

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION SECTION OF LEGAL EDUCATION AND ADMISSIONS TO THE BAR

PUBLIC HEARING RE:
AMENDMENTS TO STANDARDS AND
RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR
APPROVAL OF LAW SCHOOLS

HELD ON FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 2014 9:00 A.M.

THE RITZ CARLTON, ST. LOUIS 100 CARONDELET PLAZA ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63105

```
1
                             APPEARANCES:
 2
 3
   APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE STANDARDS
                              JEFFREY LEWIS
 4
   REVIEW COMMITTEE CHAIR:
 5
 6
   MEMBERS PRESENT
 7
   Craig Boise
   Dr. Anthony Caprio
 8
   Catherine L. Carpenter
10
   Honorable Robert E. Cooper, Jr.
11
   Honorable Robert J. Cordy (Via telephone)
   Thomas A. Edmonds
12
13
   James J. Hanks, Jr.
14
   Susan L. Kay
   Lisa Kloppenberg (Via telephone)
15
16
   Peter McDonough
17
   Veryl Victoria Miles
18
   Scott Pagel (Via telephone)
   Kurt L. Schmoke
19
20
   AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION STAFF:
21
22 l
   J.R. Clark
23
   Charlotte (Becky) Stretch
24
25
```

1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
2	
3	SPEAKERS
4	Carol Chomsky, University of Minnesota Law School; SALT
5	Kate Kruse. Hamline University School of Law; CLEA
6	Mathew Kerbis, ABA Law Student Division
7	Robert Kuehn, Washington University
8	Gordon Russell, Lincoln Memorial School of Law
9	Alexander Scherr, University of Georgia School of Law
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	PUBLIC HEARING RE:
2	AMENDMENTS TO STANDARDS AND
3	RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR
4	APPROVAL OF LAW SCHOOLS
5	HELD ON
6	FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 2014
7	9:00 A.M.
8	
9	CHAIR LEWIS: Good morning, everyone. My
LO	name is Jeffrey Lewis, and I've been asked to chair
L1	this public hearing. The hearing is being
L2	transcribed and so I would ask everyone to speak up,
L3	speak clearly, and please identify yourself.
L 4	As we know, the Council of the Section of
L5	Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar has
L 6	approved, for notice and comment, proposed revisions
L7	to the Standards and the Rules of Procedure.
L8	Specifically, this period for notice and comment
L 9	deals with six items. First of all, the elimination
20	of Interpretation 305-3; secondly, the adoption of a
21	new Interpretation 503-3; third, the revision of
22	Standard 505; four, the elimination of Chapter 8 and
23	the transfer of most of its provisions to other
24	portions of Public Rules and Standards; five, the
25	revision of the definitions for important words in

the Standards and the Rules; and finally, number six, the revision of the Rules of Procedure themselves.

An explanation of the changes as well as a strike-out version showing all the changes has been widely published and we've received some written comments. This public hearing is part of the process that's designed to ensure that every individual and every group that has an interest will have a meaningful opportunity to have its position heard.

So far we have five -- five people that have asked to speak, and if there are others, we will give them the opportunity following the first five.

First, Kate Kruse from Hamline University.

Kate, it's good to see you.

MS. KRUSE: Thank you. Hi. I'm Kate

Kruse. I'm a professor of law and associate dean of experiential education at Hamline University School of Law. I'm also the immediate past president of the Clinical Legal Education Association, CLEA, and I speak on behalf of CLEA today in opposition to the elimination of Interpretation 305-3. CLEA is an organization that includes over a thousand members

who teach in clinical legal education, including clinics and externships.

And the question, I think, you're faced with in whether or not to eliminate Interpretation 305-3, just to clarify at the outset, it's not whether students learn in paid employment. They do learn in paid employment. The question is whether the law schools should be able to grant academic credit and charge tuition for the learning that students do in paid employment.

The overwhelming majority of externship professors who have responded to your call for notice and comment are telling you basically the same thing, which is that an employer-employee relationship would significantly interfere with their ability to structure the educational experience that they provide students in their externship programs. That's because the employer-employee relationship changes the incentive structures of field supervisors that -- in that it significantly changed the incentives that they have for structuring the students' learning around the students' learning objectives rather than around their own needs.

And you'll hear more than that in --

```
1
   you'll hear more about that later from Al Scherr,
   who's a very experienced externship professor. I'm
 3
   not a very experienced externship professor, so I'm
 4
   not going to speak in detail about that.
 5
             But I would say you should listen -- you
 6
   should read the comments that have come in and you
 7
   should listen to the people that are -- listen to
   what they're telling you. Why should you listen to
 9
   them? Well, I would say they're the A list of
10
   externship directors. You're hearing from the
11
   people that are committed, experienced, thoughtful;
12
   they're part of the national community of externship
13
   educators who developed externship pedagogy over
14
   several decades and they know what they're talking
15
   about.
16
             UNIDENTIFED FEMALE:
                                   Hello. Is this the
17
   conference call that Justice Cordy's supposed to be
18
   in?
19
             CHAIR LEWIS:
                            It is.
20
             UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:
                                    Okay. One moment,
21
   let me put him on the phone.
22
             MS. KRUSE: Not all externship programs --
23
             CHAIR LEWIS: Hi, Bob. This is Jeff
24
   Lewis.
           Welcome.
25
             ASSOCIATE JUSTICE CORDY:
                                        Hello, Jeff.
```

```
I'm so sorry. This -- I couldn't get -- make it
 1
 2
   earlier.
 3
             CHAIR LEWIS:
                            That's all right.
                                               We're in
 4
   the midst of the beginning of the hearing right now.
 5
             ASSOCIATE JUSTICE CORDY:
                                        Okay.
 6
             CHAIR LEWIS:
                           Okay, Bob.
                                        Thanks.
 7
             MS. KRUSE: So I think of those of you
 8
   who've been on a site visit know, I certainly know
 9
   from site visits that I've been on, that not all
10
   externship programs are run by people on this list.
11
   They're not all as well run. They're not all as
12
   well structured. They're not all as well resourced.
13
   One of the site visits I was on had one -- one 40
14
   percent adjunct supervising 200-some externs. You
15
   need to worry about programs. You're the
16
   regulators. You need to worry about programs that
17
   are not lead by externship directors that are on the
18
   A list.
19
             Why? Well, I would say to you it's
20
   because the nature of field placement presents
21
   special opportunities and new challenges for the
22
   maintenance of educational quality and that
23
   externship programs, accordingly, feel -- placements
24
   accordingly require particular attention from the
25
   law schools and from the Accreditation Committee.
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, that's words from your Interpretation 305-2 that you're choosing to delete along with these revisions. I don't know why you're choosing to delete it. You -- the explanation says you're deleting unnecessary interpretations and that you feel this is unnecessary, but just if it's apparently unnecessary at this point, it doesn't make it untrue. Field placements do require special attention in order to ensure educational qualities.

Schools should not be able to collect tuition from students by rubberstamping their paid employment. They should grant academic credit and they should collect tuition when they've taken an active role in structuring the educational quality of the experience. And that's what these A list externship directors are telling you, that paid employment interferes with their ability to do that.

But you should also listen to what I'm calling the A list is not telling you. Number one, they're not telling you that they're concerned with the Fair Labor Standards Act. That's not their concern. Why not? Because the FLSA requirements are actually consistent with and work together with ABA Interpretation 305-3.

FLSA factors include a fact that it says

students are -- should not receive pay for their externship and other factors stress unpaid internships must be designed as an educational experience, not employment.

THE FLSA and ABA regulations run together to define and reinforce the same dichotomy between paid employment on one hand and education on the other hand. Removing Interpretation 305-3 will disrupt that mutually reinforcing regulatory structure.

Externship directors are not concerned with the FLSA. We do -- externship directors do run into potential placement sites where people have concern and they raise concerns about the FLSA. But what they've found is that when they work with those people and explain the educational requirements of the program and explain how the FLSA factors apply to externships, that they're able to work out arrangements that comply with FLSA.

We have an example of that in the Twin
Cities. Hamline, University of Minnesota, William
Mitchell and St. Thomas have all been offered a
program by Target Corporation to take one minority
student a year into their program to offer them,
like, a scholarship and also to offer them an

externship as part of their program to bring more minority law students into their legal department. We worked together -- the four externship directors of the four schools worked together on that contract to come up with money which -- that alleviated any kind of concerns under the FLSA.

Finally, the A list is not telling you that they're averse to, you know, students receiving support while they're in externships. They're sympathetic to the position the students are in.

The problem is not compensation per se; the problem is paid employment. It's paid employment, the creation of an employer-employee relationship that disrupts their ability to structure the educational experience in a field placement. It's not living expenses. It's not reimbursement for living expenses.

I think people are a little surprised that the University of Michigan sent several comments in saying that students had turned down offers of compensation for housing and for transportation while they were in a program in Geneva, and in fact the externship director at Michigan submitted a letter saying, actually, I wouldn't propose abolishing the standard. I think you need to

clarify -- maybe you could provide some better clarification of what is allowed under the current standard because it seems to us that the current interpretation does allow that.

Not all externship directors are opposed to grants or stipends to students from other sources, sources that don't come directly from the employer. There was something on the LexTrain email listserv a couple of months ago saying -- you know, forwarding an email from Scott Freling, you know, where someone had asked him, what about AmeriCorps funding? You know, can a student receive AmeriCorps funding?

And clear back in 2010 he answered that question by saying, you know: It looks to me, based on the way you describe AmeriCorps funding, i.e., award for work done, that this is compensation rather than reimbursement of reasonable expenses incurred. For example, in your description there's no indication AmeriCorps grants are tied to travel expenses associated getting to and from the field placement, additionally, housing costs associated with the distant field placement assignment or other reasonable out-of-pocket expenses related to the field placement. If there is some other way to

