A REPORT ON RECRUITING AND RETAINING UNDER-REPRESENTED STUDENTS IN TEXAS PUBLIC LAW SCHOOLS:

ADDENDUM TO PROJECTING THE NEED FOR LEGAL EDUCATION IN TEXAS, OCTOBER 2002

January 2003
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

This report is available on the Coordinating Board website at http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/UHRI/ProfSchools.htm.
The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age or disability in employment or the provision of services.
# A Report on Recruiting and Retaining Under-represented Students in Law Schools

## Table of Contents

I. Background .......................................................................................................................... 1

II. Methodology......................................................................................................................... 1

III. Selected Background Information on Traditional Affirmative Action and the Recruitment of Law Students from Under-represented Groups ................................................................... 2

IV. Review of the Literature -- Methods Used to Increase the Numbers of Students from Under-represented Groups ............................................................................................................. 3

V. Review of the Literature -- Methods Used to Increase the Retention of Students from Under-represented Groups ............................................................................................................. 5

VI. Survey Results ..................................................................................................................... 7

VII. Conclusion ........................................................................................................................... 9

Bibliography ................................................................................................................................... 10

Appendices .................................................................................................................................... 13
I. **Background**

Increasing the numbers of law school students from under-represented groups is an ongoing challenge for Texas and the nation. This report, which is an addendum to *Projecting the Need for Legal Education in Texas*, adopted by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board on October 25, 2002, assesses different strategies to enhance the number of under-represented students (e.g., Blacks, Hispanics, and economically disadvantaged) in Texas public law schools (Texas Southern University, Texas Tech University, University of Houston, and The University of Texas at Austin). This addendum report was requested by the Coordinating Board to provide information regarding the state’s approach to educating its citizens to enter the legal profession.

*A Report on Recruiting and Retaining Under-represented Students in Texas Public Law Schools* focuses on strategies to increase enrollment and retention of students from under-represented groups among law students in public institutions in Texas, and provides a review of the recent literature regarding these efforts in other states. The Board will provide this report to the Legislature, the state’s law schools, and other interested parties.

II. **Methodology**

The research and analysis used to produce this report involved two main components:

1. Board staff conducted a preliminary review of the applicable literature concerning the recruitment and retention of law students from under-represented groups. Staff used the general findings of this review to design and conduct a survey of those efforts at the state’s four public law schools (see Appendix A). The results of that survey are compiled in this report on pages 7 and 8.

2. Board staff also conducted a more comprehensive review of the applicable literature (published mainly since 1990), with a focus on finding articles that address the most promising strategies currently or recently used to recruit and retain law students from under-represented groups. The results of this selective review of the literature are compiled in the Bibliography and are cited throughout this report, as appropriate. Specifically, this review involved the following steps:

   A. Searches of electronic databases containing reference information on relevant articles published in general academic journals, legal journals, and periodicals;
   B. Generation of reference lists from each of these searches;
   C. Assessment of the significance to this report of each reference, based on article title, abstract, and/or publication date;
   D. Preliminary review of promising articles using full-text on-line resources, The University of Texas at Austin Tarleton Law Library, and the Texas State Library;
   E. Retrieval of the articles considered most germane for this report, based on the preliminary review; and
   F. Full review of the articles and extraction of information from the articles retrieved.
III. Selected Background Information on Traditional Affirmative Action and the Recruitment of Law Students from Under-represented Groups

While this report focuses on strategies used to increase enrollment and retention of students from under-represented groups, the report would not be complete without the presentation of some recent background information on the continuing national controversy over the use of affirmative action policies in law school admissions. This is particularly true in light of the U.S. Supreme Court’s announcement on December 2, 2002 that it would consider two cases involving the use of race-conscious admissions policies by the University of Michigan’s Law School and the University of Michigan’s College of Literature, Science, and the Arts. Some recent historical events pertaining to this issue include the following:

- In June 1978, the Supreme Court of the United States held in Regents of the University of California v. Bakke that schools could consider race as a factor, but not as the sole criterion for admissions.

