

Exhibit A

**Excerpts of The American Bar Association
Section of Legal Education and Admission to the Bar
Standards and Rules of Procedure for the Approval of Law Schools**



ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar

STANDARDS

2010-2011

Contents

<i>iv</i>	Preface
<i>viii</i>	Preamble
1	Standards for Approval of Law Schools
51	Key Word Index
67	Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools
97	Criteria for Approval of Foreign Summer and Intersession Programs
107	Criteria for Student Study at a Foreign Institution
117	Criteria for Approval of Semester and Year-Long Study Abroad Programs
127	Statement of Ethical Practices in the Process of Law School Accreditation
131	Internal Operating Practices
143	Council Statements
149	Consultant's Memos
161	<i>Appendix 1: Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure</i>
163	<i>Appendix 2: LSAC Cautionary Policies Concerning LSAT Scores</i>
165	<i>Appendix 3: Guidance on Interpretation 301-6</i>

PREFACE

Concern for improving the competence of those entering the legal profession was a major reason for creating the American Bar Association in 1878. The Standards for Approval of Law Schools are promulgated to serve that objective.

Accrediting Agency for Law

Since 1952, the Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar (“the Council”) of the American Bar Association (“the ABA”) has been approved by the United States Department of Education as the recognized national agency for the accreditation of programs leading to the first professional degree in law. It is the Council and not the ABA that is so recognized.

The majority of the highest courts of the states rely upon ABA approval of a law school to determine whether the jurisdiction’s legal education requirement for admission to the bar is satisfied. Whether a jurisdiction requires education at an ABA-approved law school is a decision made by a jurisdiction’s bar admission authority and not by the Council or the ABA. The Council and the ABA believe that every candidate for admission to the bar should have graduated from a law school approved by the ABA, that graduation from a law school alone should not confer the right of admission to the bar, and that every candidate for admission should be examined by public authority to determine fitness for admission.

History

The ABA in 1879 established the Standing Committee on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar as one of the ABA’s first committees. In 1893, the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar was established as the Association’s first section. Recognizing the need to take further steps to improve legal education, the Section leadership played the major role in creating the Association of American Law Schools (AALS) in 1900. The AALS has a regulatory role in that member law schools must meet its requirements for membership, but the AALS is not recognized by the Department of Education as an accrediting agency, and no jurisdiction requires that one have graduated from an AALS member law school in order to be eligible for admission to the bar.

In 1921 the American Bar Association promulgated its first Standards for Legal Education. At the same time, the ABA began to publish a list of ABA-approved law schools that met the ABA Standards.

To administer its program of approval of law schools meeting the Standards, the ABA in 1927 employed Professor H. Claude Horack of the University of Iowa College of Law as the first Advisor to the Section. When Professor Millard H. Ruud of the University of Texas was appointed in 1968 to succeed then-Advisor to the Section Dean John G. Hervey of Oklahoma City University School of Law, the title was changed to Consultant on Legal Education to the American Bar Association in order to recognize the broader responsibilities of the position.

Professor James P. White of Indiana University School of Law-Indianapolis succeeded Professor Ruud in January 1974 and served as Consultant until the end of August 2000. John A. Sebert, previously Dean at the University of Baltimore School of Law, succeeded Dean White as of September 1, 2000 and served as Consultant through August 31, 2006. As of September 1, 2006, Hulett H. Askew became the Consultant. Mr. Askew previously was Director of Bar Admissions for the Supreme Court of Georgia.

Revisions of the Standards, Interpretations and Rules of Procedure through 1996

The Revisions of the Early 1970s

A major revision of the 1921 Standards was undertaken in the early 1970s. After an extensive comment process, the revised Standards and the Rules of Procedure were adopted by the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar in August, 1972, and were approved by the ABA House of Delegates in February, 1973.

Ramsey Commission

In 1988 Judge Henry Ramsey, Jr., of the Alameda County, California, Superior Court and Chair-Elect of the Section, was asked to chair a study of the accreditation process. As a result of the work of the Ramsey Commission, a number of revisions to the Rules of Procedure were adopted in 1989.

Department of Justice Consent Decree

In June 1995, the United States Department of Justice filed a civil antitrust suit against the ABA, alleging violations of antitrust laws in the accreditation program. The civil suit was concluded by a final Consent Decree that was approved in June 1996. It included a number of requirements concerning the Standards, many of which reflected revisions that the ABA had previously adopted. The Consent Decree was in force for a period of ten years and expired by its own terms on June 25, 2006. The Council has determined, however, that after the expiration of the Consent Decree, accreditation processes and procedures will continue to observe the substantive provisions of the Consent Decree.

The Wahl Commission and the 1996 Revisions of the Standards

In 1992 the Council launched a formal revision of the Standards and their Interpretations. In the midst of that review, in April 1994, the Council established the Commission to Study the Substance and Process of the American Bar Association's Accreditation of American Law Schools. Justice Rosalie E. Wahl of the Supreme Court of Minnesota, and a former chairperson of the Section, accepted appointment as chairperson. The Wahl Commission's mandate was to conduct a thorough, independent examination of all aspects of law school accreditation by the ABA. Upon the basis of hearings, solicited written comments, and surveys, the Commission prepared a report for submission at the 1995 annual meeting of the ABA.