```
characterize the payments where the school uses the
 1
   funds to establish a pool of funds to reimburse
 3
   students for reasonable out-of-pocket expenses, such
 4
   reimbursement would appear to meet 305-3.
 5
             Well, AmeriCorps funding -- I mean,
 6
   apparently the person that asked that question
 7
   characterized it in a certain way. AmeriCorps
   funding is provided by the federal government as a
 9
   stipend to students who volunteer for non-profit
10
   organizations. It doesn't come from the employer,
11
   it doesn't establish an employer-employee
12
   relationship.
13
             That should not be raising concern.
   ABA needs to be a little more clear with schools
14
15
   that are trying to structure their programs what is
16
   and is not allowed.
17
             CHAIR LEWIS: Kate, let me ask you to --
18
             MS. KRUSE:
                         Yeah.
19
             CHAIR LEWIS: -- try and finish up. I've
20
   been trying to keep everybody's remarks to about 10
21
   minutes --
22
             MS. KRUSE: Great. Yeah.
23
             CHAIR LEWIS: -- so we'll have time for
24
   everyone. Thank you.
25
             MS. KRUSE:
                          Okay. I'm not sure what the
```

1 timing is and --2 CHAIR LEWIS: I'm sorry. I should have 3 mentioned that. I apologize. 4 MS. KRUSE: Okay. I just -- if I just 5 could finish. 6 CHAIR LEWIS: Please. No, go ahead. 7 MS. KRUSE: Okay. 8 What externship directors really want is 9 clarification about what counts as reasonable living 10 expenses because they'd like to be creative in structuring financial support for students in ways 11 12 that do not interfere with the educational 13 experience. 14 However, at this point it seems unwise to 15 be throwing the baby out with the bathwater. You 16 have a variance process. If schools wanted to come 17 up with a unique or different type of structured 18 arrangement with an employer or the corporation or 19 the law firm to provide, you know, some form of 20 compensation that's not wages and doesn't establish 21 an employer-employee relationship, let them ask for 22 a variance. 23 In your new transparent variance process, 24 they could create -- they could show you that it's

not going to interfere with the educational

25

experience and they could show other schools as well. They could experiment and become a model for other schools to follow.

But simply abolishing this standard wholesale would be throwing the baby out with the bathwater and taking away an important structural element that makes educational experience in its place impossible.

CHAIR LEWIS: Thank you.

Carol Chomsky from the University of Minnesota. Carol, welcome.

MS. CHOMSKY: Thank you.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

I'm going to speak only about the elimination of

Interpretation 305-3. And I'm speaking primarily on
behalf of the Society of American Law Teachers, but
also as a long-time teach of the judicial externship
program at the University of Minnesota Law School
and now as associate dean helping to shape other
externship programs and independent field placements
as well.

I think externships and field placements are a terrific way for students to gain deeper understanding of law practice, to try out their lawyering skills. But as their use expands -- and I

think they will expand with the newly adopted sixcredit requirement for experiential work,
externships is part of that -- it's important that
it remain quality experience. Keeping the rule,
keeping them unpaid, I think is a part of doing
that.

I want to talk about three concerns that have been expressed, three arguments that have been made for why the rule should be changed. First, that it means law firms, corporate counsel offices, and other for-profit entities cannot or will not offer internships; second, that it makes it difficult for students to have externships that are particularly expensive, especially if -- there were several mentions of the program in Geneva from the University of Michigan Law School; and that it generally prevents students from earning money to help pay for expensive legal education. So I want to address briefly each of those points.

First, the argument or the concern that for-profit firms and companies can't or won't post unpaid interns. As Kate Kruse has already mentioned and as the SALT submission talks about at some length, that, I think, rests on misunderstanding of the FLSA requirements.

Any employer is allowed to host a student unpaid intern as long as the intern is not considered an employee. And whether the student is considered an employee has been determined by application of six factors enumerated by the Department of Labor that are meant to ensure that the experience is focused on training, not on work product; that the experience is designed for the benefit of the student intern; and in the words of one of those factors, the benefits to the employer are at best minimal and, quote, on occasion its operations may actually be impeded.

And in fact, when I talk to possible placements, when I talk -- in fact, I recently had a discussion with one of the federal judges who hosts interns and she said, "You know, I don't take these students because they help us. I take them because it's an important part of their experience and because I enjoy having them around because we can help them learn. They're more trouble than they're worth in terms of what they contribute to the chambers."

And I think that's the attitude that I try to cultivate in externship field supervisors. They have to understand that they are doing this for the

benefit of the student and not the benefit -- not for their own benefit. And I think having the rule in place with the FLSA requirements helps externship directors set up and faculty supervisors set up externships appropriately.

What's particularly important about externship and field placement opportunities is that students have an opportunity to observe, to shadow lawyers, to spend probably half their time not doing work, but watching and talking, maybe attending CLEs, talking with lawyers who are doing things that are not directly related to the work that they themselves, the students, are doing for the placement. And that's not something that an employer is going to want to pay for, time spent not working, and that is what externs should be doing with a good portion of their time.

In fact, there's a comment filed by Perry
Cask (phonetic) among those filed on 305-3 that
talks specifically about a circumstance where a
student was an intern and then received a job offer
and was going to be continuing to work, and she said
to the placement supervisor, "So will they continue
to shadow while they're doing this?" And the
placement supervisor chuckled and said, "Well, not

when we're paying them."

It's a very different experience and it's very important to maintain the possibility of having that different experience. It's important to maintain the educational focus of the field placements and the externships and having students be paid for that work will interfere with that.

The second point that's been made is that students can't afford to engage in a more costly -- in externships that are more costly for them and, again, particularly mentioned was the externship in Geneva. But the current rule permits reimbursement of reasonable expenses including, in my mind -- and I think there could be some clarity brought to this -- the extra expense of travel to a faraway place, the extra cost of other kinds of transportation, of meals and lodging away from home that are more than would otherwise be spent.

And I have told students and part of the form that they have to fill out for me if they're doing a field placement that is in a for-profit --well, in any field placement, but it's particularly important in a for-profit placement, if they're going to -- they check off a box, if they're going to receive reimbursement for expenses, where they

acknowledge that they should keep records and they should be able to demonstrate those expenses.

It is not difficult to do that and I think it does comply with the current rule, though there has been enough confusion that it would be helpful to clarify that.

There may be other creative ways to compensate students not directly from the employer, but from other sources that might be either in compliance with the rule or could be, as Kate Kruse has mentioned, contemplated as a variance in the short term to make sure that those would produce the same kind of educational benefits for the students.

Final argument that has been made on why the rule should be changed is that students would understandably like the opportunity to earn money while engaged in externships or field placements.

And I understand that. I'm very sympathetic to the monetary issues of students.

I think it is now clear that there would be significantly more opportunities made available. There are many employers who will take unpaid interns and who would not likely pay, including the non-profits, but even for-profit enterprises are more likely to host students and host them

effectively if they're not -- they don't pay and don't have to pay for that.

quite a few students who are working and doing externships. They're not precluded from earning money; it's just in two different experiences. And those experiences are, and that goes back to my first point, very different. There's the paid experience of working for a law firm or corporate office or even a non-profit if they have money for it and there's the experience of interning where much more of the time is spent in educational activities, in learning activities and not so much in producing work.

The other -- and two other aspects of that sort of trying things out. Students are given opportunities in unpaid placements that they probably would not have. If this was an employer who were paying -- a legal employer who were paying for an intern, they might very well want to have specified qualifications, make choices about who the intern would be, and take fewer chances on a student who can learn from the experience but may not be the person that they would choose to hire if they were doing it as an employment context.

1 By the same token, the students are more 2 likely to have experiences as unpaid interns when 3 they choose them focused on their educational goals rather than on earning money. They are more likely 4 5 to have experiences that will expand their 6 interests. They may work for a non-profit and 7 decide that that kind of work is more interesting to them than they thought it would be initially because 9 they tried it out as an unpaid intern. 10 That's true across a wide range of 11 opportunities. I think it expands the opportunities 12

for students as well as getting them ready and more attractive to hire as employees later.

So, as -- again, as Kate Kruse noted, the overwhelming number of comments filed on this issue from law school faculty and staff who run externship programs oppose this change, and with good reason. The rules help ensure and should continue to help ensure that law schools do externships the right way. Allowing pay and credit would undercut that obligation, so I would urge the retention of Interpretation 305-3.

> CHAIR LEWIS: Thank you, Carol.

Alexander Scherr from the University of

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Georgia.

MR. HANKS: 1 Jeff? 2 CHAIR LEWIS: Yes. 3 MR. HANKS: Are we going to have questions 4 later? 5 CHAIR LEWIS: You can ask questions now or 6 Do you have a question? Go ahead, Jim. 7 MR. HANKS: I do. 8 CHAIR LEWIS: This is Jim Hanks. 9 MR. HANKS: Hi, Carol. 10 MS. CHOMSKY: Hi. 11 MR. HANKS: A couple of your premises that 12 I'd like to ask about. First, you and Ms. Kruse 13 said that you think the employment relationship 14 interferes with learning in the externships, and --15 did I -- I think I quoted Ms. Kruse correctly, but 16 you seem -- do you agree with that premise? 17 The reaction I had was that MS. CHOMSKY: 18 students do learn from their employers and it is not 19 that learning can't happen with an employer-employee 20 relationship, but that by having it be an employer-21 employee relationship, that undercuts the obligation 22 to have it be primarily about learning and not about producing work for the employer. That's -- so it's 23 24 a slightly more nuanced sense that it interferes. 25 MR. HANKS: Well, that's what I'd like to

ask about because if the purpose of these unpaid internships is learning and the benefit to the law firm or other legal services provider is to have the availability of a good, young, eager law student working in the office, then what sort of understanding is there typically between the school, the extern, the extern supervisor, and the legal services provider about what is expected? Because certainly I would agree with you that in an employment situation, it is unquestionably the prerogative of a legal services provider to say do this, do that, and so forth.

Is that always or almost always understood not to be the case in the unpaid externships?

MS. CHOMSKY: I can't speak to what every externship is like across the country in every law school, but the -- but there are -- many of them have either contracts, explicit checklists of understandings about how the externship will be run that include that there will be time for -- I mean, my judicial externship says about 50 percent of the time should be observing and talking to people and following up on things and not producing work, 50 percent writing, drafting memos and -- bench memos and 50 percent observing.

It's not always precise because there are variations day to day in the work, but that that is an understanding. And it's usually an explicit understanding in some form, whether it's a conversation with the field supervisor or it is a written contract, as many schools have, where the employer agrees, the supervisor agrees.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think that the placements that take these on are taking them on not so much because it will benefit the firm or the corporate office of the non-profit, but because the lawyer there -- and actually, it's a personal thing. The lawyer who is doing the supervising wants to be a mentor, wants to work with a student, wants to help out.

I mean, it's the same motivation that leads our adjuncts to teach because we don't pay them the kind of amount that would actually compensate for the time that they put in it. do that because they like working with students, they want to have a part of that educational piece. And they view it as -- well, it's part of giving back to the profession and part of giving back often to their own law school and they want to help the students.

And so there's a -- there is an

understanding. It is not just somebody finds a job -- student finds a job and then they apply and get credit for it. There's a much more robust conversation about it.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HANKS: Okay. Thanks. That was very helpful. One more question that may have been substantially answered by what you just said, but let me be sure.

You say that the externs should be doing non-service-providing things like talking with other lawyers, going out to lunch, observing, that sort of thing. My experience as a practicing lawyer for over 40 years is the very young associates and our summer associates do get a lot of those sorts of opportunities to interact, to observe, to be mentored in non-billable ways just by being at the firm.

So I don't think that, at least from my experience, it's necessary for externs to be unpaid to be getting those kinds of experiences because I see our paid associates and summer associates getting those experiences all the time.

MS. CHOMSKY: I think there's some paying placements that offer that and many that don't. There are. But externships should always offer

that, and I think you need -- or that the rule helps 1 2 schools create an expectation and then understanding 3 that they're all like the best of those. 4 I mean, I applaud you if that's what is 5 happening with your junior lawyers, but --6 MR. HANKS: Well, I don't think we're 7 uncommon in that respect. 8 I have one, if I could, Jeff. CM: 9 You characterized it as a student finding 10 a job and then getting credit for it. Isn't it the 11 case that the same standards of 305 with respect to 12 the faculty instruction, resources, evaluation, and 13 so forth would apply even if the student were receiving compensation? 14 15 They would, but what MS. CHOMSKY: 16 wouldn't apply in part of the particulars -- there's 17 a very general notion that it be supervised, that it 18 be faculty supervised, but the specifics of how 19 that's done, those -- actually the factors from the 20 FLSA are actually very helpful. Those are not part 21 of the externship rules from the ABA. Those are 22 part of the Fair Labor Standards Act requirements 23 for being unpaid. 24 So the requirements that it be educational

are very general, and I think the pressures on law

25

schools and on law students, and even on employers, would be to short circuit -- to circumvent to some degree, to give short shrift to those kinds of requirements.

I think to have the rule in place that makes it unpaid and therefore have to fit within this rubric for the benefit of the student, not for the benefit of the employer, is a really important rule to maintain to be sure that it continues to do that. The specifics come out of the externship programs, but they are strengthened by the fact that it's an unpaid position, and some of that would go away.

DEAN BOISE: The fact that the law school controls the externship, though, gives the law school control over what happens and -- I mean, as a dean, I don't have a problem telling an externship site: You can't be an externship site for credit if you don't satisfy our requirements.

MS. CHOMSKY: And I think that if -- if every dean and every externship director and every faculty supervisor did that and felt comfortable doing that, then it would be fine, but the rule is meant to ensure that everybody in fact does that.

And I think the pressures -- if there are

difficulties between the student and the placement 1 in the midst of an externship, you know, how the 3 pressures on schools to have their students be viewed in a favorable light towards employment, I think, put pressures on it the other way. And I 6 fear what would happen without the rule, that it 7 would allow a lot more slippage on that point. 8 So what you're saying is CHAIR LEWIS: 9 because you think some schools would not do it 10 right, those schools that would do it right 11 shouldn't be prevented to do so. That's the end 12 result of this. 13 MS. CHOMSKY: I think that the rule -- the accreditation standards are a minimum standard to 14 15 ensure that the education of value is there for 16 students in all instances, and I think that -- and 17 the schools that are doing it right are not asking 18 for a change. They think that it's better to have -19 - I think this supports helps them do it right. 20 think doing it right in the absence of that rule 21 would become harder and not as many schools may find themselves able to maintain the same standards. 22 23 CHAIR LEWIS: Okay.

MS. CHOMSKY: Thanks.

MR. SCHERR: My name is Alex Scherr and

24

25

I'm a professor at the University of Georgia, School 1 I have taught externship programs for 18 3 years. I have designed them, both low credit and high credit and semester in practice programs. I've 5 been a lead organizer at the last three national 6 externship conferences eliciting proposals and 7 listening to people talk about this and many other 8 issues. And I'm a co-author, I'm a co-editor of a couple leading national texts on externship 9 10 teaching, so while I hesitate to do this, I may be 11 on that A Team list Kate was talking about. 12 I want to make three points. First, and 13 to speak to some of the concerns that have already been raised, I think the negative effects in 14 15 revoking the rule would far outweigh its benefits 16 and I want to detail those negative effects. 17 Second, I think there is no need to make this change 18 and that the limited benefits will be far outweighed 19 by the costs. And third, I want to assert clearly 20 that the rule serves important benefits to the ABA

First, repeal would harm the quality of educational opportunities for law students. The goals of paid work and of credit work conflict.

Paid work involves the creation of value, leaving --

and to law schools generally.

21

22

23

24

25

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

leaving all participants subject to the menace of the billable hour. For-credit work allows student learning, without concern for the creation of value and without concern for the billable hour. Learning in a practice environment for the student is wasteful, unproductive, and largely of no benefit to the firm.

You asked what the common consensus was among externship programs and field supervisors. can't count the number of times I've heard externship supervisors say, "These students don't give me much. In fact, they're more trouble than they're worth if I'm thinking about it exclusively in terms of economic value. But I do it because I want to teach and I do it because I want to mentor."

For field placement supervisors, a central concern is to make sure that the field placement -the lawyer who is at the site does the work that they need to do. All right? Talks with the student, engages them in discussions. Has a twohour discussion, editing session about a draft. Takes them to a hearing and then talks with them about that hearing afterwards. None of that time can be billed to a client. None of it. All right?

Similarly, a student engaged in an

externship is encouraged to seek out learning 1 2 opportunities within the firm, to assert themselves, 3 to ask for the chance to sit in on a hearing, to go 4 to a placement -- to go to a court action, to talk 5 with a partner or a judge or non-profit lawyer, and 6 to engage in conversations that are not directly 7 related to the purpose of the firm. And again, in 8 the for-profit sector, it cannot be billed. 9 These realities create a serious risk that 10 placements that are paid will move towards a paying 11 -- a billable relationship. With respect, it may 12 well be true that firms who are committed to 13 educating their lawyers permit a lot of wasted time, 14 but it seems to me that the pressures of a billing 15 practice push people towards employment. 16 employment is a value to the firm; not a primary 17 benefit. 18 CHAIR LEWIS: I'm sorry to sort of 19 interrupt, Alex --20 MR. SCHERR: Sure, yeah. 21 CHAIR LEWIS: -- but is it really likely 22 that a firm could bill a client for the time of a 23 student in an externship? How likely is it that a

client is actually going to pay? Well, there is a consensus MR. SCHERR:

24

25

among the community at large that firms not bill for work that students produce, as it stands right now, at a for-credit program.

engaging in a lot of time that doesn't even contribute directly to the production of work of value to the firm. Moreover, I'd also point out that the expectation of the lawyer at the site is that they, too, engage in activity that is of not direct benefit to the firm. Talking with a student, editing a brief, editing a memo, giving them feedback about their work, discussing career opportunities and introducing them to the culture of a firm; none of those are — none of that is billable work, so the firm has to commit to taking that lawyer out of the billable cycle for that time.

MR. HANK: But just because some of what the extern does is not billable doesn't mean that everything that the extern does is not of value to the client and therefore potentially billable, does it?

MR. SCHERR: There is a quantum of learning that can be done for work that is of value to the firm, I'd agree. But that's a minimal quantum, particularly compared to the volume and the

1 quality of the learning that comes when both supervisor and the student agree that the work is 3 not about helping the firm; the work is about helping the student. There's more time the supervisor can spend mentoring, critiquing, assessing the student's work. There's more time the student can spend outside the parameters of valuecreating work.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HANKS: It seems to me that you're pursuing inconsistent lines here. On the one hand, you're saying externships are a very valuable thing because they expose the student to the practice of law. And then you're saying, well, actually, to the extent that they do what lawyers really do, which is provide valuable legal services to clients, that shouldn't be billed. That's not worthwhile. seems to me that those themes conflict.

MR. SCHERR: You're -- with respect, you're mishearing what I'm saying.

Externships are valuable because they give students the opportunity to engage in carefully supervised work in a practice setting, in a way that focuses on the student learning and not on the benefit to the firm. That's the value of externship programs. It's not generally exposing them to a