- In March 1996, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit, which covers Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas, in Hopwood v. Texas struck down the race-conscious admissions policies used by The University of Texas School of Law.

- In November 1996, California voters passed Proposition 209, which prohibits discrimination or preferential treatment by state and other public entities on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin.

- In May 1997, then Texas Governor Bush signed a bill into law providing that, effective September 1997, Texas students in the top ten percent of their graduating high school classes be admitted automatically to any Texas public university.

- In March 1998, U.S. District Judge Sam Sparks ruled that The University of Texas School of Law could not consider race when admitting applicants.

- In December 2000, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit, which covers nine Rocky Mountain and Pacific states, upheld a race-conscious admissions policy in Smith v. University of Washington Law School.

- In August 2001, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit, which covers Alabama, Florida, and Georgia, struck down a race-conscious admissions policy in Johnson v. Board of Regents of the University of Georgia.

- In May 2002, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 6th Circuit, which covers Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, and Tennessee, upheld the University of Michigan Law School’s race-conscious admission policies in Grutter v. Bollinger.

- In December 2002, the Supreme Court of the United States announced that it would consider two cases involving the use of race-conscious admissions policies by the University of Michigan’s Law School (Grutter v. Bollinger) and the University of Michigan’s College of Literature, Science, and the Arts (Gratz v. Bollinger).
IV. Review of the Literature -- Methods Used to Increase the Numbers of Students from Under-represented Groups

Note: These numbers coincide with the same item numbers on the survey sent to the state’s four public law schools (Appendix A).

1. Summer programs/institutes to provide skills to enhance law school attendance

Using summer programs/institutes\(^1\) to provide skills to enhance law school performance was formalized nationally in 1968 when the Council on Legal Education (CLEO) started regional institutes (Amana, 1991; Purdie, 1992). The CLEO program is a six-week pre-law program that provides an orientation to law school, information on financial issues, training in legal writing, and exam-taking techniques, as well as offering stipends for attendance. Other pre-start programs focus on encouraging undergraduates to enter the field of law (e.g., Gonzago University School of Law’s six-week Summer Fellowship Program) (Lundwall, 1994); familiarize candidates with the application process and admission requirements (e.g., Florida State University College of Law’s Summer Law Program for Undergraduates) (American Bar, 2000, p. 27); and provide a “preview” of realistic law school expectations (e.g., the American Bar Association CLEO’s Regional Summer Institutes, Indiana CLEO’s Summer Institute) (American Bar, 2000, pp. 36, 39). Most of these summer programs provide financial assistance to students for attendance.

The Law School Preparation Institute at The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) (American Bar, 2000, p. 34) is particularly noteworthy in attracting undergraduate students from under-represented groups into law school and preparing them to optimize the admissions process. The Institute, which is part of UTEP’s Center of Law and Border Studies, is open to juniors and seniors at UTEP who intend to go to law school. Program activities include helping students develop analytical and critical reading and writing skills, guiding students in law school selection and application, and providing prospective law schools with an account of an applicant’s ability to study law. A similar program has been initiated at The University of Texas – Pan American (UTPA) that was modeled on the UTEP program. The UTPA Law School Preparation Institute takes place during the second summer session and includes intensive analytical reading and writing assignments, and test preparation for the Law School Admissions Test (LSAT).

Law schools that offer summer programs for newly admitted law students generally range in length from two to eight weeks (Practical Guide, 2000 pp. 41-46). Eight-week programs offer greater opportunities for more in-depth learning skills instruction, the opportunity to take the class for credit, more valuable exam-taking experience, and a possible reduction in law class responsibilities during the first academic year (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 41). Four-week programs offer sufficient time to identify and address some fundamental learning skills deficits and acclimate students to the law school experience (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 41). Generally, two-week programs emphasize the development of study skills specific to law school, exposure to the experience of law school classes, and acclimation to law school facilities and the surrounding community (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 46).

