An Approach to Monitoring and Assessing **Online/Hybrid J.D. Programs**

Authored by RTI International for AccessLex Institute®

RTI INTERNATIONAL

AccessLex INSTITUTE®

Introduction

The expansion of distance learning among American Bar Association (ABA)-approved J.D. programs has the potential to increase access to a legal education, especially for students who have traditionally faced barriers to J.D. attainment because of employment, family duties, geographical location, and other circumstances. Compared to attending class in person, distance learning provides greater flexibility and increased convenience and may also result in cost savings since students do not have to relocate or forgo earnings to enroll full-time.

Before the COVID-19 pandemic, only a few law schools offered ABA-approved hybrid J.D. programs, but the pandemic temporarily forced all law schools online and, subsequently, seems to have spurred the creation of additional hybrid and fully online J.D. programs.[1] Despite the increasing number of law schools with distance education programs, there has been limited research on the successes and challenges these schools encountered as they initiated and grew their hybrid and online programs. We know little about which aspects of these law programs, including their specific pedagogies, are most beneficial to improving student engagement and learning outcomes and how the impact of these programs varies depending on student characteristics.

This guide serves as a primer to law schools and other parties interested in evaluating hybrid J.D. programs.[2] Its instructions and recommendations are based on a recent formative evaluation we conducted of an ABA-approved, hybrid J.D. program. Within each evaluation step outlined below, we recommend activities, strategies, and issues to consider for both formative and summative[3] assessments.

Evaluation Steps

Developing an evaluation approach begins with the evaluation team[4] working together to determine the purpose of the evaluation and the goals and questions to be answered given the stage of the program. For example, if the program is relatively new, the evaluation could focus on program implementation to better understand the challenges and barriers that have emerged since the launch of the program.

1 For a list of ABA-approved law schools with approved distance education J.D. programs, see **https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/resources/distance_education/approved-distance-ed-jd-programs/**.

2 This guide was prepared for AccessLex Institute by evaluators at RTI International.

3 Formative evaluations take place while a program is in early stages and still underway, and summative evaluations typically occur after a program ends.

4 The evaluation team could include internal or external evaluators, program leaders, evaluation funders, and other interested parties (e.g., those who are invested in the program, interested in the results of the evaluation, or interested in what will be done with the results).

Determine Evaluation Goals

As with any research venture, the evaluation team should first spend time considering *why* an evaluation is needed. Perhaps the hybrid J.D. program is new, and it is imperative to learn what is working or not working so changes can be made to improve the program experience and its early outcomes. On the other hand, if the program is more established, an evaluation could help determine — through multiple measures — whether the hybrid J.D. program accomplished its goals. Most evaluations are guided by a *logic model,* where researchers determine inputs, activities, outputs, and short, medium, and/or long-term outcomes. **Inputs** are defined as the investments or efforts that contribute to the program. **Activities** are the components of a program being measured or studied. **Outputs** define what occurs as a result of the program, and **outcomes** are measurements that determine whether a program met its defined goals.[5]

Early in the evaluation, it is also important to determine what aspects of the hybrid J.D. program will be assessed. These aspects could include the following:

- The quality of student learning;
- Enrollment and retention of students in remote areas or those with employment and family responsibilities;
- Fostering student engagement at levels equal to or greater than that of comparable brick-and-mortar J.D. programs;
- Unique aspects of the program—such as success in training students for a particular area of legal practice; and
- Successful development of lawyering competencies in students (e.g., legal writing, argumentation, research, etc.).

Determine the Appropriate Type of Evaluation

Evaluation falls into one of two general categories: formative and summative. The type of evaluation conducted will depend on the program's stage of development and on the research goals and questions. Since many hybrid J.D. programs are new, currently in development, or undergoing recent changes, a **formative** evaluation may be more appropriate and useful. Formative evaluations inform program administrators of successes or challenges *while the program is underway* and are used to guide program development and assess whether the program is being implemented as intended. Outcomes of formative evaluations might be used to incorporate suggested updates or improvements to the program. Formative evaluations often rely on qualitative research methods and can involve frequent gathering, analysis, and reporting of data. Because of this, formative evaluations can be resource intensive.

5 Learn more about logic models and how to create one for a program evaluation by visiting resources like **https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northeast/pdf/rel_2015057.pdf**.