The Consent Decree, however, required that the ABA establish a special commission to determine whether the Standards, Interpretations, and Rules of Procedure should be revised in some respects. It was agreed by the Department of Justice and the ABA that the Wahl Commission's mandate would be enlarged to include these matters and that the Commission's tenure would be continued. In response to this additional mandate, in November 1995 the Wahl

Commission submitted a supplement to its August 1995 report.

The four-year revision process that began in 1992 and culminated with the work of the Wahl Commission focused both on the form and the substance of the Standards and Interpretations. After extensive opportunity for comment, the revised Standards were approved by the Council and adopted by the House of Delegates in August, 1996.

Review of the Standards, Interpretations and Rules of Procedure Since 1996

Proposed revisions to the Standards, Interpretations and Rules of Procedure are subject to an extensive public comment process. Proposed revisions are widely distributed for comment, and comment is solicited by letter and e-mail, and at public hearings. Proposed revisions are then carefully considered in light of the comment received before any final action is taken.

The Council, with the assistance of the Standards Review Committee, regularly reviews and revises the Standards and Interpretations to ensure that they are appropriate requirements for current legal education programs and that they focus on matters that are central to the provision of quality legal education. A comprehensive review of the Standards and Interpretations was undertaken during 1996–2000. Another such comprehensive review was undertaken from 2003-04 through 2005-06. The next comprehensive review commenced in fall 2008 and is expected to take at least the next two academic years.

In the summer of 2004, the Council appointed a Rules Revision Committee, chaired by Provost E. Thomas Sullivan of the University of Minnesota (a former chair of the Section), to undertake and recommend a comprehensive revision of the Rules. In June 2005 the Council accepted the Committee's report and shortly thereafter distributed for comment a proposed comprehensive revision of the Rules. The Council adopted the comprehensive revision of the Rules of Procedure in December 2005 and the House of Delegates concurred in those revisions in February 2006.

Council Responsibility

The Council grants provisional and full ABA approval to law schools located in the United States, its territories, and possessions. It also adopts the Standards for Approval of Law Schools and the Interpretations of those Standards, and the Rules of Procedure that govern the law school approval process. The Council also must grant prior acquiescence in any major changes that are proposed by an approved law school.

ABA House of Delegates Responsibility

In August 2010, the role of the ABA House of Delegates in accreditation matters was revised in order to comply with new Department of Education requirements regarding appeals. Prior to August 2010, a school that was denied provisional or full approval by the Council was able to file an appeal to the House of Delegates. The House of Delegates could either concur in the Council's decision or refer that decision back to the Council for further consideration. A decision of the Council was final after referral from the House of Delegates a maximum of two times in the case of decisions denying provisional or full approval, or once in the case of decisions to withdraw approval from a school. As a result of the changes in August 2010, the House of Delegates no longer has a role in the appeals process. See Standard 801, Rule 10 and IOP 19 for other changes related to this change in the appeals process.

Any decision of the Council to adopt any revisions to the Standards, Interpretations or Rules of Procedure must be reviewed by the House of Delegates. The House either concurs in those revisions or refers them back to the Council for further consideration. The Council's decision after the second referral back is final.

Contents of This Publication

Standards and Interpretations

The Standards contain the requirements a law school must meet to obtain and retain ABA approval. Interpretations that follow the Standards provide additional guidance concerning the implementation of a particular Standard and have the same force and effect as a Standard. Almost all Standards and Interpretations are mandatory, stating that a law school “shall” or “must” do as described in the Standard or Interpretation. A few Standards and Interpretations are not mandatory but rather are stated as goals that an approved law school “should” seek to achieve.

Rules of Procedure

The Rules of Procedure govern the accreditation process and the process through which decisions concerning the status of individual schools are made. The Rules also contain provisions related to the operation of the Office of the Consultant on Legal Education.

Criteria for Approval of Foreign Programs

Under its authority to adopt rules implementing the Standards, the Council has adopted criteria for the approval of programs leading to credit for the J.D. degree that are undertaken outside the United States by ABA-approved law schools. Those Criteria include the Criteria for Approval of Foreign Summer and Intersession Programs, the Criteria for Approval of Semester Abroad and Year-Long Study Programs, and the Criteria for Student Study at a Foreign Institution. The Council has delegated to the Accreditation Committee the authority to approve programs under the Criteria.

Additional Contents

The Statement of Ethical Practices in the Process of Law School Accreditation contains principles that ensure impartiality and propriety in all aspects of the accreditation process. Internal Operating Practices provide additional direction concerning the operation of accreditation functions and other activities of the Office of the Consultant on Legal Education. Council Statements are positions that the Council has taken on various matters that do not have the force of a mandatory Standard or Interpretation.

