S) NAME(S)]
EMAIL:	[PROFESSOR(S) EMAIL(S)]
DAYS/TIME:	[WEEKDAY], 6:40-9:30 PM In-Person only
UNITS:	3 units
START DATE:	[MONTH DAY, YEAR] (First lecture on: [date])
COMPLETION DATE:	[MONTH DAY, YEAR] (Midterm exam on: [date])
OFFICE HOURS:	[By Appointment] OR [Specific dates/times]
WEEKLY HOMEWORK DUE:	NOTE: Please see the course page in Populi for the weekly assignments, and submission instructions (if applicable).
REQUIRED TEXT/MATERIALS:	[textbook info]
RECOMMENDED MATERIALS (NOT REQUIRED):	[None] OR [input specific info]
COURSE DESCRIPTION:	[Insert language from catalog here]
PREREQUISITES FOR THE COURSE:	[None.] OR [Prerequisite details]

COURSE SCHEDULE:

As shown in the Lesson Detail table below, each class session includes a corresponding class reading assignment. Any reading assignment and (if necessary) other included activities or assignments are **due in the week indicated**, unless otherwise specified. Students should complete the reading and any associated case briefs and/or case analysis templates prior to class. **Additional language for additional assignments or activities should be explained here.**

During class time, students may complete a formative assessment (quiz) to demonstrate understanding of the topics covered in class.

During class time, students may also be given a practical application exercise. These may be individual, or group projects designed to provide a “real world” application of the concepts introduced earlier in class. Unless otherwise instructed, this exercise is to be completed during class time and submitted to Canvas.

LESSON DETAIL:

WEEK 1 (DATE): [LECTURE SUBJECT]

Objective: [INSERT LECTURE OBJECTIVE]

Reading Assignment/Assignment Due

- [Information listed here]

WEEK 2 (DATE): [LECTURE SUBJECT]

Objective: [INSERT LECTURE OBJECTIVE]

Reading Assignment/Assignment Due

- [Information listed here]

WEEK 3 (DATE): [LECTURE SUBJECT]

Objective: [INSERT LECTURE OBJECTIVE]

Reading Assignment/Assignment Due

- [Information listed here]

WEEK 4 (DATE): [LECTURE SUBJECT]

Objective: [INSERT LECTURE OBJECTIVE]

Reading Assignment/Assignment Due

- [Information listed here]

WEEK 5 (DATE): [LECTURE SUBJECT]

Objective: [INSERT LECTURE OBJECTIVE]

Reading Assignment/Assignment Due
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Information listed here

WEEK 6 (DATE): LECTURE SUBJECT
Objective: INSERT LECTURE OBJECTIVE
Reading Assignment/Assignment Due
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Information listed here

WEEK 7 (DATE): LECTURE SUBJECT
Objective: INSERT LECTURE OBJECTIVE
Reading Assignment/Assignment Due
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Information listed here

WEEK 8 (DATE): LECTURE SUBJECT
Objective: INSERT LECTURE OBJECTIVE
Reading Assignment/Assignment Due
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Information listed here

WEEK 9 (DATE): LECTURE SUBJECT
Objective: INSERT LECTURE OBJECTIVE
HOMework

Pre-Class Reading/Homework #10 (PREPARATION FOR FOLLOWING CLASS)

- [Information listed here]

WEEK 10 (DATE): [LECTURE SUBJECT]

Objective: [INSERT LECTURE OBJECTIVE]

Reading Assignment/Assignment Due

- [Information listed here]

WEEK 11 (DATE): [LECTURE SUBJECT]

Objective: [INSERT LECTURE OBJECTIVE]

Reading Assignment/Assignment Due

- [Information listed here]

WEEK 12 (DATE): [LECTURE SUBJECT]

Objective: [INSERT LECTURE OBJECTIVE]

Reading Assignment/Assignment Due

- [Information listed here]

WEEK 13 (DATE): [LECTURE SUBJECT]

Objective: [INSERT LECTURE OBJECTIVE]

Reading Assignment/Assignment Due

- [Information listed here]

WEEK 14 (DATE): [LECTURE SUBJECT]
Objective: [INSERT LECTURE OBJECTIVE]
Reading Assignment/Assignment Due
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Information listed here]

WEEK 15 (DATE): [LECTURE SUBJECT]
Objective: [INSERT LECTURE OBJECTIVE]
Reading Assignment/Assignment Due
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Information listed here]

COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES:

At the conclusion of this course, the successful student will:

TEMPLATE INSTRUCTION: Individual class objectives and assignments should be informed by the outcomes listed below. Each outcome should identify the corresponding LLSSJ Student Learning Outcome(s) which it serves.