Summative evaluations, on the other hand, assess the extent to which a program has been successful in improving student outcomes and achieving its goals. Once a hybrid J.D. program is established, a summative evaluation of student outcomes, such as bar exam passage rates or employment outcomes, can provide evidence of whether the hybrid J.D. program is effective and for whom. However, conducting summative evaluations can be challenging. Measuring the impact of a hybrid J.D. program takes time and it can be difficult to disentangle outcomes based on the program itself versus other outside, confounding factors that can influence observed program results. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, residential law students were required to complete coursework online. In this situation, it would be difficult for a law school to conduct an evaluation comparing student engagement outcomes of its residential program and its hybrid program. By understanding the limitations of the formative or summative evaluation, the evaluation team can work to mitigate potential biases and challenges.

For either type of evaluation, those conducting the assessment must consider the population or groups to be studied. If the evaluation is interested in the experiences of hybrid J.D. students and whether the hybrid J.D. program is meeting its intended goals, then the study population would only include hybrid J.D. students and would not require a comparison group of residential J.D. students to determine program efficacy. On the other hand, it might be pertinent to compare the outcomes of hybrid J.D. students to the outcomes of residential J.D. students to determine whether the hybrid J.D. program components are comparable to the residential J.D. program components. However, the comparison group of residential students should be similar to the hybrid students in terms of demographics and other measures. For instance, there may be inherent differences in the intensity of attendance (part-time versus full-time) between the two programs, and quantitative analyses should account for those differences and control for discrepancies.

Develop Research Questions

Once the goals, evaluation type, and study population have been determined, the evaluation team should collaborate to develop research questions. These research questions will provide a "North Star" for the evaluation, and all components of the evaluation should be connected tow the research questions.

When developing research questions, it is important to consider the broader goals of the evaluation and tie the questions to those goals. Refer back to the logic model to help guide research questions in determining, for example, whether intended outcomes are being achieved or whether all program inputs are being adequately considered. Research questions will vary based on the evaluation type. As an example, the following are five research questions from a recent formative evaluation of a hybrid J.D. program. These research questions were developed in collaboration with program leaders, evaluators, and evaluation funders.

1. To what extent is the hybrid J.D. program effective in producing **law student learning outcomes** as described in **ABA Standard 302**?
2. To what extent is the hybrid J.D. program effective in fostering **student engagement** (e.g., participation in class, student activities, extra- and cocurricular experiences)?
3. To what extent is the hybrid J.D. program effective in **expanding access to law school** (e.g., to caregivers, military members) and attracting and retaining students from underserved (e.g., rural, low-income) communities?
4. What aspects of the hybrid J.D. program are most effective in meeting ABA Standard 302 generally and **its access and engagement objectives** specifically?
5. Which ABA Standard 302 outcomes, if any, pose the greatest **challenges and/or opportunities for improving delivery and efficacy** of the hybrid J.D. program?

By comparison, a summative evaluation of a hybrid J.D. program, could include the following research questions:

1. Has the hybrid program achieved its goal of broadening access to legal education?
2. Have hybrid program activities been beneficial to the target population?
3. Did offering multiple hybrid course options increase bar passage rates for program students?
4. Did offering a hybrid or online option for legal education increase the diversity of the applicant pool?
5. When compared to residential students, did hybrid students achieve similar academic and professional goals at the conclusion of their legal education?

For hybrid J.D. programs with a particular focus, at least one research question should center around that unique feature. For example, if a hybrid J.D. program featured intellectual property law, a specific research question should address the program's ability to prepare students to practice in that particular field (e.g., "To what extent is the hybrid J.D. program effective in preparing students to practice intellectual property law?").

Identify Data Elements

The research questions will guide the plan to obtain the data required to address those questions. To build the plan, it is necessary to identify what data elements are needed to evaluate the work. These elements should be defined in broad categories first, then fleshed out into more specific categories. For example, to determine answers to formative research question three ("To what extent is the hybrid J.D. program effective in expanding access to law school [e.g., to caregivers, military members] and attracting and retaining students from underserved [e.g., rural, low-income] communities?"), evaluators could select student demographics as a broad category, and specific categories within student demographics would be age, race, ethnicity, etc. As with other brainstorming activities, it is advisable to start with a comprehensive list first, and then narrow it down by prioritizing items of greatest interest or most relevance to the research questions, which will be mapped to the data collection sources, as discussed below.