```
1
   practice context, but quite specifically engaging in
   a learning process that develops the student's
 3
   skill, regardless of whether the work that gets done
   contributes to the firm.
 4
 5
             Similarly --
 6
             MR. HANKS: But doesn't that have --
 7
             MR. SCHERR: Let me -- excuse me.
                                                  If I
   might just --
 8
 9
             MR. HANKS:
                          Sure.
10
             MR. SCHERR: I want to cover this.
11
             Externship programs are not about
12
   providing service of value to the firm and not about
13
   providing service of value to the firms' clients.
14
   So that other premise is also not something
15
   necessary. We are about exclusively carefully
16
   structuring learning environments for students.
17
             DEAN BOISE:
                          Would you object, then, if a
18
   firm wanted to do that, undertook that obligation,
19
   that responsibility, and also wanted to pay the
20
   student? Because I don't think that a firm is
21
   likely to build its business model on hiring law
22
   school externs in order to create value and be able
23
   to bill clients.
24
             So you're already assuming the firm is
25
   willing to acknowledge and willing to assume the
```

obligation, that it's going to have the training responsibility for this extern where there's going to be a loss in terms of not only time, but the time of the people providing the training.

MR. SCHERR: I mean, my contention is that

-- and I think -- and I'm not alone in this. You

see substantial comment from the vast overwhelming

majority of externship professionals that allowing

pay in these circumstances would seriously reduce

the willingness of an employer to provide

unstructured learning environments -- learning

experiences for students.

I don't object to students learning from paid work. The existing rule permits that. There's nothing in the existing situation that prevents them from doing it. What I object to is giving course credit for work where a structured learning environment is not present.

DEAN BOISE: But by definition, that wouldn't be the case because we have standards in 305 that require that kind of structure for credit. Right?

MR. SCHERR: Yeah. But my belief is that permitting pay in that situation would increase the incentive for employers to move away from those

1 requirements. Remember what we're talking about here. 2 3 We're talking about a situation with divided 4 supervision. The student works at the placement. 5 The law -- the law school clinician is away from the 6 placement. The major effort for the law school 7 clinician is to make sure that the placement on a routine daily basis is able to provide these 9 learning experiences. 10 They're not present in the firm. They are 11 not capable of being -- of shadowing each student in 12 a 20-, 30-, 40-student placement program to make 13 sure that the teacher at the site does what they're 14 supposed to do. 15 Permitting pay essentially asks the firm 16 to pay students to do wasteful work, to pay students 17 to be supervised by supervisors who themselves can't 18 bill for the work. So my view is, and my contention 19 is, that pay aggravates a problem that's already 20 central to the law school and site relationship. Ιt 21 makes it harder for the law school to --22 CHAIR LEWIS: Well, let's --23 MR. SCHERR: -- exhibit that influence --24 CHAIR LEWIS: Let's assume, you know, that

that is the view of the school. I would -- they

25

don't have to provide externships that pay the 1 student. Elimination of this interpretation doesn't 3 require a law school to do anything. It just 4 permits a law school, if it decides it can comply 5 with Standard 305, to structure an experience that 6 involves pay. 7 MR. SCHERR: With respect, in theory you may be correct, but in practice, once the word gets 9 out that schools can provide -- can allow students 10 to get paid for a for-credit experience, students 11 will demand, alumni will demand those opportunities. 12 The balance will shift. 13 CHAIR LEWIS: So this interpretation is necessary to protect schools against doing something 14 15 they know they shouldn't do. 16 MR. SCHERR: This interpretation is 17 necessary to allow schools to do the right thing, 18 which is to ensure the quality of the educational 19 experiences --20 CHAIR LEWIS: Okay. 21 MR. SCHERR: -- that they get. 22 CHAIR LEWIS: Okay. 23 MR. SCHERR: It's a minimum standard. 24 Carol has -- as Carol said, it's a minimum standard. 25 It allows schools to resist the pressure to dilute

the quality of the externship experience by 1 introducing payment into the relationship between a 3 teacher and a student. 4 Students don't get paid for any other course in law school. They don't get paid to take 5 6 They don't get paid to do a clinic. They 7 don't get paid to do a trial practice seminar. think most of us would agree that allowing a student to get paid by a professor in order to engage in a 10 course would be antithetical to the goals of 11 learning. Externships, as the ABA has made clear 12 for 30 years, are courses like any other. 13 should not introduce payment in a way that you would 14 not introduce for any other course. 15 If I may return to my --16 CHAIR LEWIS: Yeah. 17 MR. SCHERR: I know I'm running short on 18 time, but --19 CHAIR LEWIS: Yeah. Please. 20 MR. SCHERR: -- I want to make sure I get 21 my points out. 22 CHAIR LEWIS: Sure. Sure. 23 MR. SCHERR: I don't think the benefits of 24 this rule will outweigh against the severe costs. 25 There is no pool of for-profit placements that are

clamoring to pay students. It just doesn't exist. 1 To the contrary, and I've checked with my placement 3 people about this as have my colleagues at other 4 schools, the trend is for paying employers to 5 increasingly contact law schools for free work, but 6 for work that they don't want to have to control. 7 And I would suspect that those employers are not looking to engage in teaching, they're looking to 9 get value from those students. 10 The assistance that this -- that that --11 revoking the rule would offer to students is 12 minimal. The rule as it stands permits earning in a 13 traditional and well-accepted and, frankly, uncontroversial choice for students. They can 14 15 either earn credit or they can work for pay. I have 16 seen no students jumping on this at no school. 17 Carol Chomsky has mentioned the impact of 18 the Fair Labor Standards Act. The consensus in the 19 externship community is the Fair Labor Standards Act 20 concerns are not a concern. 21 And finally, the rule permits innovation. The rule has been in place since 1981. Think about 22

And finally, the rule permits innovation. The rule has been in place since 1981. Think about what's happened to the legal community in the last 33 years. There've been a vast expansion of placement programs of all corners of the practice

23

24

25

community, an enormous amount of creativity and created hybrid programs, and an increasing trend over the last five years to place students for forprofit -- for credit opportunities in the forprofit world without pay. There's no need to change the rule to promote innovation. Innovation already exists and the rule is a central part of that.

In closing, I would assert that the rule continues to serve important purposes. It preserves law school control of the quality of the educational experience. It levels the playing field between students who a firm might want to hire and students on whom a firm might not want to take a risk; between clinics that can't offer pay and clinics where payment is made available; and between schools that employers might see as desirable places to pay students and schools that are less elite.

The rule encourages and has demonstratively encouraged innovation in field placement design, field placement structure. It has not been treated as something like an innovation in programs.

And finally, the rule encourages and preserves the ABA's long-standing commitment to encouraging interest in public service, in public

interest work. You have before you, comments from 1 supervisors in these placements that express severe 3 concern about the impact that paid placements would 4 have on the availability of placements in the public 5 service field. 6 For these reasons, I would ask you not to 7 revoke the rule. MR. EDMONDS: May I ask you a question 8 9 before you sit down? 10 MR. SCHERR: Sure. Yeah. Absolutely. 11 MR. EDMONDS: Tom Edmonds, a member of the 12 Standards Review Committee. There have been references to the 13 unevenness that exists at different schools and the 14 15 way in which these experiences are structured, and I 16 know that to be true from the inspections that I've 17 So my question to you is, you refer to it as 18 It's couched as a rule, but it is an 19 interpretation. If we should change our mind and do 20 something different here along the lines that maybe 21 the comments have suggested, would you advocate 22 moving that up into the rule itself, the standard, 23 as opposed to leaving it an interpretation?

MR. SCHERR:

24

25

MR. EDMONDS: In other instances where we

Yes.

Public Meeting April 25, 2014 NDT Assgn # 9278-82 have mandated a course of action, either to do 1 something or to refrain from doing it, we've moved 3 it up into the rule. This one, we've chose to go this route, I guess. But if we should change our 5 mind, would you like to see it in the standard 6 itself? 7 MR. SCHERR: I would. Quite candidly, I think it's of sufficient importance to justify having it in the standard. At the same time, I 10 think Carol Chomsky and Kate Kruse are correct; 11 there's a need to clarify the scope of the 12 reimbursements that are permissible under the rule. 13 I think there could be an interpretation that would 14 usefully do that.

There's a need to clarify what to make of third-party payment situations -- fellowships, stipends -- where the money doesn't come from the employer, it comes from another source, and you don't see those creating the same set of concerns.

MR. EDMONDS: Well, let me -- let me ask about that because I was concerned about whether you might want that in the way of a clarification. I mean, it says reasonable out-of-pocket costs attributable to being in a different place, et cetera.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SCHERR: Exactly.

MR. EDMONDS: I guess I don't -- I have some experience with AmeriCorps and to me, those are stipends paid directly to the volunteer, is the terminology there, and they can use that money in any way they wish. It's -- they don't have to account for it by submitting evidence that they paid their rent with it if they're in a different location or that they incurred meal expense. They don't have to do that. They use it in any way they want.

So I guess I wouldn't make that distinction that you seem to. If it's money that's being paid to the student, whether from the employer or a third party, and the student had unrestricted use of it, I guess I wouldn't -- I don't see much need for clarification.

In other words, to me, I agreed with what Carol had to say about the Switzerland experience.

I mean, to me, if you have to buy a plane ticket to Switzerland to be in the program, that's clearly an out-of-pocket reimbursable expense.

So I don't know that I see much need to clarify what -- I was just very interested in the comment about AmeriCorps stuff and to me, that's not

```
different from payment from the employer.
 1
 2
             MR. SCHERR:
                          Well, here's the distinction
 3
   that we see, although I recognize it may not be
 4
   persuasive to you.
 5
              If a third party is paying the stipend,
 6
   the employer-employee relationship doesn't exist
 7
   with respect to routine daily work. That's where we
 8
   see the problem with paid placements; that the
 9
   employer has to justify payment to the student who's
10
   working in a value-creating context.
11
             With AmeriCorps and with summer public
12
   interest fellowships, with grants from third
13
   parties, it's a lump sum payment that is not related
14
   to the student's performance, not related to the
15
   number of hours the student puts in, not related in
16
   any way that would reduce the law school control of
17
   the quality of educational experience.
18
             MR. EDMONDS: You might persuade me on
19
   that.
          Thank you.
20
             MR. SCHERR:
                           Okay.
21
             CHAIR LEWIS:
                            Thank you. Mathew Kerbis.
22
             Mathew, welcome.
23
             MR. KERBIS:
                           Thank you.
                                       Thank you.
24
             Can those calling in hear me clearly?
   morning.
25
             DEAN KLOPPENBERG:
                                 Well --
```

```
1
             CHAIR LEWIS:
                           Not sure.
 2
             MR. KERBIS:
                         Okay. We're not sure.
 3
   keep going, then.
 4
             Again, good morning.
 5
             ASSOCIATE DEAN PAGEL:
                                     We can.
 6
             CHAIR LEWIS: Yes. They can hear you.
 7
             MR. KERBIS:
                           Oh, that's good. Thank you.
 8
             ASSOCIATE DEAN PAGEL: Yes, we can hear
 9
   you.
10
             CHAIR LEWIS:
                          Okay. Thank you.
11
             MR. KERBIS:
                           Good.
                                  Thanks.
12
             So thank you today and good morning for
13
   hearing us. It's great that we can be here and that
14
   you guys are listening, so thank you.
15
             My name is Mathew Kerbis. I am a third-
16
   year law student at DePaul University, College of
17
   Law, and I am the chair the American Bar
18
   Association's Law Student Division. We have 34,000
19
   law student members and I am here speaking on their
20
   behalf today. I am here to speak in support of
21
   these Standard Reviews Committee's recommendation to
22
   elimination Interpretation 305-3.
23
             Now, all the speakers today will probably
24
   agree, I think, that externships are valuable for
25
   law students. We don't disagree on that. However,
```

there is no one-size-fits-all rule, and
Interpretation 305-3 is an over-inclusive rule.

You have the opponents of the elimination putting forth their arguments, giving their anecdotal evidence; the proponents, such as the Law Student Division, doing the same; and then you have some people in between requesting clarity or revisions to the interpretation, so if there's anything we can glean from that it's that there is not a consensus.

Now, you could look at our written comment to see our arguments lead forth, but that's not what I'm going to speak about today. Getting back to this idea that there's not a consensus and that actually supports the elimination of the interpretation, you only need to look at the people that have put in comments and things that have been said today.

You look at Michigan's program with Geneva and they're requesting clarity. You look at Wayne State's legal aid organizations that are requesting clarity because they have paid and unpaid law students working side by side in legal aid organizations. And in certain situations you have schools such as I bring from my own experience here

in Chicago where there is such a dense population of law students and not enough externships that they could partake in.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Law students are denied participation in externships because they fill up and there's just not enough resources. So in cities like Chicago, that -- where there's not enough opportunities for law students, if more opportunities exist, which can happen if the interpretation is limited, then those students can then go out and fill those now open season.

And we're not assuming that all of a sudden there's going to be all of these paid externships. That's not a misconception that we In fact, we think that externships as they currently exist are good for the reasons that have been stated, and you don't lose that. elimination of the interpretation doesn't necessitate all of a sudden that law students must be paid.

And even if they demand it and the alumni come and demand it, first of all, I think that's great. Good. Law students want that. But even if they do, that doesn't mean the law school needs to allow their externship programs to pay.

It doesn't necessarily change the status quo as it is. It just allows the schools that are willing to take the necessary steps and still fulfill all the requirements of the standard to allow those opportunities. And law students will seek them out where they don't exist.

I think that it's not a useful use of your time to have to have these conversations where people are requesting clarity in an interpretation that is over-inclusive. These are conversations that should be had at the schools. The schools should figure them out on their own. There are over 200 accredited law schools. Let them among their administration and the externship opportunities that are available have these conversations there and figure it out. That way, Michigan doesn't have to have this debate along with everyone else, but they can figure it out at their school. The elimination would allow that.

I'd like to note Professor Jim Beckman's comment, a professional in clinical work, and he, along with others that signed on -- and I'm proud to say that the field placement director at my school also signed on to that -- that the elimination is a good thing. And so I encourage that you read that

comment in addition to the Law Student Division's 1 2 comment because it puts forth arguments that we 3 agree with. 4 Additionally, there have been statements 5 that law students will take these because they want 6 No. Law students will take these because a 7 lot of law students need the pay, and now we're 8 forcing them to choose. 9 Also point you to Professor Jennifer 10 Jolly-Ryan's comment talking about seeing one of her 11 students working at a grocery store because he has 12 to make money in order to pay for law school, in 13 order to pay for needs that he has. And we've received comments and we 14 15 submitted them at the last hearing where there are a 16 lot of students speaking up, a lot of them part-17 time, that simply can't afford to take on 18 externships because they don't pay, and the 19 elimination would allow them to. 20 So --21 MR. EDMONDS: Could I ask you a question 22 about that? 23 MR. KERBIS: Yes, please. 24 MR. EDMONDS: Tom Edmonds. 25 I read that comment about the grocery

1 store till clerk --2 MR. KERBIS: Yes. 3 MR. EDMONDS: -- and I didn't understand 4 it because if a student is taking a full load of work or a part-time load of work if they're a parttime student, obviously, they -- many of them work outside the law school curriculum. They may or may 7 not be taking a clinical course at the time, 9 externship, or anything else. But if they are, it's 10 part of their course load and, in addition to doing 11 that, they can also work at a law firm in a paid 12 capacity if they wish to do that. 13 So I guess I didn't understand. 14 student could have been working in a grocery store. 15 He could have been working in a law firm while he's 16 also taking his tuition-paid work at the law school. 17 And so I guess I don't understand that 18 I think a student who's taking law school work can work part-time if he -- part of that law 20 school work is a clinical experience or an 21 externship, they can still work outside of the 22 normal load of work that they're taking. 23 So how does that work? Tell me how it 24 works.

MR. KERBIS:

25

I can't speak to that.