[NUMBERED BULLET POINT LIST]

RELATIONSHIP TO PROGRAM CURRICULUM:

Please see below for more information on how this course addresses LLSSJ Student Learning Outcomes.

GRADING:

Letter Grade. Grades are assigned on a non-curve/normative grading scale and 73% is considered the Pass threshold. As set forth in the Lincoln Student Handbook, a single course grade below 60, and/or a cumulative program or cumulative class year grade point average below 2.33 may result in academic disqualification.

TEMPLATE INSTRUCTION: The table must be customized per course. Specific attention needs to be paid towards appropriate weighting of outside assignments, and the use of points toward participation vs. the points for Practical Application Exercises (if applicable). Must adjust grade weighting of categories if some elements are not used. "Course Outcomes Addressed" will correspond to the numbered outcome(s) listed above.

The final grade for full year bar-tested courses is based upon the following:

	<u>Points / Weighting of Grade</u>	<u>Due Date</u>	<u>Course Outcomes Addressed</u>
1. <u>Written Assignments</u>	## points per semester;	[DATE]	#, #, #

<u>(# per semester)</u> [These assignments will be posted on Populi, and graded by Professor.]	## points per assignment #% of total grade		
2. <u>Other homework</u> <u>(# per semester)</u> [These assignments will be posted <u>location</u> , and scores will be monitored by a Skills Professor.]	## points per semester; ## points per assignment #% of total grade	[DATE]	#,#,#
3. <u>Practical Application</u> May include <u>class participation</u> ; case briefing; in-class exercises; homework exercises or other assignments at the professor's discretion.	## points; Assignment specific; #% of total grade	In class	#,#,#
4. <u>Midterm</u> The Midterm Exam will consist of <u>Description</u>	## points; #% of total grade	[DATE]	#,#,#
5. <u>Final exam</u> The Final Exam will consist of <u>Description</u>	## points; #% of total grade	[DATE]	#,#,#
TOTAL POINTS	### points total		

COURSE FORMAT:

This course will be taught in-person on campus during weekly lectures. All assignments will be posted, managed, submitted, and graded through the Populi unless otherwise indicated by the instructor.

LLSSJ STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES:

Each of Lincoln's Juris Doctor courses is intended to progress a Lincoln student toward mastery of one or more of four Student Learning Outcomes. These include:

- I. **Doctrinal Knowledge**
 - d. Substantive and Procedural Law
 - e. Legal philosophy and principles
 - f. Understanding of the legal system
- II. **Critical Thinking**
 - a. Analysis of statutes and case law
 - b. Issue spotting
 - c. Application of law to new facts and problems

d. Creative application, problem solving and analogizing

III. Communication

a. Effective factual, analytical and persuasive communication, both in oral and written presentation

IV. Professionalism and Ethics

a. Knowledge and understanding of applicable rules of ethics, civility, and ethical obligations

b. Professionalism in the practice of law.

Policy on Residency and Importance of Following Curriculum:

Students must successfully complete at least 1,200 hours of study “in residence”, extending over a period of not less than 24 months, in order to qualify for the Juris Doctor degree. At Lincoln, residence has two conditions that must be satisfied: completed enrollment and regular and punctual class attendance. The term “residence” includes hours quantified as “verified academic engagement.” This will consist of actual classroom time, hours allotted for final exams, and, in some instances, prescribed activities or academic assignments required in any class (graded or ungraded), the completion of which is identified in the course syllabus and can be verified by the faculty member. Under special circumstances, certain studies or certain activities conducted outside the classroom (e.g. Independent Study activities), which have been approved in advance and in writing by the Dean or the Associate Dean–Academics or faculty member in charge of the Independent Study Program. Students therefore should complete their study in a timely, *sequential and concentrated manner*, and not on a piecemeal basis. The rules pertaining to the timely completion of legal studies are established and set forth by the Committee of Bar Examiners and limit the time from the first commencement of legal studies to the completion of the J.D. program requirements to a maximum of eighty-four (84) months.