If we consider research question two from the recent hybrid law school formative evaluation ("To what extent is the hybrid J.D. program effective in fostering **student engagement**?"), **data elements** could include enrollment status, student and faculty perceptions of engagement, and time spent on courses. These elements could be measured through **data sources** like administrative data, student surveys, faculty surveys, and learning management system (LMS) data, such as logins or the amount of time spent on particular course components.

Determine Data Sources

As the list of data elements is finalized, the evaluation team needs to determine how best to gather the information that aligns with those elements. The most common sources for program evaluation data include existing information, people, and direct observation. Existing information can include student administrative records; promotional, recruitment, or other program materials; and training materials used to assist faculty in undertaking distance learning instruction.

People are another data source for evaluations. For example, the evaluation team could collect information directly from faculty, students, law school deans, and instructional designers to gather information about these groups' perceptions and experiences with the hybrid J.D. program.

Finally, direct observation is a potential data source. It could include the evaluation team observing online classes synchronously and asynchronously, as well as other virtual interactions between and among students and faculty.

For each data source, there are a variety of data collection methods available for the evaluation. Using multiple methods is most ideal for obtaining different perspectives and "triangulating" or verifying findings. Furthermore, assigning too many data elements to any one data collection method could be overly burdensome for those who are providing data. The following list offers a menu of methods for obtaining data from students, instructors, course designers, administrators, and existing sources.

Surveys. Surveys can be an efficient way to gather standardized response data from a large number of people. It is important to keep surveys short and focused to reduce the lburden on participants and help ensure high response rates. If data can be obtained from administrative or other existing sources, the same data need not be collected in a survey. It can also be beneficial, if funding is available, to offer a monetary or token incentive to encourage participation. Online surveys are easy to create, and many open-source online platforms allow for easy email correspondence and exportation of descriptive statistics outlining results. It is advisable to vary question types as much as possible and perhaps limit the number of open-ended response options, since they can be costly to review and code.

Focus Groups and Interviews. Focus groups and interviews are effective modes for gleaning expansive, in-depth information about participants' experiences and opinions. One-on-one interviews provide safer spaces for individuals to speak freely without other participants hearing their responses. However, given the time that one-on-one interviews take to conduct and analyze, it may only be possible to conduct focus groups or interviews with a small subset of the target population.

Course/LMS Observations. Classroom observations allow for a replication of participants' experiences and provide a frame of reference for information provided through other data sources. This can be done by viewing recordings of synchronous coursework via the LMS. It is not advisable for the evaluator to "sit in" on the virtual course, which can influence how the instructor and/or the students act and react.

Document/Artifact Analysis. Reviewing program documents can provide operational, historical, and/or comparative information about the hybrid J.D. program. Because these program documents already exist, they are a relatively inexpensive data source and there is generally little burden on others to collect them. Examples of program documents include recruitment materials, websites, syllabi, and LMS artifacts.

Administrative Data. In addition to demographic information, directory information such as email addresses and names can be helpful for contacting potential participants for surveys and other data collection methods. Other administrative data could include demographics, academic outcomes, prior education, and admission information.

Program Assessment Rubric. Leveraging a validated rubric or framework to rate data obtained via observation or documentation can be a useful way to quantify or streamline qualitative information. In a recent formative evaluation of a hybrid J.D. program, we developed and applied a rubric to assess important elements of the hybrid J.D. program's course design and delivery. Specifically, we used the framework described in RTI International's **Blended Learning Toolkit**, the **Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) Framework**, and the **International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) Standards** to identify five key dimensions on which to rate the hybrid J.D. program. These frameworks and standards were also used to identify and describe key elements within each dimension. The rubric was applied to multiple sources of data, including surveys, interviews, document reviews, and exploration of the LMS, to assess the program's performance within multiple elements of five key dimensions (as shown in **Appendix A** of this). We chose a four-point rubric to allow for a distinction between the lowest and highest points on the rubric in ways that have meaningful implications for hybrid teaching practices.