```
course, I can't speak to the specifics because you'd
 1
 2
   have to ask the professor for that.
 3
             MR. EDMONDS:
                           But you cited it.
 4
             MR. KERBIS:
                           I know. I know. And so what
 5
   I would say -- what I would ask you in return is:
 6
   When do they sleep? When do they spend time with
 7
   their girlfriends or their family?
 8
             You're asking a lot of law students by --
 9
   you're right. They have -- they're putting in time
10
   for credits. They're putting in time for all these
11
   other things. I'll tell you, as Chair of the Law
12
   Student Division, working part-time to the maximum
   20 hours that I'm allowed, in a dedicated
13
14
   relationship, having a lot of family in Chicago, I
15
   have had to make a lot of sacrifices personally.
16
   And I'll tell you, I don't sleep a lot.
17
             MR. EDMONDS:
                           The law is a jealous
18
   mistress, as they say and --
19
             MR. KERBIS:
                           I hear you.
20
             MR. EDMONDS: -- you have to make time for
21
   all those things. So students do it.
                                           They've done
22
   it for generations. They've worked and they've gone
23
   to school.
24
             MR. KERBIS:
                          And we're saying we've had
25
   enough, and that's why I'm here.
```

MR. EDMONDS: All right.

2.0

MR. KERBIS: So I think hopefully now we're beginning to understand that there is no one-size-fits-all rule and that the elimination would allow schools to adapt as they see fit while still adhering to the other standards.

And that conclude my prepared remarks, but I just want to say to the A listers out there: Rise to the challenge. If this interpretation is eliminated, rise to the challenge and make sure that there is still an educational component as part of this because we're not saying there shouldn't be. And while we still think that you learn a lot about actually going out into practice and working when you're being paid to work in an educational environment where you receive credit, rise to the challenge because law students are asking for this. There's evidence supporting and people that work in your field supporting this elimination, so rise to the challenge.

And with that, the Law Student Division urges that the recommendation of the Standards

Review Committee to eliminate Interpretation 305-3 is adopted. Thank you.

Are there any more questions?

```
CHAIR LEWIS:
 1
                           Thank you, Mathew.
 2
             MR. KERBIS:
                           Thank you. And thank you.
 3
             CHAIR LEWIS: Robert Kuehn from Washington
 4
   University. Welcome.
 5
                          I've come a long way for this,
             MR. KUEHN:
 6
   so --
 7
             CHAIR LEWIS:
                            You have. It's about a half
 8
   a mile, isn't it?
 9
             MR. KUEHN:
                         Yeah, but I walked, of course,
10
   and it was freezing snow and all the rest of it.
11
             Anyway, it's nice to be her today. My
12
   name is Bob --
13
             PROFESSOR CARPENTER: Uphill both ways.
14
             MR. KUEHN:
                          So you did both ways.
15
             My name is Bob Kuehn and I'm the Associate
16
   Dean for Clinical Education at Washington University
17
   here in St. Louis. I've been teaching in law
18
   clinics and externships for 25 years and I directly
19
   oversee two externships now and am responsible for
20
   eight overall.
21
             I have worked with many, many, many
22
   students over the years who, quite frankly, have
23
   done both. They have worked and they have done
24
   externships. And in fact, I take special
25
   responsibility for trying to make sure that those
```

students do get a chance to do both and I see them not just do externships, but moot court, law review and all the rest.

So I'm a little surprised by this exceptionalism that supposedly is happening here and now because this has always been a part of students' lives. In fact, it was part of my life. I worked every semester in law school. I worked full-time and went to school full-time. My last year, if there was a 20-hour rule there, I broke it. The statute of limitations has run.

I never imagined that I could buy credits, that I could turn in my summer hours or the hours in the firm and in some way get academic credit for it. And quite frankly, that firm was not giving me time to observe anything, not giving me a chance to hang out because they were billing me and charging the client, and rightfully so.

I want to briefly just talk about a process issue really briefly and then two substantive issues. The process issue is I'm just troubled that once again, quite frankly, we're in the middle of contested rulemaking as part of trying to figure out accreditation standards. It's all -- we're back again to this all or nothing thing.

And I've mentioned this to Barry many times, I'm sorry he's not here, but I just think the way we're going about getting at standards is just all wrong. I think we should bring people around the table, we should see if there's a middle ground, and we should do things right.

In my understanding, from looking at other accreditors, this is how they do it. We've just become so freaking formalistic here, I think we've lost sight of a much better way. And I think, quite frankly, if we learn nothing else, all the work on Chapter 4, I think we learned that didn't work. Right? Because we did five years' work on Chapter 4. It was a very contested setting and, quite frankly, got nothing either way.

It also is quite amazing to me that there are two organizations within the ABA that haven't been sought out who I would think we ought to be listening to. Within the Section itself we have a Clinical Skills Committee, and I see no effort to bring them in as experts, to ask them what they think.

And because there's a lot of concern about what's going on or might be going on with the Fair Labor Standards Act, I don't understand why the

Section of Labor and Employment wasn't brought in as well to help clarify these things.

So unfortunately, I think we have a process that's both less informed and more polarized and we get a result in which nobody is happy.

I want to talk about two particular substantive issues that I see. The first is what I think is a very troubling and perverse signal we're about to send when we allow externships, above all other sorts of students experiences, to now become a paid position.

I think that it's quite interesting to me, sort of, what's happened if this is the case to clinical legal education. Right? Because we started out with a goal of making the student learning coincide with the goal of using the student learning experiences to assist those who can't get access to legal representation. Those were always to dual purposes, even the dual purposes of own externship.

We then moved to corporate placements and externships. You know, rightfully so. I think educationally because we felt that perhaps we were missing out on some important experiences. So law schools are now at law firms, yet another step

removed from the goal of trying to make sure that this process is also about public interest and access to justice.

And now we're going even farther. Now we're allowing payment. But quite frankly, only payment for a certain kind. Right? Only payment for externships.

Every student practice rule that I'm aware of for law clinics says very clearly that students cannot be paid compensation for their work in a law clinic. And so why, why are we now thinking about making an exception for externships?

Why should it be, right, at my school, that if a student enrolls in and does a law clinic and is prohibited by the state supreme courts of every state, to my knowledge, and the federal courts from being compensated for that, why are they in that situation versus an externship? Why are we creating that perverse incentive?

Why are we now driving students, quite frankly, out of those public interest opportunities and into more paid positions? I think that's wrong. I think that's wrong. I think this is about education. It's not about making money.

Also, I think there's an issue of the Fair

Labor Standards Act that I heard from someone the other day that hasn't been raised that I want to briefly mention. I was speaking to a corporate placement site in New York, and he was talking about taking a student and mentioned the importance of making sure they got academic credit.

And he said, you know, when I sent him the ABA Standards, he said he spoke to his HR people, including the lawyer in that office, and they noted something about these sorts of externships and law school that his HR people said was distinctive and important to them, and that is that there's a rule with our externs that they can't get paid. Right?

And so, therefore, if the Fair Labor Standards
Act issue ever arose, unlike if they could pay these
students, they felt much more comfort in telling the
Labor Department or someone else: You know, not
only is this student doing this for academic credit,
which we believe provides some safe haven, but we're
prohibited from paying that student.

When you remove that, to me perversely, you're exposing these organizations who are not paying students to potentially greater opportunity for someone to raise a Fair Labor Standards system and possibly, therefore, result in fewer

opportunities for students rather than more with what's been going on here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I want to suggest a few things here towards the end. I think that, obviously, my position would be that you should retain this, but I do believe, as others have, that any clarification of the existing interpretation be useful.

The debacle at Michigan is just astounding. There is no question that that student could have gotten reimbursed for that, and it is stunning to me that this happened. I know that it happened because that particular program was not run by a clinical professor, but by someone else who was uninformed. I think the consultants now know to clarify these issues, we've helped everyone, but that does not stand as an example of something that's wrong with the present rule. It stands as an example of a school failing a student to the cost of \$6,000.

I also believe, as has been mentioned, that third-party compensation should be allowed. But the key, as has been said before, is the employer-employee relationship and the trouble that creates.

I would ask that if in fact you are

```
inclined to strike the rule, you should follow the
 1
   rule that students in law clinics are subject to, as
 3
   I said, through the student practice rule, and that
 4
   is that the employer is not allowed to bill the
 5
   client for the students' time. Right? Don't call
 6
   them a law clerk and bill it at 50 or a hundred
 7
   dollars an hour; you will not be able to pass on
 8
   that cost up to the client.
 9
        And finally, I would ask this, which is a
10
   little confusing to me, to the student section: Why
11
   are you not here today talking about the 20-hour
12
   rule? Right? Why are you not talking today about
13
   abolishing the limit that a student can only work 20
14
   hours?
15
             MS. STRETCH: Because we did that.
16
             CHAIR LEWIS:
                           We did.
17
             MS. STRETCH: We did already at --
18
             MR. KUEHN:
                         It's totally gone now?
19
             MS. STRETCH:
                            Yes.
20
             MR. KUEHN:
                          Good.
                                 Thank you.
                                             I'm glad
21
   because I couldn't understand why there would be a
22
   restriction on how many hours one could work, while
23
   on the other hand, we would want to come in and get
```

So finally, I'll say this. I -- 40 years

24

25

paid.

ago this same issue was debated before the ABA. I'm glad I was -- I can just say, at least I was not in law school 40 years ago. But as I said, from my time in law school and the 25 years I've been teaching, I really don't see what's changed and I don't know why, you know, the situation today is different.

But if it is different, there's an elephant in the room that ought to be dealt with, and that's:
What are students paying for and what are students getting. Right? The real issue here is not to solve the problem by having a select few students, out of all the students in the school, find the select positions that pay and preference them over students doing public interest work, government placements, or a law clinic.

The real issue is to try to ask what is a student's money going for and is there a way to reduce tuition overall, not just preference a few.

Because it seems to me, until we get to that issue, we've not really solved the cost issue for students; we've just preferenced a few students.

So I therefore ask you, please, to retain Interpretation 305-3. And, to the extent that some people want to keep score, my score on the A Team is

```
1
   159 professors expressing interest in retaining the
   rule and only seven supporting its abolishment.
 3
   Thank you.
 4
             CHAIR LEWIS:
                            Thank you very much.
 5
             We're over the time allotted for the
 6
   hearing.
            No one else has specifically asked to
 7
   speak. Is there anyone in the audience that would
 8
   like to?
 9
             Yes. Let's try and keep our remarks to
10
   about five minutes.
11
             MR. RUSSELL: It's very short and it's not
12
   on 305.
13
             CHAIR LEWIS: Okay. All right.
14
             MR. RUSSELL: Gordon Russell, Lincoln
15
   Memorial University. I'd actually like to speak on
   505.
16
17
             CHAIR LEWIS:
                            Okay.
18
             MR. RUSSELL: And 505 as it relates to
19
   foreign law students, particularly Canadian law
20
   students.
21
             My experience, I'm a -- I went to the
22
   University of Western Ontario Law School. Later on
23
   in my career, I took a job at University of New
24
   Mexico.
            This was pre-1994 when the old standard
25
   was, as you may recall, that a law school could give
```

up to two years' credit at their discretion for a foreign law degree. At that point, in 1994, the change was made going to the 30 hours for a foreign law degree, and it appears in the language that you accept now to continue that change.

Reflecting back, when I was at New Mexico and in 1994, New Mexico actually sent a letter on the change opposing the change at that time, and the reasoning aspect was that they'd put together a program, had had almost every year a Canadian or more than one Canadian who had come there, they'd designed a 30-hour, 31-hour program that met the needs that they felt to allow those students to be able to reach the experiences that they needed to take their Canadian law degree and then receive a U.S. law degree.

I would ask this Committee to think about why they're saying you need two years with a foreign law degree, particular for common law countries, and that there might be other approaches that you might look at.

For example, in Canada, a lot of U.S. students have need to or decide to come to Canada to take a Canadian law degree when they have an American degree. What the -- Ottawa has set up is

basically a council, structured through the committee -- the ABA could do the same thing -- where they look at a transcript of a U.S. student. They look at that transcript and then decide what Canadian courses that that person would need. That might be courses like Canadian constitutional law, Canadian evidence.

They then say to that student: We looked at your transcript. You need the following X number of courses. You would then go to a law school in Canada and work out an arrangement to take those classes so that you meet the requirements.

about it from a sort of common law aspect, coming from a traditional four-year undergraduate and a law degree, which is becoming more what we're seeing in Australia, you're seeing in other countries. There must be a way to look at those experiences that are very similar to an American and say what are our needs rather than saying two years, one year credit. What are the courses that they need to fill out and flesh out what they've already taken in the common law experience.

And I would just suggest that you might want to look at other alternatives when dealing with

```
those common law experiences.
 1
 2
              CHAIR LEWIS: Okay. Thank you very much.
 3
              Does anyone else wish to speak?
 4
             All right. The hearing is over. Thank
   you all for being here. We will take a 15-minute
   break for the Committee, Standards Review Committee,
 7
   and we'll commence our regular agenda.
 8
              (Whereupon, the Public Hearing was
 9
   concluded at 10:14 a.m.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I, Jesse J. Brown, Notary Public, certify that the foregoing was reported by stenographic and/or mechanical means, that same was reduced to written form; that the transcript prepared by me or under my direction, is a true and accurate record of same to the best of my knowledge ability; that there is no relation nor employment by any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financial or otherwise interest in the action filed or outcome.

IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 29th day of April, 2014.

/S/

20 Jesse J. Brown



	Public Meeting April 25, 201	4 NDT Assgn # 9278-82	Page 68
\$	15:15 18:19	ability	22:10 24:16
\$6,000 60:19	22:22 46:22	6:16 9:17	Act 9:21
	47:2	11:14	27:22 40:18
1	53:23 62:24	able 6:8 9:10	40:19 56:25
10 13:20	30-hour 64:12	10:18	59:1 59:15
10:14 66:9	31-hour 64:12	20:2	action 32:4
159 63:1	33 40:24	29:22 35:22	43:1
15-minute	34,000 46:18	37:8 61:7	active 9:14
66:5	11,111	64:14	activities
18 30:2	4	abolishing	21:13 21:13
	4 56:12 56:14	11:25 15:4 61:13	activity 33:9
1981 40:22	40 8:13 26:13		actually 9:23
1994 64:2	61:25 62:3	abolishment 63:2	11:24 17:12
64:7	40-student		21:3
2	37:12	absence 29:20	25:12 25:17
20 37:12		Absolutely	27:19 27:20
52:13 61:13	5	42:10	32:24 34:13
200 49:13	50 24:21	academic	47:15 53:14 63:15 64:7
200-some 8:14	24:23 24:25	6:8 9:12	
	61:6	55:14 59:6 59:18	adapt 53:5
2010 12:14	503-3 4:21		addition 50:1
2014 4:6	505 4:22	accept 64:5	51:10
20-hour 55:10	63:16 63:18	access	additionally
61:11		57:18 58:3	12:22 50:4
25 4:6	8	accordingly	address 16:19
54:18 62:4	8 4:22	8:23 8:24	adhering 53:6
	9	account 44:7	adjunct 8:14
3	9:00 4:7	accreditation	adjuncts
30 37:12 39:12 64:3	1	8:25	25:16
	A	29:14 55:24	administratio
305 27:11	a.m 4:7 66:9	accredited	n 49:14
36:21 38:5 63:12	ABA 9:24 10:5	49:13	Admissions
305-2 9:2	13:14 27:21	accreditors	4:15
	30:20 39:11	56:8	adopted
305-3 4:20	56:17	acknowledge	16:1 53:24
5:24 6:5 9:24 10:8	59:8 62:1	20:1 35:25	adoption 4:20
13:4	65:2	across	_
	ABA's 41:24		advocate