Activity	Assignments	Estimated contact time (in hours) for the average student for the entire course time
In Person Academic Engagement	Lecture, case analysis, practical application	3 hours per class for 15 classes = 45 hours
	Total In Person Academic Engagement	45 hours
Student Preparation	Verify Based on Reading Assignment sabove Required reading: 15 pages per hour Case briefing: 30 minutes per brief	3 hours every week for 15 weeks = 45 hours
Assignments: (Should Match # of assignments in GRADING)	Essay and other writing assignments	# hours over # of assignments = # total hours
	Additional Assignments	# hours over # of assignments = # total hours
	Final exam	3 hours
Overall Total	Should be at least 135 hours for a three-credit course per semester	## hours

Course Learning Outcomes Assessment and Action Plan
Instruction form

APPENDIX C

[Use the separate form to complete the summary. Information in brackets contain instructions.]

[State Name of Course]

[State applicable semester or school year "Fall Semester 2025" or "2025-26 School Year". If a full-year course, you may need to complete this form at the end of each semester. If your class is only a semester course, you should complete this form at the end of that semester.]

Introduction.

[Please feel free to provide an introduction of your Course Learning Outcomes assessment summary. This should be brief and can be used to preview your summary, as well as positive and critical feedback.]

Course Learning Objective #1 (SLO #(s)):

[Please state the CLO from your respective syllabus. Each CLO should have its own section, though in subsequent sections if the information is the same as in a prior summary of a CLO, you can reference the prior CLO (e.g., "See summary in CLO #1."].

Listing of CLO assessment methods/tools utilized in your course.

[Check all that apply.]

_____ **Essay Writing Exercises/Quizzes**

_____ **Multiple-Choice Exercises/Quizzes**

_____ **Oral Presentation Exercises**

_____ **Homework Assignments**

_____ **Midterm/Final Exam** (please indicate separately if a midterm and final exam occurred)

_____ **Other**

[Please List/Describe any other forms of assessments utilized in your course.]

Summary and Results of Methods/Tools.

[Here, please summarize in as much detail as you deem appropriate the reasons, purposes and results in utilizing specified methods/tools (checked above) in your course. Results may vary; that is, some results may be quantitative (e.g., scores on quizzes and assignments) and others may be qualitative (e.g., planned discussions, summaries of group activities, or impactful anecdotal observations) providing a description of efforts and whether student learning improved. Please include in your summary if you noticed any trends or weaknesses in tool/methods utilized in seeking to achieve a specific CLO (this includes whether you believe students lacked effort or were not sufficiently prepared for class). Please include whether there were any positive results, and if so, what was the percentage of students who succeeded/showed growth as a result of your efforts. The summary per CLO need not be longer than a half-page; however, feel free to elaborate further on each CLO summary. Please be candid in your summary, meaning positive and critical feedback is welcome.]

[Repeat the above for succeeding CLOs in your syllabus.]

Future Assessment Measures/Action Plan.

[This is a concluding section, which follows completion of all CLO summaries. If applicable, please indicate what you may have done differently. Discuss any improvements or changes with an action plan (i.e any plans, ideas that you have for the next iteration of this course and the steps that should be taken in the interim to develop them).]

Course Learning Outcomes Assessment and Action Plan

[E.g., Constitutional Law
2025-2026 School Year]

Introduction:

Course Learning Objective #1 (SLO #(s)):

Listing of CLO assessment methods/tools utilized in your course.

[Check all that apply.]

_____ Essay Writing Exercises/Quizzes

_____ Multiple-Choice Exercises/Quizzes

_____ Oral Presentation Exercises

_____ Homework Assignments

_____ Midterm/Final Exam

_____ Other

[Please List/Describe any other forms of assessments utilized in your course.]

Summary and Results of Methods/Tools.

Course Learning Objective #2 (SLO #(s)):

Course Learning Objective #3 (SLO #(s)):

Future Assessment Measures/Action Plan.