The value of using a rubric focused on instructional delivery is that it specifies domains to inform where distance education programs should focus efforts to develop and improve. For example, the rubric we used assessed the program's delivery of "personalized learning" and determined that it "accomplished" this element if it "used a variety of technology tools to engage students, provided supports for using those tools, and made effective use of feedback to enhance student learning." In this way, the rubric makes use of research-based best practices to provide goals or targets to aim for when developing and delivering a distance learning program.

Ideally, the rubric should be used as a guide to the other data collection tools. In the evaluation discussed in this guide, the rubric was developed after other data collection tools, and this limited our ability to address certain outcomes. Had the rubric been created first, we could have aligned all other data collection instruments to the rubric.

Map Research Questions to Data Elements and Data Sources

The next step is determining the best data collection source and method for each element needed to address the evaluation's research questions. Once the evaluation team has determined which data elements apply to each research question, they must map the elements to data *sources*. From there, they can determine which methods of data collection will best address the questions. For instance, can the data only be obtained from focus groups or interviews? Should the data be requested from survey participants *as well as* focus group participants? Can the data be obtained from administrative data sources? Once the evaluation team has determined the best and most feasible methods for collecting data, the next step is to develop the data collection instruments and check alignment with the list of elements to make sure all have been covered. To see this mapping in action for research question one ("To what extent is the hybrid J.D. program effective in producing law student learning outcomes as described in ABA Standard 302?"), see **Appendix B**.

Develop Data Collection Instruments

Using the data collection map as a guide, all components of the data collection instruments should be developed with those data elements and methods in mind. Determine specifications for — and perhaps a template for collection — of administrative data items. A data request template can make it easier for data providers to better understand the data elements needed and in what form these data are needed for each student. **Appendix C** provides an example of a template for an administrative data request for the data elements needed for research question three ("To what extent is the hybrid J.D. program effective in expanding access to law school and attracting and retaining students from underserved (e.g., rural, low-income) communities?") of our recent hybrid J.D. program evaluation. To collect data from surveys, evaluators will need to develop question types, question wording, response options, and routing logic. For qualitative data collection methods, evaluators must develop question protocols and ensure that facilitators are well-versed in qualitative methods and procedures.

Data Collection Considerations

Before data collection begins, several factors need to be considered. First, have all methods and research plans been cleared through the appropriate Institutional Review Board (if required)? Is there sufficient funding to conduct data collection and the necessary analyses? Are safeguards in place to protect confidential or proprietary data? It may be beneficial to personally meet with the staff who will be obtaining any administrative data to determine what is available and what elements may need to be prioritized in the spirit of efficiency. For example, a program looking to evaluate its graduates' bar exam outcomes could begin by collecting and analyzing student demographics and engagement information while awaiting bar exam results, then follow up with data collection and analysis of final academic outcomes and bar exam results later in the study.

Analyze Data

There are two common types of data analysis: quantitative and qualitative. Each of these analysis types reflects the data collection sources or methods being analyzed — for example, non-open-ended survey questions and administrative records yield *quantitative* data, while focus groups, observations, and interviews yield *qualitative* data. Rubrics can be developed using a variety of data.

Quantitative Data Analysis. Quantitative data analysis may include descriptive statistics or basic comparisons of respondents or groups. Quantitative analysis is useful for survey and administrative data. In a formative assessment, analytic goals may include producing descriptive statistics that serve as a baseline for ongoing or longitudinal analyses. For example, if increasing the diversity of students is a goal of the program, the characteristics of the first cohort of students in the hybrid J.D. program could serve as the baseline and be compared to characteristics of future cohorts to track whether the program is meeting its diversity goals.

Qualitative Data Analysis. To analyze data obtained from focus groups, interviews, or documents, the evaluation team needs to develop coding frameworks based on data elements and research questions, then use notes or transcripts to assign phrases and responses to particular codes. In the process, new codes may emerge. It is helpful to have more than one researcher participate in the coding for reliability checks. As discussed below, consider also including the best practice of member checking, wherein researchers follow up with participants for clarification or verification of analysis outcomes — as a way of asking, "Did our analysis accurately represent your contributions or opinions?"