\(^1\) Summer programs/institutes are cited in the literature as a means of both recruitment and retention.
2. **Collaboration with local bar associations to encourage law school attendance**

The review of the literature did not add any additional insights beyond the survey.

3. **Collaboration with state bar associations to encourage law school attendance**

The review of the literature did not add any additional insights beyond the survey.

4. **Outreach programs at local K-12 schools or communities to increase interest in attending law school**

Proponents of early intervention argue that if a law school wants to have a diverse student body, the school should consider outreach in the public schools (Dannin, 1999). Outreach programs at K-12 schools to increase interest in attending law school were noted by several sources. Examples include holding conferences on high school campuses and providing brochures about opportunities in a legal career (Neely, 1986), employing high school students in law firms (American Bar, 2000, p. 29), sponsoring a mock trial program (American Bar, 2000, p. 29), providing job shadow days where students “shadow” lawyers and judges (American Bar, 2000, p. 29), offering summer internships in law offices (American Bar, 2000, p. 30), and sponsoring a summer camp for aspiring future law students (American Bar, 2000, p. 31). Generally, the purpose of these programs is to motivate and inform.

As a specific example of an early outreach program, California Western School of Law, a private law school in Southern California, has been a partner with inner-city San Diego public schools since 1991 (Dannin, 1999). The partnership offers tutoring of high school students by law school students, special programs for at-risk students, and a four-week outreach program where law school students meet with high school students once per week for two hours after school.

5. **Outreach programs at selected universities to solicit interest by students in attending law school**

The review of the literature did not add any additional insights beyond the survey.

6. **Recruiting at university “law fairs,” particularly at universities with a large percentage of students from under-represented groups**

Recruiting at university “law fairs” is pursued by some institutions (Neely, 1986). Activities include administering sample admission tests and providing information about financial aid and the application process.

7. **Other programs to increase enrollment of students from under-represented groups**

A variety of other programs (than those listed above) were offered across the nation to entice students into law school. These include using both the university’s and law school’s student services (i.e., placement, financial aid, academic support) to assist students from under-represented groups into law school (Hazen, 1992); building a comprehensive law school recruiting process (including an organizational self-analysis, forming a standing committee, having an action program) (Neely, 1986);
“active recruitment” (visiting college campuses seeking good matches between students and law schools) (Motley, 1992); stimulating law faculty to reshape the debate about affirmative action (Haddon, 1997); utilizing cohorts of under-represented groups to enhance the chances for pre-law undergraduates (e.g., the Law and Diversity Program at Western Washington University) (Bannai & Eaton, 1997); and publishing newspapers for children with “It’s Your Law” and “You be the Judge” features (e.g., the Massachusetts Bar Association’s legal newspaper for middle school students) (American Bar, 2000, p. 29).

V. Review of the Literature -- Methods Used to Increase the Retention of Students from Under-represented Groups

Note: These numbers coincide with the same item numbers on the survey sent to the state’s four public law schools (Appendix A).

8. Mentor programs with faculty and/or practicing lawyers

Mentor programs with faculty and/or practicing lawyers were found in several institutions. Activities involve acting as role models (Johnson, 1992); providing dinners, diversity training, and orientation visits to the law community (American Bar, 2000, p. 44); and matching attorneys with law students to provide tutorials and career development information (American Bar, 2000, pp. 45, 46).