PREAMBLE

The Standards for Approval of Law Schools of the American Bar Association are founded primarily on the fact that law schools are the gateway to the legal profession. They are minimum requirements designed, developed, and implemented for the purpose of advancing the basic goal of providing a sound program of legal education. Consistent with their aspirations, mission and resources, law schools should continuously seek to exceed these minimum requirements in order to improve the quality of legal education and to promote high standards of professional competence, responsibility and conduct.

The graduates of approved law schools can become members of the bar in all United States jurisdictions, representing all members of the public in important interests. Therefore, an approved law school must provide an opportunity for its students to study in a diverse educational environment, and in order to protect the interests of the public, law students, and the profession, it must provide an educational program that ensures that its graduates:

- (1) understand their ethical responsibilities as representatives of clients, officers of the courts, and public citizens responsible for the quality and availability of justice;
- (2) receive basic education through a curriculum that develops:
 - (i) understanding of the theory, philosophy, role, and ramifications of the law and its institutions;
 - (ii) skills of legal analysis, reasoning, and problem solving; oral and written communication; legal research; and other fundamental skills necessary to participate effectively in the legal profession;
 - (iii) understanding of the basic principles of public and private law; and
- (3) understand the law as a public profession calling for performance of pro bono legal services.

STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF LAW SCHOOLS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 GENERAL PURPOSES AND PRACTICES; DEFINITIONS

Standard 101. Basic Requirements for Approval.....	4
Standard 102. Provisional Approval	4
Standard 103. Full Approval	6
Standard 104. Deleted in 2009	
Standard 105. Major Change in Program or Structure	7
Standard 106. Definitions	9

Chapter 2 ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

Standard 201. Resources for Program	11
Standard 202. Self Study	11
Standard 203. Strategic Planning and Assessment	11
Standard 204. Governing Board of an Independent Law School	12
Standard 205. Governing Board and Law School Authority	12
Standard 206. Dean	12
Standard 207. Allocation of Authority between Dean and Faculty	13
Standard 208. Involvement of Alumni, Students and Others.....	13
Standard 209. Non-University Affiliated Law Schools.....	13
Standard 210. Law School-University Relationship	13
Standard 211. Non Discrimination and Equality of Opportunity	14
Standard 212. Equal Opportunity and Diversity	15

Standard 213. Reasonable Accommodation for Qualified Individuals with Disabilities.....	16
--	----

Chapter 3 PROGRAM OF LEGAL EDUCATION

Standard 301. Objectives	17
Standard 302. Curriculum	19
Standard 303. Academic Standards and Achievements	21
Standard 304. Course of Study and Academic Calendar	22
Standard 305. Study Outside the Classroom	24
Standard 306. Distance Education	26
Standard 307. Participation in Studies or Activities in a Foreign Country	28
Standard 308. Degree Programs in Addition to J.D	28

Chapter 4 THE FACULTY

Standard 401. Qualifications	29
Standard 402. Size of Full-Time Faculty	29
Standard 403. Instructional Role of Faculty	31
Standard 404. Responsibilities of Full-Time Faculty	32
Standard 405. Professional Environment	32

Chapter 5 ADMISSIONS AND STUDENT SERVICES

Standard 501. Admissions	35
Standard 502. Educational Requirements	35
Standard 503. Admission Test	36
Standard 504. Character and Fitness	37
Standard 505. Previously Disqualified Applicant	37

Standard 506. Applicants from Law Schools Not Approved By the ABA	37
Standard 507. Applicants from Foreign Law Schools	38
Standard 508. Enrollment of Non-Degree Candidates	38
Standard 509. Basic Consumer Information	38
Standard 510. Student Loan Programs	40
Standard 511. Student Support Services	40
 Chapter 6 LIBRARY AND INFORMATION RESOURCES	
Standard 601. General Provisions	41
Standard 602. Administration	41
Standard 603. Director of the Law Library	42
Standard 604. Personnel.....	42
Standard 605. Services	43
Standard 606. Collection	43
 Chapter 7 FACILITIES	
Standard 701. General Requirements	45
Standard 702. Law Library	46
Standard 703. Research and Study Space	46
Standard 704. Technological Capacities.....	46
 Chapter 8 COUNCIL AUTHORITY, VARIANCES AND AMENDMENTS	
Standard 801. Council Authority	47
Standard 802. Variance	47
Standard 803. Amendment of Standards, Interpretations and Rules	48
Key Word Index	51

Interpretation 210-2

The resources generated by a law school that is part of a university should be made available to the law school to maintain and enhance its program of legal education. "Resources generated" includes law school tuition and fees, endowment restricted to the law school, gifts to the law school, and income from grants, contracts, and property of the law school. The university should provide the law school with a satisfactory explanation for any use of resources generated by the law school to support non-law school activities and central university services. In turn, the law school should benefit on a reasonable basis in the allocation of university resources.

Standard 211. NON-DISCRIMINATION AND EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

(a) A law school shall foster and maintain equality of opportunity in legal education, including employment of faculty and staff, without discrimination or segregation on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age or disability.

(b) A law school shall not use admission policies or take other action to preclude admission of applicants or retention of students on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age or disability.