	abile Meeting 7 (pril 20, 201	+ 11D17100g1111021002	1 490 00
42:21	61:4	47: 5	arrangement
afford 19:9	allowing	answered	14:18 65:11
50:17	22:20	12:14 26:7	arrangements
afterwards	36:8 39:8	antithetical	10:19
31:23	58:5	39:10	aspect 64:9
against 38:14	allows 31:2	anyone 63:7	65 : 14
39:24	38:25 49:2	66:3	aspects 21:15
agenda 66:7	alone 36:6	anything 38:3	assert
aggravates	already 16:22	47:9 51:9	30:19
37:19	30:13 35:24	55:16	32:2 41:8
ago 12:9 62:1	37:19 41:6	Anyway 54:11	assessing
62:3	61:17 65:22	apologize	34:6
agreed 44:18	alternatives	14:3	assignment
ahead 14:6	65:25	apparently	12:23
23:6	alumni	9:7 13:6	assist 57:17
aid 47:21	38:11 48:21	appear 13:4	assistance
47:23	am 46:15	appears 64:4	40:10
Al 7:1	46:17 46:19	applaud 27:4	associate
Alex 29:25	46:20 54:19	application	5:19 7:25
32:19	amazing 56:16	17 : 5	8:5 15:19 46:5 46:8
Alexander	AMENDMENTS	apply 10:17	54:15
22:24	4:2	26:2	associated
alleviated	American	27:13 27:16	12:21 12:22
11:5	15:16 46:17	approaches	associates
allotted 63:5	64:25 65:19	64:20	26:13 26:14
allow 12:4	AmeriCorps	appropriately	26:21 26:21
29:7 38:9	12:11 12:12	18:5	Association
38:17 48:25	12:16 12:20 13:5 13:7	APPROVAL 4:4	5:22
49:5	44:3	approved 4:16	Association's
49:19 50:19 53:5 57:9	44:25 45:11	APRIL 4:6	46:18
64:13	among 18:19	argument	assume
allowed	31:9 33:1	16:20 20:14	35:25 37:24
12:2	49:13	arguments	assuming
13:16	amount	16:8 47:4	35:24 48:12
17:1	25:17 41:1	47:12 50:2	astounding
52:13 60:21	anecdotal	arose 59:15	60:9



attending	bathwater	billable 31:2	Canadian
18:10			63:19 64:10
	14:15 15:6	31:4	
attention	Beckman's	32:11 33:15	64:11 64:15
8:24 9:9	49:20	33:16 33:18	64:24
attitude	become 15:2	33:20	65:5 65:6
17:23	29:21	billed	65:7
attractive	56:9 57:10	31:24	candidly 43:7
		32:8 34:16	capable 37:11
22:13	becoming	billing 32:14	_
attributable	65:16	55:17	capacity
43:24	beginning 8:4		51:12
audience 63:7	53:3	Bob 7:23	career
	behalf 5:23	8:6 54:12	33:12 63:23
Australia	15:16 46:20	54:15	carefully
65:17		BOISE 28:14	34:21 35:15
availability	belief 36:23	35:17 36:19	
24:4 42:4	believe 59:19	box 19:24	Carol 15:10
available	60:6 60:20		15:11 22:23
20:21 41:15	bench 24:24	break 66:6	23:9
49:15		brief 33:11	38:24 38:24
	benefit	briefly 16:19	40:17 43:10
averse 11:8	17:9 18:1	55:19 55:20	44:19
award 12:17	18:1 18:2	59:3	CARPENTER
aware 58:8	24:2		54:13
	25:10	bring 11:1	case 24:14
away 15:6	28:7 28:8	47:25	27:11 36:20
19:17 28:13	31:6	56:4 56:21	57:13
36:25 37:5	32:17 33:10	broke 55:10	
	34:24	brought 19:14	Cask 18:19
В	benefits	57:1	central 31:16
baby 14:15	17:10 20:13		37:20 41:7
15:5	30:15 30:18	build 35:21	certain
balance 38:12	30:20 39:23	business	13:7
Bar 4:15	best 17:11	35:21	47:24 58:6
	27:3	buy 44:20	
46:17		55:12	certainly 8:8
Barry 56:1	better 12:1	00.12	24:9
based 12:15	29:18 56:10		cetera 43:25
	bill 32:22	Canada	chair 4:9
basically	33:1		4:10 7:19
6:13 65:1	35:23 37:18	64:22 64:23	7:23 8:3
basis 37:8	61:4 61:6	65:11	8:6 13:17
			0.0 10.17



	Public Meeting April 25, 2014	NDT Assgn # 9278-82	Page 71
13:19 13:23	6:21 16:9	18:25	61:6
14:2 14:6	20:15 62:5	circuit 28:2	CLEs 18:11
15:9	changes 5:4	circumstance	
22:23	5:5 6:19		client
23:2 23:5		18:20	31:24 32:22
23:8 29:8	Chapter 4:22	circumstances	32:24 33:20
29:23 32:18	56:12 56:13	36:9	55:18
32:21 37:22	1	circumvent	61:5 61:8
37:24 38:13	characterize	28:2	clients 34:15
38:20 38:22	13:1	cited 52:3	35:13 35:23
39:16 39:19	characterized		clinic 39:6
39:22 45:21	13:7 27:9	cities	58:11 58:14
46:1 46:6	charge 6:9	10:21 48:6	62:16
46:10 46:17	1 -	clamoring	clinical 5:22
52:11	charging	40:1	6:1 49:21
54:1 54:3	55:17	clarification	51:8
54:7	check 19:24	12:2 14:9	51:20 54:16
61:16	checked 40:2	43:22 44:17	56:20 57:14
63:4	1	60:6	60:13
63:13 63:17 66:2	checklists		
	24:18	clarify 6:5	clinician
challenge	Chicago	12:1 20:6	37:5 37:7
53:9	48:1 48:6	43:11 43:15	clinics 6:2
53:10 53:17	52:14	44:24	41:14 41:14
53:20	choice 40:14	57:2 60:15	54 : 18
challenges	abaires 01.01	clarity 19:14	58:9 61:2
8:21	choices 21:21	47:7	closing 41:8
chambers	Chomsky 15:10	47:20 47:22	CM 27:8
17:22	15:12 23:10	49:9	
	23:17 24:15	classes 65:12	co-author
chance 32:3	26:23 27:15	CLEA 5:22	30:8
55:1 55:16	28:20 29:13	5:23 5:24	co-editor
chances 21:22	29:24 40:17		30:8
change	43:10	clear 12:14	coincide
22:17 29:18	choose	13:14 20:20	57 : 16
30:17	21:24	39:11	
41:5	22:3 50:8	clearly	colleagues
42:19	choosing	4:13	40:3
43:4 49:1	9:2 9:3	30:19 44:21	collect
64:3 64:5	chose 43:3	45:24	9:10 9:13
64:8 64:8		58:9 65:13	College 46:16
changed	chuckled	clerk 51:1	-



	Public Meeting April 25, 201	4 ND1 A33911# 3270-02	raye 12
comes 34:1	65:22 66:1	43:19	64:5
43:18	community	conclude 53:7	continues
comfort 59:16	7:12 33:1	concluded	28:9 41:9
comfortable	40:19 40:23	66:9	continuing
28:22	41:1	conference	18:22
coming 65:14	companies	7:17	contract 11:4
commence 66:7	16:21	conferences	25 : 6
comment	compared	30:6	contracts
4:16 4:18	33:25	conflict	24:18
6:13	compensate	30:24 34:17	contrary 40:2
18:18	20:8 25:18	confusing	contribute
36:7	compensated	61:10	17:21 33:6
44:25 47:11	58:17	confusion	contributes
49:21	compensation	20:5	35:4
50:1 50:2 50:10 50:25	11:11 11:21	consensus	control 28:16
51:18	12:17 14:20 27:14 58:10	31:8	40:6
comments	60:21	32:25 40:18	41:10 45:16
5:7 7:6	compliance	47:10 47:14	controls
11:19 22:15	20:10	considered	28:15
42:1	comply	17:3 17:4	conversation
42:21 47:17	10:19	consistent	25:5 26:4
50:14	20:4 38:4	9:23	conversations
commit 33:15	component	constitutiona	32:6 49:8
commitment	53:11	1 65:6	49:10 49:15
41:24	concern	consultants	CORDY 7:25
committed	9:22	60:14	8:5
7:11 32:12	10:14 13:13	contact 40:5	Cordy's 7:17
committee	16:20	contemplated	corners 40:25
8:25	31:3 31:4 31:17 40:20	20:11	corporate
42:12 53:23 56:20 64:17	42:3 56:23	contention	16:10
65:2 66:6		36:5 37:18	21:9
66:6	concerned 9:20	contested	25:10 57:21
Committee's	10:11 43:21	55:23 56:14	59:3
46:21	concerns	context 21:25	corporation
common 31:8	10:14	35:1 45:10	10:23 14:18
64:19 65:14	11:6 16:7	continue	correct
	30:13 40:20	18:23 22:18	38:8 43:10
			





	ublic weeting April 25, 201	4 ND1 Assyll# 9276-62	Page 73
correctly	14:24	48:16	64:2 64:4
23:15	27:2 32:9	curriculum	64:15 64:16
cost 19:16	35:22	51:7	64:19 64:24
60:18	created 41:2	cycle 33:16	64:25 65:16
61:8 62:21	creates 60:24	0,010 00.10	delete 9:2
costly 19:9	creating 34:8		9:4
19:10	43:19 58:19	daily 37:8	deleting 9:5
costs 12:22	creation	45:7	demand
30:19 39:24	11:13 30:25	day 25:2 25:2	38:11 38:11
43:23	31:3	59:2	48:21 48:22
couched 42:18	creative	dealing 65:25	demonstrate
council	14:10 20:7	deals 4:19	20:2
4:14 65:1	creativity		demonstrative
counsel 16:10	41:1	dealt 62:9	ly 41:19
	credit 6:9	dean 5:19	denied 48:4
count 31:10	9:12 16:2	15:19 28:14	dense 48:1
countries	22:20	28:17 28:21 35:17 36:19	
64:19 65:17	26:3	45:25	department
country 24:16	27:10 28:18	46:5 46:8	11:2 17:6 59:17
counts 14:9	30:3 30:4	54:16	
couple 12:9	30:24 36:17	debacle 60:8	DePaul 46:16
23:11 30:9	36:21 40:15	debate 49:17	describe
course	41:4 53:16 55:14		12:16
36:16	59:6	debated 62:1	description
39:5	59:18	decades 7:14	12:19
39:10 39:14	64:1 65:20	decide 22:7	design 41:20
43:1 51:8	credits 52:10	64:23 65:4	designed
51:10	55:12	decides 38:4	5:8 10:3
52:1 54:9	critiquing	dedicated	17:8 30:3
courses 39:12	34:5	52:13	64:12
65:5 65:6	cultivate	deeper 15:23	desirable
65:10 65:21	17:24	-	41:16
court 32:4	culture 33:13	define 10:6	detail 7:4
55:2		definition	30:16
courts	current	36:19	determined
58:15 58:16	12:2 12:3 19:12 20:4	definitions	17:4
cover 35:10		4:25	developed
create	currently	degree 28:3	7:13
1			İ



	Public Meeting April 25, 201	4 ND1 Assgn # 9278-82	Page 74
develops 35:2	17:15 31:21	earning 16:17	57 : 23
dichotomy	discussions	21:5 22:4	educators
10:6	31:20	40:12	7:13
different	disrupt 10:9	economic	effectively
14:17	disrupts	31:14	21:1
19:2 19:4	11:14	editing 31:21	effects 30:14
21:6 21:8	distant 12:23	33:11 33:11	30:16
42:14 42:20 43:24	distinction	Edmonds	effort 37:6
44:8 45:1	44:13 45:2	42:8	56:20
62:7 62:8	distinctive	42:11 42:11 42:25 43:20	eight 54:20
difficult	59:11	44:2	either 20:9
16:13 20:3	divided 37:3	45:18 50:21	24:18 40:15
difficulties	Division	50:24 50:24	43:1 56:15
29:1	46:18	51:3 52:3	<pre>element 15:7</pre>
dilute 38:25	47:6	52:17 52:20 53:1	elephant 62:8
direct 33:10	52:12 53:21	educating	eliciting
directly 12:7	Division's	32:13	30:6
18:12	50:1	education	eliminate 6:4
20:8 32:6	dollars 61:7	4:15 5:20	53:23
33:6 44:4	done 12:17	5:22 6:1	eliminated
54:18	27:19 33:23	10:7	53:10
director	35:3	16:18 29:15	elimination
11:23 28:21 49:23	42:17 52:21 54:23 54:23	54:16 57:14 58:24	4:19 4:22
			5:24
directors 7:10 8:17	draft 31:21	educational 6:16 8:22	15:14 38:2
9:16	drafting	9:9 9:14	46:22
10:11 10:12	24:24	10:3	47:3
11:3 12:5	driving 58:20	10:16 11:14	47:15 48:18
14:8 18:4	dual 57:19	14:12 14:25	49:18 49:24
disagree	57:19	15:7 19:5 20:13 21:12	50:19 53:4 53:19
46:25	E	20:13 21:12	
discretion	eager 24:4	25:20 27:24	elite 41:17
64:1	earlier 8:2	30:23 38:18	else 49:17
discussing		41:10 45:17	51:9 56:11 59:17
33:12	earn 20:16 40:15	53:11 53:15	60:13
discussion	40.13	educationally	63:6 66:3





	Public Meeting April 25, 20	14 ND I Assgn # 9278-82	Page 7
email 12:8	32:15 32:16	35:16 36:11	45:6 48:8
12:10	57:1	especially	48:16 49:6
employee 6:19	encourage	16:14	existing
17:3 17:4	49:25	essentially	36:14 36:15
23:21	encouraged	37:15	60:7
employees	32:1 41:19	establish	exists 41:7
22:13	encourages	13:2	42:14
employer 6:18	41:18 41:23	13:11 14:20	expand 16:1
12:8	encouraging	et 43:24	22:5
13:10 14:18	41:25		expands 15:25
17:1	engage 19:9	evaluation 27:12	22:11
17:10 18:15	32:6 33:9		expansion
20:8	34:21	everybody	40:24
21:18 21:19	39:9 40:8	28:24	
23:20 23:23 25:7 28:8	engaged 20:17	everybody's	expectation 27:2 33:8
36:10 43:18	31:25	13:20	
44:14		everyone	expected 24:8
45:1 45:9	engages 31:20	4:9 4:12	expense 19:15
61:4	<pre>engaging 33:5</pre>	13:24 49:17	44:9 44:22
employer-	35:1	60:15	expenses
employee	enjoy 17:19	everything	11:16 11:17
6:14	enormous 41:1	33:19	12:18 12:21
11:13 13:11	enrolls 58:14	evidence 44:7	12:24
14:21 23:19	ensure 5:8	47:5	13:3 14:10 19:13
45:6 60:23	9:9 17:6	53:18 65:7	19:25 20:2
employers	22:18 22:19	Exactly 44:1	
20:22 23:18	28:24 29:15	example 10:20	expensive 16:14 16:18
28:1	38:18	12:19 60:16	
36:25	enterprises	60:18 64:22	experience
40:4 40:7	20:24	exception	6:17 9:15 10:4
41:16	entities	58:12	10:4
employment	16:11	exceptionalis	15:1 15:7
6:6 6:7		m 55:5	16:4 17:7
6:10 9:12 9:17 10:4	enumerated 17:5	exclusively	17:8
10:7		31:13 35:15	17:18
11:12 11:12	environment		19:2 19:4
21:25 23:13	31:5 36:18 53:16	excuse 35:7	21:9
24:10 29:4		exhibit 37:23	21:11 21:23
	environments	exist 40:1	26:12 26:19