9. Summer clerkships arrangements for law students from under-represented groups

Summer clerkships for law students (in addition to pre-law internships discussed above in No. 1) were used in several locations. Summer jobs programs pay law students while they get legal experience and develop contacts (American Bar, 2000, p. 39). The Minority Judicial Internship Program, which is sponsored by the New York County Lawyers’ Association, accepts first- and second-year minority students to perform legal research, draft memos, and assist with jury selection (American Bar, 2000, p. 42). Other programs place top students into law firms during summers and provide legal work experiences for law students in law firms (American Bar, 2000, pp. 44, 46). The initial goal of summer clerkship programs for under-represented students is to increase the number of minorities taking part in law firm clerkship programs; the ultimate goal of such programs is to increase the number of minorities hired to work with large firms (“University of Colorado,” 2001).

10. Study groups/programs

Study groups/programs were conducted at some institutions. For example, one law school developed a Study Skills for Success Program, designed to assist students in exam taking (American Bar, 2000, p. 41). The University of Pittsburgh School of Law developed a legal writing program, which includes a week-long formal presentation of study techniques and methods of preparation for examinations; presents methods for analyzing and synthesizing cases; and provides ample opportunities for socializing with faculty, administrators, upper-class students, and practicing attorneys (Deasy, 1991). Many programs offer both small-group sessions and individual sessions with teaching assistants throughout the academic year (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 52).
11. Law student/faculty organizations

Law student/faculty organizations were noted in two references. Student associations typically meet to share ideas and solve minority-related issues (American Bar, 2000, p. 38). Other law student associations get involved in recruitment activities that include grooming college juniors for law school (Amana, 1991).

12. Exam workshops

Most academic assistance programs in law schools have some type of first-year academic component that includes opportunities for students to take practice exams, have them critiqued, and then rewrite them (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 52). Exam workshops conducted shortly before exam taking were described by one institution in Massachusetts (American Bar, 2000, p. 41).

Bar exam preparation workshops are offered by a few law schools (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 27) and range from a series of lectures on study skills to substantive review and writing courses (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 60).

13. Academic course to enhance law student performance

Knaplund and Sander (1995) reviewed and assessed academic courses designed to enhance law school performance. The University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law has offered such a course since 1985 (Knaplund & Sander, 1995). For this “First-Spring Course,” law professors select students who performed poorly in their first semester and substitute for their legal writing course a special course that focuses on the learning process (Knaplund & Sander, 1995). Based on their extensive comparisons on the three variations of this course at UCLA, Knaplund and Sander concluded that it is particularly important to have students fully understand a learning concept before asking them to transfer it to other subjects.

14. Tutoring

The review of the literature did not add any additional insights beyond the survey.

15. Other programs to enhance retention of students from under-represented groups

Several additional programs (other than those listed in the survey) to enhance retention of law students in under-represented groups were described. These include full disclosure of a law school’s diversity goals, a comprehensive grievance mechanism, and a job-hunting skills development program (Hagen, 1992); use of a transfer policy (from law school to law school) that is diversity conscious (especially for students to “move up” to a more prestigious institution) (Martinez, 1994); and establishment of a scholarship fund to be used for racial and ethnic minority students (American Bar, 2000, p. 37).

---

2 See Appendices B and C for additional information regarding academic assistance programs in law schools.
For a select number of entering students, some law schools offer extended school year orientation programs that are one to three days in length (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 46). These programs either serve as a bridge between the summer and academic year components of the school’s academic assistance program, or introduce students to a comprehensive school-year academic assistance program (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 49).