Developing and Applying a Program Assessment Rubric. Rubrics can be developed and applied to assess the program's distance learning instruction model using multiple sources of data, including interviews, focus groups, and surveys with students, faculty, and faculty instructional designers. We developed the descriptions of each of five dimensions using the aforementioned frameworks and standards to identify key elements within each dimension. We chose a four-point rubric to allow for a distinction between the lowest and highest points on the rubric in ways that have meaningful implications for hybrid teaching practices. Please refer to **Appendix A** for more information.

Interpret, Report, and Share the Findings

Once all analyses have been completed, the next step is to see what conclusions can be drawn from the analyses by revisiting the research questions and tying conclusions back to those questions. At this (and every) point throughout the evaluation, it is critical to highlight and elevate the student voice and the specific experiences of all program participants. Because most hybrid J.D. programs are fairly new, it is crucial to document and learn from these personal experiences.

It is a good practice to share preliminary findings and conclusions with the law school administrators (especially in the case of an external evaluation), data providers, and evaluation participants to confirm that data are being interpreted correctly. For example, member checking is an important activity and involves sharing preliminary results with evaluation participants to ensure that their opinions and contributions are accurately represented and interpreted. Sharing findings directly with participants helps to build trust and show respect, and it helps participants feel valued. For the hybrid J.D. program evaluation we conducted, we sent a brief survey to the study participants summarizing findings and asking for their reactions. We also met with program leadership and other evaluation team members to share preliminary findings and invite feedback.

Different methods and formats can be used to disseminate the findings from the evaluation (e.g., written report, infographic, dashboard, presentation). Regardless of the format(s) used, the evaluation's results, outcomes, and recommendations should be shared not only with funders and administrators but with all parties invested in the program, including faculty, instructional designers, and current and prospective students. Sharing the findings with a wider audience helps to provide transparency in the evaluation and build credibility with interested parties.

Conclusions and Lessons Learned

We have several recommendations from our experience evaluating a hybrid J.D. program. Whether the evaluation is funded by outside parties or conducted by a group or individual within the school community, a study "champion" on campus can be a valuable resource for program insights, obtaining information or data, and guiding the evaluators through gaining access to participants and data. Given the collaborative nature of program evaluation, if the assessment is grant-funded, it is critical to have a funder who is dedicated and involved at all stages. As with any research endeavor, it is important to have stakeholder voices represented, including leaders, funders, data users, and participants.

No research effort is without its challenges. It can be difficult to engage busy students and instructors. By design, students who are enrolled in hybrid J.D. programs likely also have work and family responsibilities. Therefore, it is important to offer flexibility in scheduling focus groups and interviews by offering virtual participation options on weekends or evenings. Further, considering the timing of survey administration, it may be advantageous to communicate with school administrators to select a time when students are not likely to be burdened with exams or intensive assignments. To encourage participant participation, we used different communication strategies such as emails, phone calls, and text messages, offered incentives for participation, and employed a mobile-friendly survey platform for ease of access. We sent students several survey reminders, which also helped increase survey participation.

When developing the evaluation schedule, the evaluation team should build in extra time for unexpected delays and other challenges. Sharing information while keeping sensitive data confidential is of utmost importance, so plenty of time should be allowed to negotiate protections and guardrails around obtaining and safeguarding data. Time should also be built into the schedule to develop strategies for member checking and thorough data review for accuracy and fidelity. When working with administrative data, it may be necessary to submit additional data requests and/or follow up with the data provider about inconsistencies or other anomalies found in the data. Administrative data providers have many responsibilities and are not always able to fulfill data requests or respond to questions promptly, so extra time should also be built into the schedule for these activities.

As hybrid J.D. programs continue to grow and develop, program evaluations can provide valuable lessons and guidance to institutions looking to expand their virtual learning offerings to reach a more diverse range of applicants. **Appendix D** provides additional resources for guiding a program evaluation.

Appendix A. Example of Rubric Dimensions for Hybrid Delivery

Each element within the five dimensions is rated on a four-point rubric scale: Accomplished (4), Established (3), Developing (2), and Undeveloped (1).