	Public Meeting April 25, 201	+ 11D1 /\33911 # 0210-02	Page 70
38:5	expressing	36:8 39:1	9:25 10:2
38:10	63:1	40:19 48:25	10:17
39:1	extent	49:14	17 : 5
41:11	34:14 62:24	51:9	17:10 27:19
44:3		51:21 57:20	faculty
44:19 45:17	extern 24:7	58:18	18:4
47:25 51:20	24:7	externships	22:16 27:12
63:21 65:23	33:18 33:19	6:2 10:18	27:18 28:22
experienced	36:2	11:9	
7:2 7:3	externs	15:22	failing 60:18
7:11	8:14	16:3	Fair 9:21
	18:16	16:13	27:22 40:18
experiences	26:9	18:5 19:6	40:19 56:24
21:6 21:7	26:19 35:22	19:10 20:17	58:25 59:14
22:2 22:5 26:20 26:22	59:13	21:5	59:24
36:12	externship	22:19 23:14	family 52:7
37:9	6:11 6:18	24:14 26:25	52:14
38:19 42:15	7:2 7:3	34:11 34:20	faraway 19:15
57:10 57:17	7:10 7:12	38:1	_
57:24 64:14	7:13 7:22	39:11 46:24	farther 58:4
65:18 66:1	8:10 8:17	48:2 48:5	favorable
	8:23 9:16	48:14 48:15	29:4
experiential	10:2	50:18 54:18	fear 29:6
5:20 16:2	10:11 10:12	54:19 54:24	
experiment	11:1 11:3	55:2 57:9	federal
15:2	11:23	57 : 22	13:8
experts 56:21	12:5 14:8	58:7	17:15 58:16
explain 10:16	15:17 15:20	58:12 59:10	feedback
10:17	17:24	extra 19:15	33:12
	18:3 18:7	19:16	feel 8:23 9:6
explanation	19:11 22:16		fellowships
5:4 9:4	24:16 24:19	F	43:16 45:12
explicit	24:21 27:21	faced 6:3	
24:18 25:3	28:10 28:15	fact 9:25	felt 28:22
expose 34:12	28:17 28:18	11:22 17:13	57:23 59:16
_	28:21	17:14 18:18	64:13
exposing	29:2 30:2	28:11 28:14	FEMALE 7:16
34:25 59:22	30:6 30:9 31:9	28:24 31:12	7:20
express 42:2	31:9	48:15 54:24	fewer 21:22
expressed	32:1	55:7 60:25	59:25
16:8	32:23 34:24	factors	field 6:20
	35:11	Idctors	11 -14 0:20



	Public Meeting April 25, 201	4 ND1 Assgn # 9278-82	Page //
8:20 9:8	32:7	focused	Freling 12:10
11:15 12:21	32:16 32:22	17:7 22:3	FRIDAY 4:6
12:23 12:25	33:7	focuses 34:23	fulfill 49:4
15:20 15:22	33:10 33:14	forcing 50:8	
17:24	33:15 33:24	_	full 51:4
18:7 19:5	34:3	for-credit	full-time
19:21 19:22 20:17	34:24 35:4	31:2 33:3	55:8 55:9
25:5 31:9	35:12 35:18	38:10	funding 12:12
31:16 31:17	35:20 35:24	foreign 63:19	12:13 12:16
41:11 41:19	37:10 37:15	64:2 64:3	13:5 13:8
41:20	41:12 41:13	64:18	funds 13:2
42:5	51:11 51:15	form 14:19	13:2
49:23 53:19	55:14 55:15	19:20 25:4	10.2
figure	firms 16:10	formalistic	G
49:12 49:16	16:21 32:12	56:9	gain 15:23
49:18 55:24	33:1	for-profit	general 27:17
filed 18:18	35:13 57:25	16:11 16:21	27:25
18:19 22:15	first 4:19	19:21 19:23	generally
fill 19:20	5:14 5:16	20:24	16:17 30:21
48:5	16:9	32:8	34:25
48:10 65:21	16:20	39:25 41:4	
Final 20:14	21:8	forth 24:12	generations 52:22
	23:12 30:12	27:13	
finally 5:1	30:22 48:22 57:7	47:4	Geneva
11:7		47:12 50:2	11:22 16:15
40:21 41:23 61:9 61:25	fit 28:6 53:5	forwarding	19:12 47:19
	five 4:24	12:10	Georgia 22:25
financial	5:12 5:12	four-year	30:1
14:11	5:15 41:3	65:15	gets 35:3
finding 27:9	56:13 63:10	frankly 40:13	38:8
finds 26:1	flesh 65:22	54:22 55:15	getting 12:21
26:2	FLSA 9:22	55:22 56:11	22:12 26:20
fine 28:23	9:25 10:5	56:15	26:22 27:10
finish	10:12 10:14	58:5 58:21	47:13
13:19 14:5	10:17 10:19	freaking 56:9	56:3 62:11
firm 14:19	11:6	free 40:5	girlfriends
21:9 24:3	16:25	freezing	52 : 7
25:10 26:17	18:3 27:20	54:10	given 21:16
31:7 32:2	focus 19:5	01.10	gives 28:15



- I	Public Meeting
giving	54:7
25:21 25:22	Hamli
33:11 36:16	5:16
47:4	10:2
55:15 55:16	hand
glad 61:20	10:8
62:2	34:1
glean 47:9	hang
goal 57:15	HANK
57:16 58:1	Hanks
<pre>goals 22:3</pre>	23:3
30:24 39:10	23:8
gone 52:22	23:1
61:18	26:5
Gordon 63:14	34:9
gotten 60:10	35:9
_	happe
government 13:8 62:15	23:1
	29:6
<pre>grant 6:8 9:12</pre>	happe
	40:2
grants 12:6 12:20 45:12	
	happe
<pre>great 13:22 46:13 48:23</pre>	happy
	harde
greater 59:23	29:2
grocery 50:11 50:25 51:14	harm
ground 56:5	haven
_	haven
group 5:9	havin
guess 43:4	17:1
44:2 44:12 44:16	18:2
51:13 51:17	19:6
	23:2
guys 46:14	52:1
Н	hear
half 18:9	45:2

Meeting April 25, 201
54:7
Hamline
5:16 5:20
10:21
nand 10:7
10:8
34:10 61:23
nang 55:16
HANK 33:17
Hanks 23:1
23:3 23:7
23:8 23:9
23:11 23:25
26:5 27:6
34:9 35:6
35:9
nappen
23:19
29:6 48:9
nappened
40:23 57:13
60:11 60:12
nappens 28:16
nappy 57:5
narder 29:21 37:21
narm 30:22
naven 59:19
naven't 56:17
naving
17:19
18:2 19:3
19:6
23:20
43:9
52:14 62:12
near 6:25 7:1
45:24

46:6 46:8 52:19	1
heard 5:11	1
31:10 59:1	1
hearing 4:1	1
4:11 4:11 5:7 7:10	
8:4 31:22	1
31:23 32:3	,
46:13 50:15	1
63:6 66:4	1
66:8	
HELD 4:5	1
Hello 7:16 7:25	
help 16:18	
17:17 17:20	1
22:18 22:18 25:14 25:23	
57:2	I
helped 60:15	1
helpful	1
20:5 26:6	-
27:20	-
helping 15:19 34:3 34:4	3
helps 18:3	
27:1 29:19	
here's 45:2	
he's 51:15 56:2	=
hesitate	
30:10	
Hi 5:18 7:23 23:9 23:10]
high 30:4	

hire 21:24 22:13 41:12
hiring 35:21
home 19:17
hopefully 53:2
host 17:1 20:25 20:25
hosts 17:15
hour 31:2 31:4 31:21 61:7
hours 45:15 52:13 55:13 55:13 61:14 61:22 64:3
housing 11:21 12:22
HR 59:8 59:11
hundred 61:6
hybrid 41:2
I
i.e 12:16
I'd 23:12 23:25 33:7 33:24 49:20 63:15
idea 47:14
<pre>identify 4:13</pre>
I'll 52:11 52:16 61:25
I'm 5:18 5:19 5:21 7:2 7:3 8:1



	Public Meeting April 25, 2014	NDT Assgn # 9278-82	Page 79
13:25	6:19	42:16	16:12 24:2
14:2	36:25 58:19	instances	interpretatio
15:14 15:15	incentives	29:16 42:25	n 4:20 4:21
20:18	6:21	instruction	5:24 6:4
30:1 30:8	inclined 61:1	27:12	9:1 9:24
30:8			10:8 12:4
31:13 32:18	include	interact	15:15 22:22
34:19	9:25 24:20	26:15	38:2
36:6	includes 5:25	interest	38:13 38:16
39:17 47:13	including 6:1	5:9 41:25	42:19 42:23
49:22 52:13 52:25 54:15	19:13 20:23	42:1	43:13 46:22
55:4	59:9	45:12	47:2 47:8
55:21	inconsistent	58:2	47:16
56:2 58:8	34:10	58:21 62:15	48:9
61:20		63:1	48:18
62:1 63:21	increase	interested	49:9 53:9
	36:24	44:24	53:23
imagined 55:12	increasing	interesting	60:7 62:24
	41:2	22:7 57:12	interpretatio
immediate	increasingly	interests	ns 9:5
5:21	40:5	22:6	interrupt
impact	incurred		32:19
40:17 42:3	12:19 44:9	interfere	introduce
impeded 17:12		6:15	39:13 39:14
_	independent	14:12 14:25	
importance 43:8 59:5	15:20	19:7	introducing
	indication	interferes	33:13 39:2
important	12:20	9:17	involves
4:25 15:6	individual	23:14 23:24	30:25 38:6
16:3	5:9	<pre>intern 17:2</pre>	isn't 27:10
17:18	influence	17:2 17:9	54:8
18:6 19:3 19:4	37:23	18:21 21:20	issue 22:15
19:4		21:22 22:9	55:20 55:21
28:8	informed 57:4	interning	58:25 59:15
30:20	initially	21:11	62:1
41:9	22:8	interns 16:22	62:11 62:17
57:24 59:12	innovation	17:16 20:23	62:20 62:21
	40:21	22:2	issues
impossible	41:6 41:6		20:19
	41:19 41:21	internships	30:8 55:21
incentive	inspections	10:3	
i .			i l



	Public Meeting April 25, 2014	NDT Assgn # 9278-82	Page 80
57:7 60:15	43:8 45:9	Labor 9:21	46:16 46:17
items 4:19		17 : 6	46:18 46:19
	K	27:22 40:18	46:25
I've 4:10 8:9	Kate 5:16	40:19 56:25	47 : 5
13:19	5:17 5:18	57:1 59:1	47 : 22
30:4	13:17 16:22	59:14 59:17	48:2 48:4
31:10	20:10 22:14	59:24	48:8
40:2	30:11 43:10	language 64:4	48:19 48:23
42:16 54:5	Kerbis		48:24
54:17	45:21 45:23	large 33:1	49:5
56:1 62:4	46:2 46:7	largely 31:6	49:13
30.1 02.4	46:11 46:15	last 30:5	50:1 50:5
J	50:23	40:23	50:6 50:7
	51:2	41:3	50:12
jealous 52:17	51:25	50:15 55:9	51:7
Jeff 7:23	52:4	later 7:1	51:11 51:15
7:25 23:1	52:19 52:24	22:13	51:16 51:18 51:19
27:8	53:2 54:2	23:4 23:6	52:8
Jeffrey 4:10	key 60:22	63:22	52:11 52:17
Jennifer 50:9	kinds 19:16	law 4:4	53:17 53:21
Jim 23:6 23:8	26:20 28:3	5:19 5:21	54 : 17
49:20		6:8 8:25	55:2 55:8
	KLOPPENBERG	11:2	57:24 57:25
job 18:21	45:25	14:19 15:16	58:9
26:1 26:2	knowledge	15:18 15:24	58:10 58:14
27:10 63:23	58:16	16:10 16:16	59:10
Jolly-	Kruse 5:16	21:9	61:2 61:6
Ryan's	5:18 5:19	22:16 22:19	62:3 62:4
50:10	7:22 8:7	24:2 24:4	62:16 63:19
judge 32:5	13:18 13:22	24:16 25:23	63:19 63:22
	13:25	27:25	63:25
judges 17:15	14:4 14:7	28:1	64:2 64:4
judicial	16:22 20:10	28:14 28:15	64:15 64:16
15:17 24:21	22:14 23:12	30:2	64:19 64:19
jumping 40:16	23:15 43:10	30:21 30:23	64:24
junior 27:5	Kuehn 54:3	34:13 35:21	65:6
-	54:5 54:9	37:5 37:5	65:10 65:14
justice	54:14 54:15	37:6	65:15 65:23
7:17 7:25	61:18 61:20	37:20 37:21	66:1
8:5 58:3		38:3 38:4	lawyer
justify		39:5 40:5	25:11 25:12
		41:10 45:16	26:12 31:18





	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· ···-·	
32:5 33:8	legal 4:15	66:2	51:5
33:16 59:9	5:22 6:1	LexTrain 12:8	51:10 51:22
lawyering	11:2	life 55:7	location 44:9
15:25	16:18 21:19 24:3 24:7	light 29:4	lodging 19:17
lawyers	24:11 34:15	_	long 17:2
18:9	40:23 47:21	likely 20:23 20:25	54 : 5
18:11 26:11	47:23 57:14	20:23 20:23	long-standing
27:5 32:13 34:14	57:18	32:21 32:23	41:24
	length 16:24	35:21	long-time
lead 8:17 30:5 47:12	less 41:17	limit 61:13	15:17
	57 : 4	limitations	lose 48:17
leading 30:9	let's 37:22	55:11	loss 36:3
leads 25:16	37:24 63:9	limited 30:18	
learn 6:6 6:7	letter	48:9	lost 56:10
17:20 21:23	11:24 64:7	Lincoln 63:14	lot 26:14
23:18 53:13	levels 41:11		29:7
56:11	Lewis 4:9	lines 34:10 42:20	32:13 33:5 50:7
learned 56:12	4:10 7:19		50:16 50:16
learning	7:23 7:24	list 7:9 8:10	52:8
6:9 6:22	8:3 8:6	8:18 9:15 9:19 11:7	52:14 52:15
6:23	13:17 13:19	30:11	52:16 53:13
21:13 23:14 23:19 23:22	13:23	listen 7:5	56:23 64:22
24:2 31:3	14:2 14:6	7:7 7:7 7:8	Louis 54:17
31:4 32:1	15:9 22:23	9:18	low 30:3
33:23	23:2 23:5	listening	lump 45:13
34:1	23:8 29:8	30:7	lunch 26:11
34:23	29:23 32:18	46:14 56:19	Tunen 20.11
35:2 35:16 36:11	32:21 37:22	listers 53:8	
36:11 36:13	37:24 38:13	listserv 12:9	maintain 19:3
36:17	38:20 38:22 39:16 39:19	little	19:5 28:9
37:9	39:10 39:19	11:18 13:14	29:22
39:11 57:16	46:1 46:6	55:4 61:10	maintenance
57:17	46:10	lives 55:7	8:22
least 26:18	54:1 54:3		major 37:6
62:2	54:7	living	majority 6:11
<pre>leaving 30:25</pre>	61:16	11:15 11:16 14:9	36:8
31:1 42:23	63:4 63:13 63:17		mandated 43:1
	03:13 03:17	load 51:4	manuateu 45:1