(c) This Standard does not prevent a law school from having a religious affiliation or purpose and adopting and applying policies of admission of students and employment of faculty and staff that directly relate to this affiliation or purpose so long as (i) notice of these policies has been given to applicants, students, faculty, and staff before their affiliation with the law school, and (ii) the religious affiliation, purpose, or policies do not contravene any other Standard, including Standard 405(b) concerning academic freedom. These policies may provide a preference for persons adhering to the religious affiliation or purpose of the law school, but shall not be applied to use admission policies or take other action to preclude admission of applicants or retention of students on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age or disability. This Standard permits religious affiliation or purpose policies as to admission, retention, and employment only to the extent that these policies are protected by the United States Constitution. It is administered as though the First Amendment of the United States Constitution governs its application.

(d) Non-discrimination and equality of opportunity in legal education includes equal opportunity to obtain employment. A law school shall communicate to every employer to whom it furnishes assistance and facilities for interviewing and other placement functions the school's firm expectation that the employer will observe the principles of non-discrimination and equality of opportunity on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age and disability in regard to hiring, promotion, retention and conditions of employment.

Interpretation 211-1

Schools may not require applicants, students, faculty or employees to disclose their sexual orientation, although they may provide opportunities for them to do so voluntarily.

Interpretation 211-2

As long as a school complies with the requirements of Standard 211(c), the prohibition concerning sexual orientation does not require a religiously affiliated school to act inconsistently with the essential elements of its religious values and beliefs. For example, it does not require a school to recognize or fund organizations whose purposes or objectives with respect to sexual orientation conflict with the essential elements of the religious values and beliefs held by the school.

Interpretation 211-3

Standard 211(d) applies to all employers, including government agencies, to which a school furnishes assistance and facilities for interviewing and other placement services. However, this Standard does not require a law school to implement its terms by excluding any employer unless that employer discriminates unlawfully.

Interpretation 211-4

The denial by a law school of admission to a qualified applicant is treated as made upon the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age or disability if the basis of denial relied upon is an admissions qualification of the school which is intended to prevent the admission of applicants on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age or disability though not purporting to do so.

Interpretation 211-5

The denial by a law school of employment to a qualified individual is treated as made upon the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age or disability if the basis of denial relied upon is an employment policy of the school which is intended to prevent the employment of individuals on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age or disability though not purporting to do so.

Standard 212. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND DIVERSITY

(a) Consistent with sound legal education policy and the Standards, a law school shall demonstrate by concrete action a commitment to providing full opportunities for the study of law and entry into the profession by members of underrepresented groups, particularly racial and ethnic minorities, and a commitment to having a student body that is diverse with respect to gender, race, and ethnicity.

(b) Consistent with sound educational policy and the Standards, a law school shall demonstrate by concrete action a commitment to having a faculty and staff that are diverse with respect to gender, race and ethnicity.

Interpretation 212-1

The requirement of a constitutional provision or statute that purports to prohibit consideration of gender, race, ethnicity or national origin in admissions or employment decisions is not a justification for a school's non-compliance with Standard 212. A law school that is subject to such constitutional or statutory provisions would have to demonstrate the commitment required by Standard 212 by means other than those prohibited by the applicable constitutional or statutory provisions.

Interpretation 212-2

Consistent with the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in Grutter v. Bollinger, 529 U.S. 306 (2003), a law school may use race and ethnicity in its admissions process to promote equal opportunity and diversity. Through its admissions policies and practices, a law school shall take concrete actions to enroll a diverse student body that promotes cross-cultural understanding, helps break down racial and ethnic stereotypes, and enables students to better understand persons of different races, ethnic groups and backgrounds.

Interpretation 212-3

This Standard does not specify the forms of concrete actions a law school must take to satisfy its equal opportunity and diversity obligations. The determination of a law school's satisfaction of such obligations is based on the totality of the law school's actions and the results achieved. The commitment to providing full educational opportunities for members of underrepresented groups typically includes a special concern for determining the potential of these applicants through the admission process, special recruitment efforts, and programs that assist in meeting the academic and financial needs of many of these students and that create a more favorable environment for students from underrepresented groups.

Standard 213. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION FOR QUALIFIED INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

Assuring equality of opportunity for qualified individuals with disabilities, as required by Standard 211, may require a law school to provide such students, faculty and staff with reasonable accommodations.

Interpretation 213-1

For the purpose of this Standard and Standard 211, disability is defined as in Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. Section 794, as further defined by the regulations on post secondary education, 45 C.F.R. Section 84.3(k)(3) and by the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. Sections 12101 et seq.

Interpretation 213-2

As to those matters covered by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act, neither this Standard nor Standard 211 imposes obligations upon law schools beyond those provided by those statutes.

Interpretation 213-3

Applicants and students shall be individually evaluated to determine whether they meet the academic standards requisite to admission and participation in the law school program. The use of the term "qualified" in the Standard requires a careful and thorough consideration of each applicant and each student's qualifications in light of reasonable accommodations. Reasonable accommodations are those that are consistent with the fundamental nature of the school's program of legal education, that can be provided without undue financial or administrative burden, and that can be provided while maintaining academic and other essential performance standards.

ability, and other characteristics clearly show an aptitude for the study of law. The admitting officer shall sign and place in the admittee's file a statement of the considerations that led to the decision to admit the applicant.