Dimension	Description	Elements
Instruction	Instruction is personalized and uses multiple high-impact instructional strategies that are culturally relevant and experiential and prepare students for a law career. Instruction is coupled with effective feedback that is descriptive and immediate and helps students improve their performance.	1. Personalized Learning 2. High-Impact Strategies 3. Meaningful Practice 4. Feedback 5. Assessments 6. Cultural Humility
Use of Technology	Technology tools are effectively integrated into instruction to teach and differentiate the use of technology tools to engage students in learning content and demonstrating skills.	7. Tools 8. Engagement and Interaction 9. Adaptability to Diverse Learners 10. Access 11. Feedback and Assessment
Learning Community	Establish, build, and maintain community among a diverse, hybrid population of students and faculty focused on cultural humility, networking, and professional development.	12. Rapport and Positive Social Interactions 13. Respect for Student Diversity 14. High Expectations for Learning 15. Safe Learning Environment
Course Structure	Online hybrid programs are structured so that students experience a combination of online and in-person experiences in asynchronous and synchronous activities.	16. Asynchronous and Synchronous Online Courses 17. Engagement and Interaction 18. In-person Structure 19. Course Design 20. Spiraling Learning Objectives 21. Flexibility and Accessibility
Content	Courses provide appropriate content for program completers to become practicing attorneys. Courses are diverse and vary between doctrinal and skills courses and courses on specific legal topics.	22. Appropriateness for Practicing Attorneys 23. Diversity and Variety 24. Doctrinal Skills 25. Legal Topics 26. Capstone Project

Appendix B. Example of Mapping Research Questions and Data Elements to Data Sources and Data Methods

Data Elements		Data Sources				
Broad	**Detailed**	Student survey and/or focus group	Faculty survey and/or focus group	Instructional design interviews	Observations from LMS for rubric analysis	Institution records
RQ1: To what extent is the hybrid J.D. program effective in producing law student learning outcomes as described in ABA Standard 302?						
Student perceptions	Students' satisfaction with the Hybrid JD program	x				
	Students' perceptions of understanding material	x				
	Students' perceptions of relevant skills gained in program	x				
	Students' perceptions of opportunities for 'beyond classroom' experiences (mock trial, etc.)	x				
	Students' perceptions of which features of the courses have been most helpful for learning	x				
Faculty perceptions	Faculty perceptions of students' preparedness to be successful in coursework		x			
	Faculty perceptions of students' understanding material		x			
	Faculty perceptions of students' relevant skills gained in program		x			
Grades and assessments	Academic standing					x
	Students' grades					x
Bar exam	Students' plans to take bar exam	x				
	Students' perceptions of preparedness from program to pass bar exam	x				
	Bar exam taken?					x
	Bar exam passed?					x

Data Elements		Data Sources				
Broad	**Detailed**	Student survey and/or focus group	Faculty survey and/or focus group	Instructional design interviews	Observations from LMS for rubric analysis	Institution records
RQ1: To what extent is the hybrid J.D. program effective in producing law student learning outcomes as described in ABA Standard 302?						
Plans for using J.D.	Career objectives — how do you plan to use this degree?	x				
Design features to enhance student learning outcomes	Features of course design that support student success in mastering material		x	x	x	
Improvement recommendations	Student recommendations for improving program to better facilitate student success in achieving learning outcomes	x				
	Faculty recommendations for improving program to better facilitate student success in achieving learning outcomes		x			

Appendix C. Example Template for Administrative Data Request

Domain	Data Element	Response Option Format	Notes	Include Hybrid Students (specify cohort period)	Include Residential Students (specify cohort period)
Unique Identifier	Student ID	Student ID	Please also provide a file that maps each ID to the corresponding name (LNAME, FNAME, MNAME SUFFIX). This file will be saved in a secure location and will only be used for purposes of contacting participants for data collection invitations.	x	x
Demographics	Birth month	MM		x	x
Demographics	Birth year	YYYY		x	x
Demographics	Biological sex	1 = Male 2 = Female -1 = Unknown	As assigned at birth	x	x
Demographics	Student's reported gender identity	1 = Male 2 = Female 3 = Other -1 = Unknown		x	x