VI. Survey Results

As noted in Section II, a short survey (designed by Board staff on the basis of a preliminary review of the applicable literature) was sent to each of the four public law schools in Texas (Texas Southern University, Texas Tech University, University of Houston, and The University of Texas at Austin) during November 2002. Each law school responded and described its own programs to increase the recruitment and retention of under-represented groups of students in the law school. The following results have been aggregated and a range of costs provided (where known) for each of the 15 items in the survey. These results are displayed in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Methods used by public law schools in Texas to increase the numbers of students from under-represented groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Proportion Using</th>
<th>Annual Cost Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Summer program/institute to provide skills to enhance law school performance</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>$50,000 - $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Collaboration with local bar associations to encourage law school attendance</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collaboration with state bar associations to encourage law school attendance</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Outreach programs at local K-12 schools or communities to increase interest in attending law school</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>$586 - $1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Outreach programs at selected universities to solicit interest by students in attending law school</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>$1,000 - $18,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Recruiting at university “law fairs” at universities with a large percentage of students from under-represented groups</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>$3,000 - $30,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other programs to increase enrollment of students from under-represented groups</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>$1,000 - $11,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mailings to target specific groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Law School Admission Council February Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student and Faculty Recruitment Council to assist in recruitment of students from under-represented groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost all of the recruitment and retention programs cited in the literature were used by Texas public law schools. More recruitment programs reportedly were used than retention programs. A comparison of the costs reveals that three times more money (approximately $344,000) was spent annually on recruitment programs than retention programs (approximately $108,000). Law schools appear to devote more time and emphasis “up front” to attract good candidates from under-represented populations. One type of retention program (study groups/programs that focus on law students from under-represented groups) was not used, but some schools have shifted their emphasis toward programs that focus on low-performing students, regardless of gender or ethnicity.

All Texas public law schools have developed other programs (than those listed in the survey) to enhance recruitment and retention of students from under-represented groups. Clearly, more funds were applied to recruit students through summer programs/institutes than through other types of programs. As the literature review revealed, these types of programs have existed for several decades throughout the United States.
Overall, Texas public law schools spend from approximately $4,000 to $180,000 annually on these programs. These costs total approximately $451,000 annually. In addition, all of the schools mentioned other, undetermined costs that were not included (e.g., faculty time spent mentoring, administrator attendance at conferences, and similar items) for efforts that contribute to the programs.

VII. Conclusion

Texas public law schools use retention and recruitment programs that are similar to those of other states’ law schools. Also, Texas institutions use a variety of programs to recruit and retain students from under-represented groups, but spend more resources on recruitment. Texas also is moving to programs that focus on retaining low-performing students (not classified by any specific under-represented group).

Despite a large number of programs, the student enrollment from under-represented groups is still small (proportionately) compared to their representation in the general population. The basis of a solution could be in better academic preparation for all students, before anyone considers admission to professional schools (like law).

A review of the applicable literature reveals that academic assistance programs in law schools cannot adequately address general educational deficiencies of incoming law students. Rather, these programs are better suited to improve students’ learning and critical thinking skills. To be most effective in improving both the short- and long-term academic performance and retention of law students, each component of the program must be carefully designed to address identified learning challenges within a law school.

Some consideration could be given to creating a joint admissions law program similar to the statewide coordinated effort that exists to increase the number of economically disadvantaged students enrolling in and graduating from Texas medical schools (i.e., The Joint Admissions Medical Program – JAMP). JAMP selects promising undergraduate students to receive a guarantee of financial support throughout their four years as undergraduates. Students who meet all program requirements also receive guaranteed admission into Texas medical schools, with full financial support. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board encourages all Texas public law schools to review this document and continue to develop effective programs to close the gaps in participation and success in legal education.
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Appendices

Appendix A  Law School Survey
Appendix B  Some Evidence Regarding Evaluation of Academic Assistance Programs
Appendix C  Overview and Assessment of Academic Support Programs at the UCLA School of Law
Please indicate (by checking “Yes” or “No”) whether you are using each of the following methods to increase the numbers of students from under-represented groups at your law school and how much annually the program costs to support.

Yes No 1. Summer program/institute to provide skills to enhance law school performance

Total annual cost:

Yes No 2. Collaboration with local bar associations to encourage law school attendance

Total annual cost:

Yes No 3. Collaboration with state bar associations to encourage law school attendance

Total annual cost:

Yes No 4. Outreach programs at local K-12 schools or communities to increase interest in attending law school

Total annual cost:

Yes No 5. Outreach programs at selected universities to solicit interest by students in attending law school

Total annual cost:

Yes No 6. Recruiting at university “law fairs” at universities with a large percentage of students from under-represented groups

Total annual cost:

Yes No 7. Other programs to increase enrollment of students from under-represented groups (please specify each additional program using as much space as required: ________________)

Total annual cost:
Please indicate (by checking “Yes” or “No”) which of the following programs you use to increase the retention of students from under-represented groups in your law school and estimate the total annual cost, and, if you can, the cost per student from under-represented groups.