Interpretation 502-1

Before an admitted student registers, or within a reasonable time thereafter, a law school shall have on file the student's official transcript showing receipt of a bachelor's degree, if any, and all academic work undertaken. "Official transcript" means a transcript certified by the issuing school to the admitting school or delivered to the admitting school in a sealed envelope with seal intact. A copy supplied by the Law School Data Assembly Service is not an official transcript, even though it is adequate for preliminary determination of admission.

Standard 503. ADMISSION TEST

A law school shall require each applicant for admission as a first year J.D. student to take a valid and reliable admission test to assist the school and the applicant in assessing the applicant's capability of satisfactorily completing the school's educational program. In making admissions decisions, a law school shall use the test results in a manner that is consistent with the current guidelines regarding proper use of the test results provided by the agency that developed the test.

Interpretation 503-1

A law school that uses an admission test other than the Law School Admission Test sponsored by the Law School Admission Council shall establish that such other test is a valid and reliable test to assist the school in assessing an applicant's capability to satisfactorily complete the school's educational program.

Interpretation 503-2

This Standard does not prescribe the particular weight that a law school should give to an applicant's admission test score in deciding whether to admit or deny admission to the applicant.

Interpretation 503-3

A pre-admission program of coursework taught by members of the law school's full-time faculty and culminating in an examination or examinations, offered to some or all applicants prior to a decision to admit to the J.D. program, also may be useful in assessing the capability of an applicant to satisfactorily complete the school's educational program, to be admitted to the bar, and to become a competent professional.

Interpretation 503-4

The "Cautionary Policies Concerning LSAT Scores and Related Services" published by the Law School Admission Council is an example of the testing agency guidelines referred to in Standard 503. [See Appendix 2]

COUNCIL AUTHORITY, VARIANCES AND AMENDMENTS

Standard 801. COUNCIL AUTHORITY

~~(a) The Council shall have the authority to grant or deny a law school's application for provisional or full approval or to withdraw provisional or full approval from a law school. A decision of the Council to grant provisional or full approval is effective upon the action of the Council. A decision of the Council to deny or withdraw approval is effective as follows: (i) if no timely notice of appeal is filed, upon the expiration of the period provided for filing notice of appeal under Rules of Procedure of the House; (ii) if the school files a timely notice of appeal and the House concurs in the decision of the Council, upon such concurrence; (iii) or, if a timely notice of appeal is filed, and the House refers the decision back to the Council, upon decision of the Council following the final referral from the House. Review of decisions appealed to the House shall be conducted pursuant to the procedures set forth in the Rules of Procedure of the House and the Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools.~~

(b) The Council shall have the authority to adopt, revise, amend or repeal the Standards, Interpretations and Rules. A decision of the Council to adopt, revise, amend or repeal the Standards, Interpretations or Rules shall not become effective until it has been reviewed by the House. Review of such decisions by the House shall be conducted pursuant to the procedures set forth in Standard 803 and the Rules of Procedure of the House.

Standard 802. VARIANCE

A law school proposing to offer a program of legal education a portion of which is inconsistent with a Standard may apply for a variance. If the Council finds that the proposal is nevertheless consistent with the general purposes of the Standards, the Council may grant the variance, may impose conditions, and shall impose time limits it considers appropriate. Council may terminate a variance prior to the end of the stated time limit if the school fails to comply with any conditions imposed by the Council. As a general rule, the duration of a variance should not exceed three years.

Interpretation 802-1

Variations are generally limited to proposals based on one or more of the following:

(a) a response to extraordinary circumstances that would create extreme hardship for students or for an approved law school; or

(b) an experimental program based on all of the following:

(1) good reason to believe that there is a likelihood of success;

(2) high quality experimental design;

(3) clear and measurable criteria for assessing the success of the experimental program;

(4) strong reason to believe that the benefits of the experiment will be greater than its risks; and

(5) adequately informed participation by students involved in the experiment.

Interpretation 802-2

A school applying for a variance has the burden of demonstrating that the variance should be granted. The application should include, at a minimum, the following:

(a) a precise statement of the variance sought;

(b) an explanation of the bases and reasons for the variance; and

(c) additional information needed to support the application.

Interpretation 802-3

The Chair of the Accreditation Committee or the Consultant may appoint one or more fact finders to elicit facts relevant to consideration of the application for a variance. Thus an application for a variance must be filed well in advance of consideration of the application by the Accreditation Committee and the Council.

Interpretation 802-4

The Consultant, the Accreditation Committee or the Council may from time to time request written reports from the school concerning the variance.

Interpretation 802-5

Variances are school-specific and based on the circumstances existing at the law school filing the request.

Standard 803. AMENDMENT OF STANDARDS, INTERPRETATIONS AND RULES

(a) A decision by the Council to adopt, revise, amend or repeal the Standards, Interpretations or Rules does not become effective until it has been reviewed by the House. After the meeting of the Council at which it decides to adopt, revise, amend or repeal the Standards, Interpretations or Rules, the Chairperson of the Council shall furnish a written statement of the Council action to the House.