	Public Meeting April 25, 201	4 ND1 Assgn # 9278-82	Page 82
Mathew	63:15	33:24 40:12	Moreover 33:7
45:21 45:22	memos 24:24	minimum 29:14	morning 4:9
46:15 54:1	24:24	38:23 38:24	45:24
maximum 52:12	menace 31:1	Minnesota	46:4 46:12
may 17:12	mention 59:3	10:21 15:11	motivation
20:7		15:18	25:15
21:23	mentioned 14:3	minority	move 32:10
22:6 26:6	16:22 19:11	10:23 11:2	36:25
29:21 30:10	20:11 40:17	minutes 13:21	moved 43:2
32:11 38:8	56:1 59:5	63:10	57:21
39:15	60:20	misconception	moving 42:22
42:8 45:3	mentions	48:14	
51:7 51:7	16:15	mishearing	mutually 10:9
63:25	mentor	34:19	N
maybe 12:1	25:13 31:15		national 7:12
18:10 42:20	mentored	missing 57:24	30:5 30:9
meal 44:9	26:16	mistress	
		52:18	nature 8:20
meals 19:17	mentoring 34:5	misunderstand	necessarily
mean 13:5		ing 16:24	49:1
24:20 25:15	met 64:12	Mitchell	necessary
27:4 28:16 33:18	Mexico	10:22	26:19 35:15
36:5	63:24	model 15:2	38:14 38:17
43:23 44:20	64:6 64:7	35:21	49:3
48:24	Michigan	moment 7:20	necessitate
meaningful	11:19 11:23	monetary	48:19
5:10	16:16 49:16	20:19	negative
means 16:10	60:8		30:14 30:16
	Michigan's	money 11:5 16:17 20:16	newly 16:1
meant 17:6	47:19	21:6	nice 54:11
28:24	middle	21:10	nobody 57:5
meet 13:4	55:23 56:5	22:4	_
65:12	midst 8:4	43:17	non-
member 42:11	29:2	44:5	billable 26:16
members	mile 54:8	44:13 50:12	
5:25 46:19	mind 19:13	58:24 62:18	none 31:23
memo 33:11	42:19 43:5	months 12:9	31:24 33:14 33:14
Memorial	minimal 17:11	moot 55:2	non-profit
			Prorre



	Public Meeting April 25, 201	4 NDT Assgn # 9278-82	Page 83
13:9	41:14	60:1	outside
21:10	offered 10:22	opportunity	34:7 51:7
22:6	offers 11:20	5:10 5:14	51:21
25:11 32:5	office	15:13	outweigh
non-profits	21:10	18:8	30:15 39:24
20:24	24:5	20:16 34:21	outweighed
non-service-	25:10 59:9	59:23	30:18
providing	offices 16:10	oppose 22:17	overall 54:20
26:10		opposed	62:19
normal 51:22	Oh 46:7	12:5 42:23	over-
note 49:20	Okay 7:20 8:5	opposing 64:8	inclusive
noted 22:14	8:6 13:25 14:4 14:7	opposition	47:2 49:10
59:9	26:5	5:23	oversee 54:19
nothing 36:15	29:23 38:20	order 9:9	overwhelming
55:25 56:11	38:22 45:20	35:22	6:11
56:15	46:2	39:9	22:15 36:7
notice 4:16	46:10 63:13	50:12 50:13	
4:18 6:13	63:17 66:2	organization	P
notion 27:17	old 63:24	5:25	PAGEL 46:5
nuanced 23:24	one-size-	organizations	46:8
25.24	fits-all	13:10 47:21	paid 6:6
0	47:1	47:24 56:17	6:7 6:10
object	Ontario 63:22	59:22	9:11 9:16 10:7
35:17 36:13	open 48:10	organizer	11:12 11:12
36:16	operations	30:5	19:7 21:8
objectives	17:12	others 5:13	26:21 30:24
6:23	opponents	49:22 60:6	30:25 32:10
obligation	47:3	otherwise	36:14 38:10
22:21 23:21	opportunities	19:18	39:4 39:5
35:18 36:1	8:21 18:7	Ottawa 64:25	39:6 39:7 39:9 42:3
obviously	20:21 21:17	ought 56:18	44:4 44:7
51:6 60:4	22:11 22:11	62:9	44:14
occasion	26:15 30:23	out-of-pocket	45:8
17:11	32:2	12:24	47:22 48:13
offer 10:24	33:13 38:11	13:3	48:20 51:11
10:25 16:12	41:4 48:7 48:8 49:5	43:23 44:22	53:15 57:11
18:21 26:24	49:14 58:21	<pre>outset 6:5</pre>	58:10 58:22 59:13 61:24
26:25 40:11			39.13 01.24



	Public Meeting April 25, 2014	4 NDT ASSYT# 9270-02	Fage 64
parameters	40:15	24:21 24:24	10:13 11:15
34:7	41:5	24:25	12:22 12:23
partake 48:3	41:14 41:16	performance	12:25
	48:25	45:14	18:7
participants	50:6 50:7		18:14 18:23
31:1	50:12 50:13	perhaps 57:23	18:25 19:21
participation	50:18 59:15	period 4:18	19:22 19:23
48:4	62:14	permissible	29:1
particular	paying 19:1	43:12	31:16 31:17
8:24 57:6	21:19 21:19	permit 32:13	32:4 37:4
60:12 64:19	26:23 32:10	_	37:6 37:7
	40:4 45:5	permits 19:12	37:12
particularly 16:14	59:20 59:23	36:14	40:2
18:6	62:10	38:4	40:25 41:20
19:11 19:22	payment	40:12 40:21	41:20 49:23
33:25 63:19	39:2	permitting	59:4
	39:13 41:15	36:24 37:15	placements
particulars	43:16	Perry 18:18	8:23 9:8
27:16	45:1 45:9	_	15:20 15:22
parties 45:13	45:13	person 13:6	17:14
partner 32:5	58:5 58:6	21:24 65:5	19:6
-	58:6	personal	20:17 21:17
part-time	payments 13:1	25:12	25 : 8
51:5		personally	26:24 32:10
51:19 52:12	pedagogy 7:13	52:15	39:25
party 44:15	people 5:12	persuade	42:2 42:3
45:5	7:7 7:11	45:18	42:4 45:8
pass 61:7	8:10		57:21 62:16
past 5:21	10:13 10:16	persuasive	places 41:16
-	11:18 24:22	45:4	plane 44:20
pay 10:1	30:7	<pre>perverse 57:8</pre>	_
16:18 18:15	32:15	58:19	playing 41:11
20:23	36:4 40:3	perversely	<pre>please 4:13</pre>
21:1 21:2	47:7	59:21	14:6
22:20 25:16	47:16		39:19 50:23
32:24 35:19	49:9	phone 7:21	62:23
36:9	53:18	phonetic	point 9:7
36:24 37:15	56:4 59:8	18:19	14:14
37:16 37:16	59:11 62:25	piece 25:20	19:8 21:8
37:19	per 11:11	_	29:7 33:4
38:1 38:6	percent 8:14	placement	33:7 50:9
40:1		8:20	64:2
	<u>l</u>		



	Public Meeting April 25, 2014	ND1 ASS911# 9210-02	Fage 65
points	26:12	<pre>primary 32:16</pre>	program 10:17
16:19 30:12	pre-1994	probably 18:9	10:23 10:24
39:21	63:24	21:18 46:23	11:1
polarized	precise 25:1	problem 11:11	11:22 15:18
57:4	1 -	11:11 28:17	16:15
pool 13:2	precluded	37:19	33:3
39:25	21:5	45:8 62:12	37:12 44:21
	preference	Procedure 4:3	47:19 60:12 64:10 64:12
population 48:1	62:14 62:19	4:17 5:2	
	preferenced		programs 6:18
portion 18:17	62:22	process 5:8	7:22 8:10
portions 4:24	premise 23:16	14:16 14:23	8:15 8:16
position 5:10	35:14	35:2	8:23
11:10 28:12	premises	55:20 55:21 57:4 58:2	13:15 15:20 22:17 28:11
57:11 60:5	23:11		30:2 30:4
positions		produce 20:12	31:9
58:22 62:14	prepared 53:7	33:2	34:25 35:11
	prerogative	producing	40:25
possibility	24:11	21:14 23:23	41:2
19:3	present 36:18	24:23	41:22 48:25
possible	37:10 60:17	<pre>product 17:8</pre>	prohibited
17:13	presents 8:20	production	58:15 59:20
possibly	1 -	33:6	promote 41:6
59:25	preserves 41:9 41:24	profession	_
post 16:21	1	25:22	proponents
potential	president		47:5
10:13	5:21	professional	proposals
	pressure	49:21	30:6
potentially 33:20 59:23	38:25	professionals	propose 11:24
	pressures	36:8	proposed 4:16
practice	27:25 28:25	professor	
15:24	29:3 29:5	5:19 7:2	protect 38:14
30:4 31:5 32:15 34:12	32:14	7:3 30:1	proud 49:22
34:22	prevented	39:9	provide
35:1 38:8	29:11	49:20	6:17 12:1
39:7	prevents	50:9 52:2 54:13 60:13	14:19 34:15
40:25 53:14	16:17 36:15		36:10
58:8 61:3	primarily	professors	37:8 38:1
practicing	15:15 23:22	6:12 63:1	38:9
F	10.10 20.22	<pre>profit 41:4</pre>	<pre>provided 13:8</pre>



	Public Meeting April 25, 201	4 NDT Assgn # 9278-82	Page 86
provider 24:3	16:4	65:20	45:3
24:8 24:11	30:22	RE 4:1	recommendatio
provides	34:1	reach 64:14	n 46:21
59:19	38:18		53:22
providing	39:1	reaction	records 20:1
35:12 35:13	41:10 45:17	23:17	
36:4	quantum 33:22	ready 22:12	reduce 36:9
	33:25	real 62:11	45:16 62:19
provisions	question	62 : 17	refer 42:17
4:23	6:3 6:7	realities	references
public 4:1	12:15	32:9	42:13
4:11 4:24	13:6 23:6		Reflecting
5:7 41:25	26:6 42:8	really 14:8	64:6
41:25	42:17 50:21	28:8	
42:4	60:9	32:21 34:14 55:20	refrain 43:2
45:11 58:2	questions	62:5 62:21	regardless
58:21 62:15	23:3 23:5		35:3
66:8	53:25	reason 22:17	regular 66:7
	quite 21:4	reasonable	regulations
published 5:6	35:1 43:7	12:18 12:24	10:5
purpose	54:22 55:15	13:3 14:9	
24:1 32:7	55:22 56:10	19:13 43:23	regulators 8:16
purposes 41:9	56:14 56:16	reasoning	
57:19 57:19	57:12	64:9	regulatory
pursuing	58:5 58:20	reasons	10:9
34:10	quo 49:2	42:6 48:16	reimbursable
push 32:15	quote 17:11	recall 63:25	44:22
1 -	quoted 23:15	receive	reimburse
<pre>puts 45:15 50:2</pre>	quoted 23.13	10:1	13:2
	R	12:12 19:25	reimbursed
putting	raise 10:14	53:16 64:15	60:10
47:4 52:9	59:24		reimbursement
52:10	raised	received 5:6 18:21	11:16 12:18
		5:6 16:21	13:4
qualification	30:14 59:2		19:12 19:25
s 21:21	raising 13:13	receiving	reimbursement
	range 22:10	11:8 27:14	s 43:12
qualities 9:9	rather 6:23	recently	
quality	12:18	17:14	reinforce
8:22 9:14	22:4 60:1	recognize	10:6
			1





<u>'</u>	Public Meeting April 25, 201	4 11D1 733911 11 0210-02	Page of
reinforcing	9:22	22:21	20:10 20:15
10:9	10:16 16:25	return	27:1 28:5
related 12:24	18:3	39:15 52:5	28:9
18:12	27:22 27:24	review	28:23
32:7	28:4	42:12 53:23	29:6
45:13 45:14	28:19	55:2 66:6	29:13 29:20
45:15	37:1 49:4		30:15 30:20
relates 63:18	65:12	Reviews 46:21	36:14 39:24
	resist 38:25	revision 4:21	40:11 40:12
relationship	resourced	4:25 5:2	40:21 40:22 41:6 41:7
6:15 6:19 11:13 13:12	8:12	revisions	41:8
14:21 23:13	resources	4:16 9:3	41:18 41:23
23:20 23:21	27:12 48:6	47 : 8	42:7
32:11 37:20		revoke 42:7	42:18 42:18
39:2 45:6	respect 27:7	revoking	42:22
52:14 60:23	27:11 32:11	30:15 40:11	43:3
remain 16:4	34:18		43:12
	38:7 45:7	rightfully	47:1 47:2
remarks 13:20		55:18 57:22	53:4
53:7 63:9	responded	rise 53:8	55:10
Remember 37:2	6:12	53:10 53:16	58:8
remove 59:21	responsibilit	53: 19	59:12 60:17
removed 58:1	y 35:19	risk 32:9	61:1 61:2
	36:2 54:25	41:13	61:3
Removing 10:8	responsible	Robert 54:3	61:12 63:2
rent 44:8	54:19		rulemaking
repeal 30:22	rest 54:10	robust 26:3	55:23
representatio	55:3	role 9:14	rules 4:3
n 57:18	restriction	room 62:9	4:17 4:24
	61:22	route 43:4	5:1 5:2
requesting	rests 16:24	routine	22:18 27:21
47:7 47:20 47:21		37:8 45:7	run 8:10 8:11
49:9	result		10:5
	29:12	rubberstampin	10:12 22:16
require	57:5 59:25	g 9:11	24:19 55:11
8:24 9:8	retain 60:5	rubric 28:7	60:12
36:21 38:3	62:23	rule 16:4	running 39:17
requirement	retaining	16:9 18:2	Russell 63:11
16:2	63:1	19:12 20:4	63:14 63:14
requirements	retention		63:18