APPENDIX D

Aggregated Attrition Data By Race, Exit Reason, and Gender					
Race		Exit Reason		Gender	
White	29.2%	Academically Disqualified	19.1%	Female	66.3%
Unknown	29.2%	Career Change	1.1%	Male	32.6%
Two or more races	25.8%	Change to method of instruction	11.2%	Decline to State	1.1%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	3.4%	Concern about loss of accreditation	3.4%		
Hispanic	23.6%	Could not verify pre-legal ed	3.4%		
Black or African American	23.6%	Death in the Family	1.1%		
Asian	29.2%	Did not return from LOA	2.2%		
American Indian or Alaska Native	25.8%	Did not return/no notice	5.6%		
		Disqualified/Didn't take FYLSX - CLEP	1.1%		
		Financial	9.0%		
		Health	3.4%		
		LOA	2.2%		
		Moved	4.5%		
		Non Enrollment	1.1%		
		Other	1.1%		
		Personal	7.9%		
		Transfer-out	11.2%		
		Wanted part time	3.4%		
		Work Schedule Conflict	1.1%		
		Other*	6.7%		

Aggregated Attrition Data By Class Level					
Overall Exits:					
1L	70.79%				
2L	17.98%				
3L	10.11%				
4L	1.12%				
Reason by Level/1L:		Reason by Level/2L:		Reason by Level/3L:	
Academically Disqualified	20.63%	Academically Disqualified	6.25%	Academically Disqualified	22.22%
Career Change	1.59%	Change to method of instruction	25.00%	Change to method of instruction	22.22%
Change to method of instruction	6.35%	Did not return/no notice	6.25%	Financial	11.11%
Concern about loss of accreditation	4.76%	Disqualified/Didn't take FYLSX - CLEP	6.25%	Moved	11.11%
Could not verify pre-legal ed	4.76%	LOA (Current)	12.50%	Other	11.11%
Death in the family	1.59%	Moved	6.25%	Transfer-out	22.22%
Did not return from LOA	1.59%	Non-Enrollment	12.50%		
Did not return/no notice	6.35%	Personal	12.50%		100.00%
Financial	11.11%	Transfer-out	6.25%		
Health	4.76%	Wanted part time	6.25%	Reason by Level/4L:	
Moved	3.17%			Academically Disqualified	100.00%
Other*	9.52%				
Personal	7.94%				
Transfer-out	11.11%				
Wanted part time	3.17%				
Work schedule conflict	1.59%				

Key Insights:

1. **Exit Reasons:**
 - **Academically Disqualified:** This is the most common reason for attrition, affecting students across all levels.
 - **Change to Method of Instruction:** Another significant reason, particularly in recent years.
 - **Financial Issues:** A notable number of students left due to financial constraints.
 - **Personal Reasons:** Various personal reasons also contributed to attrition.
2. **Gender Distribution:**
 - **Female:** The majority of the attrition cases are female students.
 - **Male:** A smaller proportion of male students have left.
3. **Race/Ethnicity:**
 - **Asian and Hispanic:** These groups have the highest attrition rates.
 - **White and Black or African American:** Also represented but in smaller numbers.
4. **Class Level:**
 - **1L (First Year):** Most attrition occurs at this level.
 - **2L and 3L:** Some attrition, but less compared to 1L.
 - **4L:** Very few cases of attrition.

Detailed Breakdown:

Exit Reasons by Gender:

- **Academically Disqualified:**
 - Female: High number
 - Male: Moderate number
- **Financial Issues:**
 - Female: Several cases
 - Male: Fewer cases
- **Personal Reasons:**
 - Female: Various reasons
 - Male: Fewer cases

Observations:

- **1L (First Year):** The highest attrition rates are observed in the first year across all races and ethnicities.
- **Hispanic and Asian:** These groups have consistently high attrition rates across multiple years.
- **White:** Significant attrition in the first year, with some cases in subsequent years.
- **Black or African American:** Lower attrition rates compared to other groups, but still present.

Possible Solutions:

1. **Support Programs:** Implement academic support programs to help students struggling academically.
2. **Financial Aid:** Increase financial support options to reduce attrition due to financial issues.
3. **Counseling Services:** Provide counseling services to address personal issues that may lead to attrition.