(b) Once the action of the Council is placed on the calendar of a meeting of the House, the House shall at that meeting either agree with the Council's decision or refer the decision back to the Council for further consideration. If the House refers a decision back to the Council, the House shall provide the Council with a statement setting forth the reasons for its referral.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR APPROVAL OF LAW SCHOOLS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. INTRODUCTION

Rule 1. Definitions As Used in These Rules	69
--	----

B. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Rule 2. Site Evaluation	69
-------------------------------	----

Rule 3. Accreditation Committee Consideration	70
---	----

Rule 4. Application for Provisional or Full Approval	71
--	----

Rule 5. Jurisdiction of the Accreditation Committee	72
---	----

Rule 6. Appearances Before Accreditation Committee and Council.....	73
---	----

Rule 7. Reconsideration	73
-------------------------------	----

Rule 8. Council Consideration of Recommendation of Accreditation Committee	73
--	----

Rule 9. Council Consideration of Appeal from Accreditation Committee Decision	74
---	----

Rule 10. Review by the House of a Council Decision to Grant or Deny Provisional or Full Approval or to Withdraw Approval.....	75
--	----

Rule 11. Reapplication for Provisional or Full Approval or for Acquiescence in Major Change	78
--	----

C. EVALUATION OF PROVISIONALLY OR FULLY APPROVED SCHOOLS

Rule 12. Site Evaluation of Provisionally or Fully Approved Law Schools	78
---	----

Rule 13. Action Concerning Apparent Non-Compliance with Standards	79
---	----

Rule 14. Fact Finders	80
-----------------------------	----

Rule 15. Hearing on Show Cause Order	80
--	----

Rule 16. Sanctions	81
--------------------------	----

Rule 17. Council Consideration of Sanctions	82
---	----

Rule 18. Compliance with Sanctions or with Remedial or Probationary Requirements	82
Rule 19. Approval Status of Law School Pending Appeal	83
D. MAJOR CHANGES IN PROGRAM OR STRUCTURE	
Rule 20. Major Change in the Organizational Structure of a Provisionally or Fully Approved Law School	83
Rule 21. Major Change in the Program of Legal Education of a Provisionally or Fully Approved Law School	85
E. CLOSURE	
Rule 22. Closure of a Law School.....	87
F. FOREIGN PROGRAMS	
Rule 23. Credit-Granting Foreign Programs	88
G. COMPLAINTS	
Rule 24. Reports Concerning Law School Non-Compliance with the Standards	89
H. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE AND CONFIDENTIALITY	
Rule 25. Confidentiality of Accreditation Information and Documents	93
Rule 26. Release of Information Concerning Law Schools	94
Rule 27. Information to be Furnished by Schools	95
Rule 28. Publication of List of Approved Schools	95
I. FEES	
Rule 29. Fees	96
J. REIMBURSEMENT	
Rule 30. Guidelines for Reimbursement of Site Evaluators and Fact Finders	96

(b) In years two, four and five of a school's provisional approval status, the school shall normally be required to prepare a complete self-study, and the site evaluation shall normally be undertaken by a full site evaluation team. In years one and three of a school's provisional status, a full self-study normally will not be required and a limited site evaluation, conducted by one or two site evaluators, normally will be undertaken. The purpose of the limited site evaluation will primarily be to determine the extent to which the school is making satisfactory progress toward achieving full compliance with the Standards, and to identify any significant changes in the school's situation since the last full site evaluation. The Accreditation Committee shall have the discretion to order a full site evaluation in any particular year, and to order a limited site evaluation if it determines that a full site evaluation is not necessary in any particular year.

(c) The Consultant shall arrange for the site evaluation in accordance with Rule 2.

(d) Upon the completion of the procedures provided in Rule 2, the Accreditation Committee shall consider the law school's evaluation in accordance with Rule 3.

(e) A request for postponement of a site evaluation will be granted only if the law school is in the process of moving to a new physical facility or if extraordinary circumstances exist which would make it impossible for the scheduled site evaluation to take place. The postponement shall not exceed one year. The pending resignation of a dean, the appointment of an acting dean or the appointment of a permanent dean are not grounds for the postponement of a scheduled site evaluation. The Consultant, with the approval of the Accreditation Committee, may postpone site evaluations of some fully approved schools for one year in order to reduce the variation in the number of site evaluations of fully approved schools that are conducted each year.

Rule 13. Action Concerning Apparent Non-Compliance with Standards

(a) If the Committee has reason to believe that a law school has not demonstrated compliance with the Standards, the Committee shall inform the school of that fact and request the school to furnish by a date certain further information in order to demonstrate the school's compliance with the Standards. The school shall furnish the requested information to the Committee.