	April 20, 201		1 age oo
	49:18 49:23	19:8 30:17	services 24:3
S	50:12	secondly 4:20	24:8
sacrifices	51:7	section	24:11 34:15
52:15	51:16 51:18	4:14	session 31:21
safe 59:19	51:20 52:23	56:19	sotting 24.22
SALT 16:23	55:8 55:9	57:1 61:10	setting 34:22 56:14
	58:13 59:11		
satisfy 28:19	60:18	sector 32:8	seven 63:2
Scherr 7:1	62:3 62:4	seeing	several
22:24 29:25	62:13 63:22	50:10 65:16	7:14
29:25 32:20	63:25 65:10	65:17	11:19 16:15
32:25 33:22	schools 4:4	seek 32:1	severe
34:18	6:8 8:25	49:6	39:24 42:2
35:7	9:10 11:4		
35:10	13:14 14:16	seem 23:16	shadow 18:8
36:5	15:1 15:3	44:13	18:24
36:23 37:23	22:19	seems 12:3	shadowing
38:7	25:6 27:2	14:14 32:14	37:11
38:16 38:21	28:1 29:3	34:9	shape 15:19
38:23 39:17	29:9	34:17 62:20	_
39:20 39:23	29:10 29:17	seen 40:16	shift 38:12
42:10 42:24	29:21 30:21		short 20:12
43:7 44:1	38:9	select	28:2 28:3
45:2 45:20	38:14 38:17	62:12 62:14	39:17 63:11
scholarship	38:25	semester 30:4	showing 5:5
10:25	40:4 40:5	55:8	_
school 5:20	41:15 41:17	seminar 39:7	shrift 28:3
13:1	42:14 47:25		sight 56:10
15:18 16:16	49:2	send 57:9	signal 57:8
22:16	49:11 49:11	sense 23:24	_
24:6	49:13	sent 11:19	signed
24:17 25:23	53:5 57:25	59:7 64:7	49:22 49:24
28:14 28:16	scope 43:11		significantly
30:1	score 62:25	serious 32:9	6:15 6:21
35:22	62:25	seriously	20:21
37:5 37:6		36:9	similar 65:19
37:20 37:21	Scott 12:10	serve 41:9	
37:25	se 11:11		Similarly
38:3 38:4	season 48:11	serves 30:20	31:25 35:5
39:5		service 35:12	simply 15:4
40:16 41:10	second 16:12	35:13 41:25	50:17
45:16 48:24		42:5	sit 32:3 42:9



\$	Public Meeting April 25, 201		rage of
site 8:8	sorry 8:1	21:21	state 58:15
8:9 8:13	14:2	spend 18:9	58:16
28:18 28:18	32:18 56:2	34:5 34:7	stated 48:17
31:18	sort 21:16	52:6	statements
33:8	24:5	spent 18:15	50:4
37:13 37:20 59:4	26:11 32:18	19:18 21:12	State's 47:21
	57:13 65:14	spoke 59:8	
sites 10:13	sorts 26:14		status 49:1
situation	57:10 59:10	St 10:22 54:17	statute 55:11
24:10 36:15	sought 56:18	COL SUPCOMENT	step 57:25
36:24	source 43:18	staff 22:16	steps 49:3
37:3		stand 60:16	VAC Extension - Office Section Section 5
58:18 62:6	sources	standard 4:22	stipend
situations	12:7 12:7 20:9	11:25	13:9 45:5
43:16 47:24	50/10/00 WW-10/10/10/2	12:3 15:4	stipends 12:6
six 4:19	speak 4:12	29:14	43:17 44:4
5:2 16:1	4:13 5:13 5:23 7:4	38:5	store 50:11
17:5	15:13 15:14	38:23 38:24	51:1 51:14
size-fits-all	24:15 30:13	42:22	strengthened
53:4	46:20 47:13	43:5 43:9 46:21	28:11
skill 35:3	51:25	49:4 63:24	stress 10:2
skills	52:1 63:7	22.0	STRETCH 61:15
15:25 56:20	63:15 66:3	standards 4:2 4:17 4:24	61:17 61:19
sleep 52:6	speakers	5:1 9:21	strike 61:1
52:16	46:23	27:11 27:22	
1710000035000 3000 500000	speaking	29:14 29:22	strike-out
slightly 23:24	15:15 46:19	36:20 40:18	5:5
	50:16 59:3	40:19 42:12	structural
slippage 29:7	special	53:6	15:6
snow 54:10	8:21 9:8	53:22 55:24	structure
Society 15:16	54:24	56:3	6:16
solve 62:12	specifically	56:25 59:1 59:8	10:10 11:14
solved 62:21	4:18	59:1 59:0	13:15 36:21
7887-28941-289	18:20	66:6	38:5 41:20
somebody 26:1	35:1 63:6	stands 33:2	structured
someone 12:11	specifics	40:12 60:17	8:12
59:1	27:18 28:10		14:17 36:17
59:17 59:24	52:1	start 65:13	42:15 65:1
60:13	specified	started 57:15	structures
	E :	l l	d .



	Public Meeting April 25, 201	4 ND1 ASS911# 9270-02	Page 90
6:20	61:3	48:10 48:19	substantially
structuring	61:10 61:13	48:23	26:7
6:22 9:14	65:3 65:8	49:5 50:5	substantive
14:11 35:16	students	50:6 50:7	55:21 57:7
student 10:24	6:6 6:10	50:11 50:16	sudden
12:12	6:17 6:22	52:8	48:13 48:19
17:1 17:3	6:23 9:11	52:21 53:17	
17:9 18:1	10:1 11:2	54:22	sufficient
18:21 21:22	11:8	55:1 55:6	43:8
24:4	11:10 11:20	57:10	suggest
25:14	12:6 13:3	58:9 58:20 59:16	60:3 65:24
26:2 27:9	13:9	59:23	suggested
27:13	14:11 15:23	60:1 61:2	42:21
28:7 29:1	16:13 16:17	61:5	
31:2 31:5	17:17	62:10 62:10	sum 45:13
31:20 31:25	18:8	62:12 62:13	summer
32:23	18:13	62:15 62:21	26:14 26:21
33:4	19:6 19:9	62:22 63:19	45:11 55:13
33:10	19:19	63:20 64:13	supervised
34:2 34:4	20:8	64:23	27:17 27:18
34:7	20:13 20:15		34:22 37:17
34:12 34:23	20:19 20:25	student's	supervising
35:20	21:4 22:1	34:6 35:2	8:14 25:13
37:4	22:12 23:18 25:19 25:24	45:14 62:18	
37:11	28:1 29:3	Students 21:3	supervision
38:2 39:3	29:16 30:23	21:16 39:4	37:4
39:8	31:11	stuff 44:25	supervisor
44:14 44:15	33:2	stunning	18:23 18:25
45:9	34:21 35:16	60:11	24:7 25:5
45:15 46:16	36:12 36:13		25 : 7
46:18 46:19	37:16 37:16	subject	28:22
47:6 50:1	38:9	31:1 61:2	34:2 34:5
51:4 51:6 51:14 51:18	38:10	submission	supervisors
52:12 53:21	40:1 40:9	16:23	6:20
57:15 57:16	40:11 40:14	submitted	17:24
58:8	40:16	11:23 50:15	18:4 31:9
58:14	41:3	submitting	31:11 31:16
59:5	41:12 41:12	44:7	37:17 42:2
59:18 59:20	41:17 46:25		support
60:9 60:18	47:23	substantial	11:9
	48:2 48:4	36:7	14:11 46:20
	48:8		



	dblic Meeting April 25, 201	. 11217100gir# 0270 02	Page 91
supporting	17:13 17:14	thank 5:18	48:5 48:7
53:18 53:19	30:7 32:4	13:24	48:13 53:18
63:2	55:19 57:6	15:9	56:5
	talking	15:12 15:13	56:23 58:25
supports	7:14	22:23 45:19	59:12 62:8
29:19 47:15	18:10 18:11	45:21 45:23	There've
supposed 7:17	24:22 26:10	45:23	40:24
37:14	30:11 33:10	46:7	
supposedly	37:2 37:3	46:10 46:12	they'd
55:5	50:10	46:14 53:24	14:10
	59:4	54:1 54:2	64:9 64:11
supreme 58:15	61:11 61:12	54:2	they're 7:8
sure 13:25		61:20	7:9 7:12
20:12	talks 16:23	63:3 63:4	7:14 8:11
26:8 28:9	18:20 31:19	66:2 66:4	8:11 8:12
31:17 32:20	31:22	Thanks 8:6	9:20 9:20
35:9 37:7	Target 10:23	26:5	10:18
37:13 39:20	taught 30:2	29:24 46:11	11:8 11:9
39:22 39:22			11:9
42:10	teach 6:1	themes 34:17	17:20 17:20
46:1 46:2	15:17 25:16	themselves	18:24 19:20
53:10 54:25	31:15	5:3 18:13	19:23 19:24
58:1 59:6	teacher 37:13	29:22	21:1 21:5
surprised	39:3	32:2 37:17	27:3
11:18 55:4	Teachers	theory 38:7	31:12 31:13
suspect 40:7	15:16		37:10 37:13
_		therefore	40:8 44:8
Switzerland	teaching	28:6	47:20
44:19 44:21	30:10	33:20 59:14	51:5
sympathetic	40:8	59:25 62:23	51:22
11:10 20:18	54:17 62:5	there's 12:19	52 : 9
system 59:24	Team 30:11	18:18	52:10 64:18
77200 03.21	62:25	21:8	they've
	term 20:12	21:11 25:25	9 : 13
table 56:5		26:3	10:15 52:21
	terminology	26:23 27:16	52:22 52:22
taking 15:6	44:5	34:4 34:6	65:22
25:9	terms 17:21	36:2	third 4:21
33:15	31:14 36:3	36:14	30:19 44:15
51:4 51:8	terrific	41:5	45:5
51:16 51:18	15:23	43:11 43:15	45:12 46:15
51:22 59:5		47:8 47:14	
talk 16:7	texts 30:9		third-party



43:16 60:21	14:23	24:6	7:16
Thomas 10:22	transportatio		UNIDENTIFIED
thoughtful	n 11:21	<u>U</u>	7:20
7:11	19:16	U.S 64:16	uninformed
thousand 5:25	travel	64:22 65:3	60:14
throwing	12:20 19:15	uncommon 27:7	unique 14:17
14:15 15:5	treated 41:21	uncontroversi	University
ticket 44:20	trend 40:4	al 40:14	5:16 5:20
tied 12:20	41:2	undercut	10:21 11:19
	trial 39:7	22:20	15:10 15:18
till 51:1	tried 22:9	undercuts	16:16 22:24 30:1
today 5:23	trouble 17:20	23:21	46:16
46:12 46:20	31:12 60:23	undergraduate	54:4
46:23 47:13 47:18 54:11	troubled	65:15	54:16 63:15
61:11 61:12	55 : 22	understand	63:22 63:23
62:6	troubling	17:25 20:18	unlike 59:15
token 22:1	57:8	51:3 51:13 51:17	unnecessary
Tom 42:11	true 22:10	53:3	9:5 9:6 9:7
50:24	32:12 42:16	56:25 61:21	unpaid 10:2
torts 39:6	try 13:19	understandabl	16 : 5
	15:24 17:23	y 20:16	16:22
totally 61:18	62:17 63:9	understanding	17:2
towards	trying	15:24	20:22 21:17 22:2 22:9
29:4 32:10 32:15	13:15 13:20	24:6 25:3	24:1
60:4	21:16 54:25	25:4 26:1	24:14 26:19
traditional	55:23 58:1	27:2 56:7	27 : 23
40:13 65:15	tuition 6:9	understanding	28:6
training 17:7	9:11 9:13	s 24:19	28:12 47:22
36:1 36:4	62:19	understood	unproductive
transcribed	tuition-	24:13	31:6
4:12	paid 51:16	undertook	unquestionabl
transcript	turn 55:13	35:18	y 24:10
65:3 65:4	turned 11:20	unevenness	unrestricted
65:9	Twin 10:20	42:14	44:15
transfer 4:23	type 14:17	unfortunately	unstructured
transparent		57 : 3	36:11
cransparenc	typically	UNIDENTIFED	



200	Public Meeting April 25, 201	4 NDT ASSGN# 9276-62	Page 93
untrue 9:8	view 25:21	46:2	wish 44:6
unwise 14:14	37:18 37:25	48:12	51:12 66:3
Discourse of the Control of the Cont	viewed 29:4	50:7	work 9:23
Uphill 54:13	visit 8:8	52:24	10:15 10:18
urge 22:21	25 121	53:3	12:17
urges 53:22	visits 8:9	53:12 55:22	16:2 17:7
useful 49:7	8:13	55:25 56:3 57:8	18:10 18:12
60:7	volume 33:25	58:4 58:5	18:22
usefully	volunteer	59:19	19:7
43:14	13:9 44:4	63:5 65:16	21:14
Liberton Constitution		Western 63:22	22:6 22:7
usually 25:3	M		23:23 24:23
- 1800	wages 14:20	we've 5:6	25:2 25:14 30:24
V	walked 54:9	43:2 43:3	30:24 30:25
valuable	25/201 34 37 40	50:14 52:24	31:2
34:11 34:15	Washington	56:8 56:9	31:18
34:20 46:24	54:3 54:16	60:15 62:21 62:22	33:2 33:6
value 29:15	wasn't 57:1		33:12 33:15
30:25	wasted 32:13	Whereupon	33:23
31:3	wasteful 31:6	66:8	34:2 34:3
31:14 32:16	37:16	whether 6:4	34:6 34:8
33:7		6:6 6:7	34:22
33:19 33:23 34:7	watching 18:10	17:3 25:4	35:3
34:24 35:12	S443C31-006-029-A21	35:3	36:14 36:17
35:13 35:22	Wayne 47:20	43:21 44:14	37:16 37:18
40:9	ways 14:11	wholesale	40:5 40:6
value-	20:7	15:5	40:15 42:1 45:7
creating	26:16 54:13	whom 41:13	49:21
45:10	54:14	who's 7:2	51:5 51:5
1 T04/05/03/04/04/04/04	welcome	45:9 51:18	51:6
variance	7:24	who've 8:8	51:11 51:16
14:16 14:22 14:23 20:11	15:11 45:22	Vacantais and American State of the State of	51:19 51:19
2710	54:4	wide 22:10	51:20 51:21
variations	we'll 13:23	widely 5:6	51:22 51:23
25:2	46:2 66:7	William 10:21	53:15 53:18
vast 36:7	well-accepted	CONTINUE FO	56:11 56:12
40:24	40:13	willing 35:25 35:25 49:3	56:13 58:10
version 5:5	we're 8:3	CONTRACTOR STATE OF ST	61:13 61:22
versus 58:18	19:1 27:6	willingness	62:15 65:11
30.10	37:2 37:3	36:10	worked 11:3
1	0.7.2.07.0		





36 36	Public Meeting	April 25, 2014	NDT Assgn # 9278-82	Page 94
11:4 52:22 54:21 54:23 55:7 55:8				
working 18:16 21:4 21:9 24:5 25:19 45:10 47:23 50:11 51:14 51:15 52:12 53:14				
works 37:4 51:24				
world 41:5				
worry 8:15 8:16				
worth 17:21 31:13				
worthwhile 34:16				
writing 24:24				
written 5:6 25:6 47:11				
wrong 56:4 58:22 58:23 60:17				
Y yet 57:25				
York 59:4				
you'll 6:25 7:1				
young 24:4 26:13				
yourself 4:13				