Yes  No   8. Mentor programs with faculty and/or practicing lawyers for law students from under-represented groups

   Total annual cost:
   Cost per student from under-represented groups:

Yes  No   9. Arranging summer clerkships for law students from under-represented groups

   Total annual cost:
   Cost per student from under-represented groups:

Yes  No   10. Study groups/programs that focus on law students from under-represented groups

   Total annual cost:
   Cost per student from under-represented groups:

Yes  No   11. Law student/faculty organizations

   Total annual cost:
   Cost per student from under-represented groups:

Yes  No   12. Exam workshops

   Total annual cost:
   Cost per student from under-represented groups:

Yes  No   13. Academic course to enhance law student performance

   Total annual cost:
   Cost per student from under-represented groups:

Yes  No   14. Tutoring

   Total annual cost:
   Cost per student from under-represented groups:

Yes  No   15. Other programs that enhance retention of students from under-represented groups (Please specify each additional program using as much space as required: _____________________________)

   Total annual cost:
   Cost per student from under-represented groups:

Thank you for your information.
Some Evidence Regarding Evaluation of Academic Assistance Programs

Law schools generally do not account for the disparate education backgrounds among entering students, at least not in their mainstream curriculum (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 10). The most widespread institutional response to use of special admission policies in law school admissions has been the creation of academic assistance programs to provide academic assistance to students who may be less prepared academically for law school (Knaplund & Sander, 1995, p. 158). These programs often are intended to help increase racial and ethnic diversity; however, academic assistance programs at most law schools are open to all students (Practical Guide, 2000, p. i).

The Law School Admission Council (LSAC) notes that “a comprehensive academic assistance program will likely enhance the retention rate and performance among program participants” (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 62). However, with the exception of the ongoing evaluation of academic assistance programs at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law, the LSAC notes that “substantial methodological hurdles” face program evaluators who are interested in documenting statistical evidence of the success or failure of academic support programs in law schools (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 96).

Based on their review of the existing literature on academic assistance programs in law schools, Knaplund and Sander (1995) concluded that the existing literature fails to provide clear evidence of the success or failure of those programs, primarily because of methodological flaws in study design (e.g., difficulty in developing good control groups, small sample sizes, etc.). Further, some programs that seem to have a positive short-term effect have a much smaller long-term effect, or no long-term effect at all (Knaplund & Sander, 1995, p. 168). Knaplund and Sander’s comprehensive empirical analysis of the academic effects of seven distinct academic support initiatives at the UCLA School of Law indicates that support can improve both short- and long-term academic performance, but the effects vary markedly across programs (see Appendix C).

Although there is no perfect model for an academic assistance program, LSAC’s review of existing programs suggests that the following aspects are vital (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 20):

- The program must have institutional commitment, both tangible and intangible;
- The program must have sufficient time to evolve;
- The professional in charge of the program must have sufficient opportunity to work with students;
- Faculty must be willing to work with the program and its students; and
- The program must be grounded in learning and cognitive theory.

1 Academic assistance programs also are referred to in the literature as academic support programs. In Appendix B, the Law School Admission Council’s practice of referring to these programs as academic assistance programs is followed.
2 The Law School Admission Council (LSAC) is a nonprofit corporation that provides services to the legal education community.
LSAC also identifies the following general components of successful academic assistance programs, with no one component operating in isolation from another (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 27):

- Summer component (offered by most laws schools in combination with a first-year academic component);
- First-year academic component (offered by most laws schools in combination with summer component);
- Upper-level academic component (offered by many law schools); and
- Bar review component (offered by a few law schools).