(b) If, upon a review of the information furnished by the law school in response to the Committee's request and other relevant information, the Committee determines that the school is not in compliance with the Standards, the school shall be required to appear at a hearing before the Committee to be held at a specified time and place to show cause why the school should not be required to take appropriate remedial action, have sanctions imposed upon it or be placed on probation, or be removed from the list of law schools approved by the Association. After a determination under Rule 13(b) that a law school is not in compliance with the Standards, the school shall have a period of time as set by the Committee to come into compliance. That period of time shall not exceed two years. If the law school does not demonstrate compliance by the end of that period, the Committee shall recommend to the Council that the law school be removed from the list of approved law schools unless the Committee, or the Council, extends the period for demonstrating compliance for good cause shown.

(c) If the Committee finds that a law school has failed to comply with the Standards by refusing to furnish information or to cooperate in a site evaluation, the school may be required to appear at a hearing before the Committee to be held at a specified time and place to show cause why the school should not be required to take appropriate remedial action, have sanctions imposed upon it, be placed on probation, or be removed from the list of law schools approved by the Association.

(d) The Consultant shall give the law school at least thirty (30) days notice of the Committee hearing. The notice shall specify the apparent non-compliance with the Standards and state the time and place of the hearing. For good cause shown, the chairperson of the Committee may grant the school additional time, not to exceed thirty (30) days. Both the notice and the request for extension of time must be in writing.

Rule 14. Fact Finders

(a) The chairperson of the Committee or the chairperson of the Council may appoint, or may direct the Consultant to appoint, one or more fact finders to elicit facts relevant to any matter before the Committee or Council.

(b) The Consultant shall furnish the fact finder(s) with a copy of the most recent site evaluation questionnaire, the site evaluation report, the annual questionnaire, any letters reporting Committee or Council actions written subsequent to the most recent site evaluation report, notice of the Committee hearing or Council meeting, and other relevant information.

(c) Following the fact finding visit, the fact finder(s) shall promptly prepare a written report. The fact finder(s) shall not determine compliance or non-compliance with the Standards, but shall report facts and observations that will enable the Committee and Council to determine compliance.

(d) The fact finder(s) shall promptly submit the report to the Consultant. After reviewing the report and conforming it to Rule 14(c), the Consultant shall transmit the report to the president and the dean of the law school in order to provide an opportunity to make factual corrections and comments. The school shall be given at least thirty (30) days to prepare its response to the report, unless the school consents to a shorter time period. The thirty-day period shall run from the date on which the Consultant transmitted the report to the school.

Rule 15. Hearing on Show Cause Order

(a) This Rule governs hearings conducted pursuant to Rule 13(b) and Rule 13(c).

(b) The Consultant shall furnish to the Committee:

(1) The fact finder(s)'s report, if any;

(2) The most recent site evaluation report;

- (3) The site evaluation questionnaire;
- (4) The annual questionnaire;
- (5) Any letters reporting Committee or Council decisions written subsequent to the most recent site evaluation report; and
- (6) Other relevant information.

(c) Representatives of the law school, including legal counsel, may appear at the hearing and submit information to demonstrate that the school is currently in compliance with all of the Standards, to present a reliable plan for bringing the school into compliance with all of the Standards within a reasonable time, or to present information relevant in a sanctions proceeding.

(d) The chairperson of the Committee may invite the fact finder(s), if any, and the chairperson or other member of the most recent site evaluation team to appear at the hearing. The law school shall reimburse the fact finder and site evaluation team member for reasonable and necessary expenses incurred in attending the hearing.

Rule 16. Sanctions

(a) Conduct for which sanctions may be imposed upon a law school includes, without limitation:

- (1) Substantial or persistent noncompliance with one or more of the Standards;
- (2) Failure to present a reliable plan to bring the law school into compliance with the Standards;
- (3) Failure to provide information or to cooperate in a site evaluation as required by the Standards;
- (4) Making misrepresentations or engaging in misleading conduct in connection with consideration of the school's status by the Committee or the Council, or in public statements concerning the school's approval status; and/or
- (5) Initiating a major change or implementing a new program without having obtained the prior approval or acquiescence required by the Standards.

(b) Sanctions other than probation or removal from the list of approved law schools may be imposed even if a school has, subsequent to the actions that justify sanctions, ceased those actions or brought itself into compliance with the Standards.

(c) Sanctions that may be imposed include, without limitation:

- (1) A monetary penalty proportionate to the violation;

- (2) A requirement that the law school refund part or all of the tuition and/or fees paid by students in such a program;
- (3) Censure, which may be either private or public;
- (4) Required publication of a corrective statement;
- (5) Prohibition against initiating new programs;
- (6) Probation; and/or
- (7) Removal from the list of approved law schools.

(d) In the course of a sanctions proceeding, the Committee or the Council may also direct a law school to take remedial action to bring itself into compliance with the Standards.

(e) If a law school is placed on probation, the Council shall establish the maximum period of time that the school may remain on probation and shall establish the conditions that the law school must meet in order to be removed from probation. The Committee may make recommendations to the Council concerning the period and conditions of probation.

(f) The Committee has the power to impose upon a school any sanction other than probation or removal from the list of approved law schools. A school may appeal a decision of the Committee to impose a sanction to the Council. The Committee also may recommend to the Council that a school be placed on probation or removed from the list of approved law schools.