Lincoln Law School

APPENDIX E

Projected Cash Flow for Fiscal Year 2024-2025 as of January 31, 2025

Income													
	Total YTD	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Tuition & Fees	540,000	156,003	106,959	49,887	20,243	26,876	88,734	40,768	10,531	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Contributions	237,650	10,000			400	1,250	1,000			100,000		125,000	
Special Events													
Donated Services	2,828	2,828											
Grants													
Intellectual Property													
Law Enforcement													
Other Revenue			15	56									
Total Income	780,477	168,830	106,974	49,943	20,643	28,126	89,734	40,768	10,531	110,000	10,000	135,000	10,000
Expenses													
	Total YTD	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Salaries & Wages	461,337	14,571	31,643	41,756	48,224	37,961	39,645	41,256	41,256	41,256	41,256	41,256	41,256
Rent	178,181	14,260	14,016	14,278	15,438	18,326	18,503	17,440	17,500	12,100	12,100	12,100	12,100
Insurance	42,501	5,018	3,826	3,048	3,826	3,826	3,826	3,826	3,826	2,870	2,870	2,870	2,870
Payroll Taxes	37,720	1,179	2,377	3,278	3,605	2,976	3,092	3,713	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500
Employee Benefits	26,618	1,590	2,931	2,989	3,006	2,028	2,036	2,038	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Other Non Labor	154,783	9,520	14,393	9,330	9,674	26,062	14,024	11,780	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Total Expenses	901,139	46,139	69,186	74,678	83,793	91,179	81,125	80,053	80,082	73,726	73,726	73,726	73,726
Net Operating Income	(120,555)	122,728	37,788	(24,735)	(63,151)	(63,053)	8,609	(39,285)	(69,551)	36,274	(63,726)	61,274	(63,726)
Balances	As of 7/1/24	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Bank Accounts	182,643	281,205	316,936	290,036	219,615	159,245	169,161	131,799	62,248	98,522	34,796	96,070	32,344
Scheduled Donations	225,000									100,000		125,000	
Projected Tuition	540,000	383,997	277,038	227,152	206,909	180,033	91,299	50,531					
Cash & Proj. Tuition	947,643	665,202	593,974	517,188	426,524	339,278	260,460	182,330					
SBA Loan Balance	145,941	141,518	140,876	140,236	139,595	138,954	137,672	137,031					

Tuition Projected obtained from FY 2024-2025 budget - represents the amount of tuition to be collected during the months remaining in the fiscal year (thru June 2025)

Projected Receipts comprised of verbal pledge by trustee donor with extensive giving history and second installment of foundation pledge booked in May 2024

The Small Business Administration loan is being paid down with payments of \$641 per month in accordance with the current terms of the loan

**Actual, Budgeted and Projected Financial Results
for Fiscal Years 2024 through 2028
as of August 22, 2024**

	Actual 2023-2024	Budgeted 2024-2025	Projected 2025 -2026	Projected 2026-2027	Projected 2027-2028
Enrollment					
1L	7	4	20	30	30
2L	10	2	4	15	25
3L	14	8	2	4	12
4L	7	13	8	2	4
Total	38	27	34	51	71
Revenue					
Tuition & Fees	731,730	540,000	680,000	1,020,000	1,420,000
Donations	489,500	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Special Events	5,786	10,000	15,000	20,000	25,000
Grants	-	-	100,000	100,000	100,000
Intellectual Property	-	-	-	-	-
Professional Training	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1,227,016	650,000	895,000	1,240,000	1,645,000
Expenses					
Dean and Staff Salaries	511,117	382,000	382,000	500,000	800,000
Dean and Staff Taxes	39,719	30,560	30,560	40,000	64,000
Dean and Staff Benefits	38,254	38,254	38,254	50,000	80,000
Faculty Payroll	146,400	109,800	146,400	146,400	146,400
Faculty Taxes	13,386	9,882	13,386	13,386	13,386
Audited Financials				35,000	35,000
Building Rent & Expenses	225,589	180,000	180,000	180,000	180,000
Marketing Expenses	6,313	5,000	5,000	15,000	20,000
SBA Loan Payments		5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Other Expenses	167,352	145,140	150,000	155,000	160,000
Total	1,149,085	905,636	950,600	1,139,786	1,503,786
Net Income	109,922	(255,636)	(55,600)	100,214	141,214
Cash Position					
Carry forward from prior year	395,039	182,643	52,007	121,407	221,621
Paid donations previously booked		125,000	125,000	-	-
Total cash to offset loss		307,643	177,007	121,407	221,621
Net cash position		52,007	121,407	221,621	362,835