Based on the identification of the principal components that are found in effective academic assistance programs, the LSAC recommends the following:

- Academic assistance programs should be designed to address identified needs within a law school (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 1).
- Solid summer, orientation, and first-year components should be established for an academic assistance program before the law school begins to add upper-level and bar preparation components to the program (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 59).
- In determining what components to include or add to an academic assistance program, the law school should identify the learning challenges each component will address, and how and in what sequence that component will fit with other components of the program (Practical Guide, 2000, p. 28).
Overview and Assessment of Academic Support Programs at the UCLA School of Law

Summer Program
- Enrolls 60 “diversity students” annually.
- Provides two-week academic orientation to law school.
- Led by about 20 faculty members.
- Total cost: $94,300 annually; cost per student: $1,572*

Weekly Review Sessions
- Offered in conjunction with 12 of the first-year courses, with about 80 participants per semester.
- Review of material or concepts covered in a particular course one hour per week.
- Led by second- or third-year law students.
- Total cost: $32,400 annually; cost per student: $135

First-Year Exam Workshops
- Gives entering students an opportunity to take practice exams in most of the substantive courses.
- Offered once per week during second half of semester, with about 120 participants per semester.
- Led by faculty.
- Total cost: $15,000 annually; cost per student: $125

First-Spring Course
- Teachers select students who performed poorly in their first semester and substitute for their legal writing course a special course that focuses on the learning process.
- Taught by faculty in two sections of 15 students each.
- Total cost: $52,000 annually; cost per student: $1,733

Probation Course
- Taken during the third semester of law school by students (typically 10) on academic probation.
- Taught by faculty as a substitute for a second-year substantive course.
- Provides supplemental instruction on the learning process.
- Total cost: $27,000 annually; cost per student: $1,800

Study Groups
- Offers study groups, led by teachers, in upper-level substantive courses, typically to students with grade averages below a certain threshold.
- Offers sessions that function as an organized study group, with a professor delegating topics to be covered and expanding on course material.
- Total cost: $11,000 annually; cost per student: $733

Tutoring
- Provides one-on-one tutoring of students by faculty.
- Program discontinued in 1988.

* Costs are for the 1992-93 academic year and include salaries of all teachers and program administrators, student accommodations (summer program), and out-of-pocket expenses. Costs do not include secretarial support, teaching space, and other general overhead expenses.

To access each academic support program at the UCLA School of Law, Knaplund and Sander (1995) ran multiple regression equations in which the key independent variable was program participation, and the key dependent variables were same-semester grades (for short-term effects) and subsequent-semester grades (for long-term effects). Table 1 summarizes Knaplund and Sander’s (1995) overall evaluation of the academic effect of academic support programs at UCLA. The researchers express more confidence in their assessment of programs that provide a similar documented experience to a large number of students (the summer program and the first-spring course). Nevertheless, their overall general conclusions are:

- Some academic support programs have a strong and long-term impact on the academic performance of students.
- Academic effectiveness varies widely among programs that have equal funding, faculty involvement, and institutional support.
- Some programs impart academic advantages that are useful to students only in the short term.

Table 1. Summary Evaluations of UCLA’s Academic Support Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of Program on Student GPA in:</th>
<th>1st Semester</th>
<th>2nd Semester</th>
<th>2nd and 3rd Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-week Summer Program</td>
<td>Moderate Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Spring Course</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Usually Moderate Effect</td>
<td>Usually Strong Effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualified Evaluations in:</th>
<th>1st Semester</th>
<th>2nd Semester</th>
<th>2nd and 3rd Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>Some Effect as Supplement to First-Spring Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Workshops</td>
<td>Strong Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Sessions</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Moderate Effect with Quantity</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Course</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Moderate Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-Led Study Groups</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Moderate Effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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