Rule 17. Council Consideration of Sanctions

(a) Council consideration of a Committee recommendation to impose sanctions or a school's appeal from a Committee decision to impose sanctions shall be conducted in accordance with Rule 8. The Council may affirm, modify or reject the sanctions imposed or recommended by the Committee, or it may refer the matter back to the Committee for further consideration.

(b) The Council has the power to impose any sanction, including probation and removal from the list of approved law schools, regardless of whether the Committee has imposed or recommended any sanction.

Rule 18. Compliance with Sanctions or with Remedial or Probationary Requirements

(a) Upon determination under Rule 13(b) that a law school is not in compliance with the Standards and or after a law school has been placed on probation pursuant to Rule 16, the school shall have a period as set by the Committee or the Council to come into compliance. The period of time may not exceed two years. If the law school does not demonstrate compliance by the end of that period, the Committee shall recommend to the Council that the law school be removed from the list of approved law schools unless the Committee, or the Council, extends the period for demonstrating compliance for good cause shown.

APPENDIX 2: LSAC CAUTIONARY POLICIES CONCERNING LSAT SCORES

These Cautionary Policies are intended for those who set policy and criteria for law school admission, interpret LSAT scores and LSDAS reports, and use other LSAC services. The Policies are intended to inform the use of these services by law schools, and to promote wise and equitable treatment of all applicants through their proper use.

I. The Law School Admission Test

Because LSATs are administered under controlled conditions and each test form requires the same or equivalent tasks of everyone, LSAT scores provide a standard measure of an applicant's proficiency in the well-defined set of skills included in the test. Comparison of a law school's applicants both with other applicants to the same school and with all applicants who have LSAT scores thus becomes feasible. However, while LSAT scores serve a useful purpose in the admission process, they do not measure, nor are they intended to measure, all the elements important to success at individual institutions. LSAT scores must be examined in relation to the total range of information available about a prospective law student. It is in this context that the following restraints on LSAT score use are urged:

Do not use the LSAT score as a sole criterion for admission.

The LSAT should be used as only one of several criteria for evaluation and should not be given undue weight solely because its use is convenient. Those who set admission policies and criteria should always keep in mind the fact that the LSAT does not measure every discipline-related skill necessary for academic work, nor does it measure other factors important to academic success.

Evaluate the predictive utility of the LSAT at your school.

In order to assist in assuring that there is a demonstrated relationship between quantitative data used in the selection process and actual performance in your law school, such data should be evaluated regularly so that your school can use LSAT scores and other information more effectively. For this purpose, the Law School Admission Council annually offers to conduct correlation studies for member schools at no charge. Only by checking the relationship between LSAT scores, undergraduate grade-point average, and law school grades will schools be fully informed about how admission data, including test scores, can be used most effectively by that school.

Do not use LSAT scores without an understanding of the limitations of such tests.

Admission officers and members of admission committees should be knowledgeable about tests and test data and should recognize test limitations. Such limitations are set forth in the Law School Admission Reference Manual and are regularly discussed at workshops and conferences sponsored by the Law School Admission Council.

Avoid improper use of cut-off scores.

Cut-off LSAT scores (those below which no applicants will be considered) are strongly discouraged. Such boundaries should be used only if the choice of a particular cut-off is based on a carefully considered and formulated rationale that is supported by empirical data, for example, one based on clear evidence that those scoring below the cut-off have substantial difficulty

doing satisfactory law school work. Note that the establishment of a cut-off score should include consideration of the standard error of measurement in order to minimize distinctions based on score differences not sufficiently substantial to be reliable. Significantly, cut-off scores may have a greater adverse impact upon applicants from minority groups than upon the general applicant population. Normally, an applicant's LSAT score should be combined with the undergraduate grade-point average before any determination is made of the applicant's probability of success in law school.

Do not place excessive significance on score differences.

Scores should be viewed as approximate indicators rather than exact measures of an applicant's abilities. Distinctions on the basis of LSAT scores should be made among applicants only when those score differences are reliable.

Carefully evaluate LSAT scores earned under accommodated or nonstandard conditions.

LSAC has no data to demonstrate that scores earned under accommodated conditions have the same meaning as scores earned under standard conditions. Because the LSAT has not been validated in its various accommodated forms, accommodated tests are identified as nonstandard and an individual's scores from accommodated tests are not averaged with scores from tests taken under standard conditions. The fact that accommodations were granted for the LSAT should not be dispositive evidence that accommodations should be granted once a test taker becomes a student. The accommodations needed for a one-day, multiple choice test may be different from those needed for law school coursework and examinations.

Avoid encouraging use of the LSAT for other than admission functions.

The LSAT was designed to serve admission functions only. It has not been validated for any other purpose. LSAT performance is subject to misunderstanding and misuse in other contexts, as in the making of an employment decision about an individual who has completed most or all law school work. These considerations suggest that LSAT scores should not be included on a law school transcript, nor routinely supplied to inquiring employers. Without the student's specific authorization, the Buckley Amendment would preclude the latter, in any event.