Domain	Data Element	Response Option Format	Notes	Include Hybrid Students (specify cohort period)	Include Residential Students (specify cohort period)
Demographics	Race (American Indian or Alaska Native)	1 = Yes 2 = No -1 = Unknown		x	x
Demographics	Race (Asian)	1 = Yes 2 = No -1 = Unknown		x	x
Demographics	Race (Black or African American)	1 = Yes 2 = No -1 = Unknown		x	x
Demographics	Race (White)	1 = Yes 2 = No -1 = Unknown		x	x
Demographics	Ethnicity (Hispanic)	1 = Yes 2 = No -1 = Unknown		x	x
Demographics	Military status at time of application	1 = Yes, veteran or active- duty military 2 = No -1 = Unknown		x	x
Demographics	Zip code at time of application to law school	00000-99999		x	x
Demographics	First-generation college status	1 = Yes 2 = No -1 = Unknown	Code "no" if any parent or guardian has a bachelor's degree or higher	x	x
Admissions	Highest LSAT score	120-180		x	x
Admissions	Bachelor's degree – GPA	0.1-4.0		x	x
Admissions	Bachelor's degree – Institution	Institution Name (Character, Max=50)		x	x
Admissions	Institution IPEDS ID (if known)	Six-digit number		x	x
Admissions	Bachelor's degree – Major	Major/Field of study (Character, Max=150)		x	x
Admissions	Degree CIP codes	Six-digit number		x	x
Admissions	Bachelor's degree – Completion date month	MM (01-12)		x	x
Admissions	Bachelor's degree – Completion date year	YYYY (1970-2022)		x	x
Enrollment	Month, Year of first enrollment	1-12, YYYY (2000-2022)		x	x
Enrollment	Did student transfer from another J.D. program?	1 = Yes 2 = No -1 = Unknown		x	x

Appendix D. Additional Resources on Program Evaluation

McKim, C. (2023). Meaningful Member-Checking: A Structured Approach to Member-Checking. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 7(2), 41–52. https://www.ajqr.org/article/meaningful-member-checking-a-structured-approach-to-member-checking-12973

Evaluators should reference this source for learning about procedures to employ in validating qualitative research. Specifically, the source provides guidelines for using a structured member-checking approach.

McLaughlin, J.A., & Jordan, G.B. (2004). Using logic models. In J.S. Wholey, H.P. Hatry, & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), *Handbook of practical program evaluation* (2nd ed., pp. 7–32). Jossey-Bass. http://surjonopwkub.lecture.ub.ac.id/files/2018/02/Handbook_of_Practical_Program_Evaluation__Essential_Texts_for_Nonprofit_and_Public_Leadership_and_Mana_.pdf#page=55

This handbook includes information about all components of program evaluation. To learn more about developing and using logic models, reference pages 7-32. Also, Chapter 3, pages 62-87, provides a concise, step-by-step guide to developing plans for an implementation evaluation. There are unique considerations when evaluating the implementation of a particular program. This chapter describes in detail four stages of implementation analysis: assess need and feasibility, plan and design program, deliver program, and improve the program.

Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W., & Freeman, H.E. (2018). *Evaluation: A systematic approach*. Sage Publications.

This volume has been a reliable resource for postsecondary instructors and students, as well as practitioners, and is recognized as the key text for introducing program evaluation for decades. The text includes definitions of all evaluation terms and processes, with guidelines around planning, conducting, and reporting on program evaluations. The authors provide relevant examples in a variety of fields to assist researchers in contextualizing concepts.

Shakman, K., & Rodriguez, S. M. (2015). *Logic Models for program design, implementation, and evaluation: Workshop toolkit* (REL 2015-057). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northeast/pdf/rel_2015057.pdf

This toolkit, authored and reviewed by the Institute of Education Sciences in the Department of Education, is a guide for evaluators preparing logic models for education program evaluations. The toolkit includes a facilitator guide and workbook for educating other participants on key considerations for developing logic models.

Stewart, J., Joyce, J., Haines, M., Yanoski, D., Gagnon, D., Luke, K., Rhoads, C., & Germeroth, C. (2021). *Program evaluation toolkit: Quick start guide* (REL 2022–112). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Central. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED615707.pdf

This toolkit, authored and reviewed by the Institute of Education Sciences in the Department of Education, is a basic, straightforward guide for practitioners or evaluators seeking to evaluate local, state, or federal programs. As a basic guide, it explains all evaluation steps, defines terms, and provides instruction for all components of evaluation, through reporting and presentation of evaluation findings to funders and program administrators.