

From: Westbrook, Jay L

Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2017 2:53 PM

To: Clark, JR

Subject: Elimination of full time faculty requirement after the first year

This proposal threatens both academic freedom and the quality of American law schools. Students around the world come here for their legal education in schools that are mostly taught by full-time faculty, especially for the basic courses in the first and second years. Adjuncts are invaluable for offering specialized courses and practice insights, but most courses should be taught by professional teachers who are immersed in their subjects in a broad way. When I left practice after eleven years thinking I knew my fields, I was shocked to realize that a teacher and academic needed a much broader understanding of them. As a partner in a well-known firm, I would have been a useful adjunct. Only by devoting myself full time to teaching and research was I able to realize my full capacities as a teacher.

Our law schools are distinguished from many others around the world by having full-time teachers for most courses. Only a few other advanced countries share that distinction, although the Japanese and others have moved in our direction in recognition of the benefits of the American approach.

I would comment in more depth except I have just been informed of this ill-advised proposal and want to make a comment before the comment period closes.

Sincerely,

Jay L. Westbrook

Benno C. Schmidt

Chair of Business Law

727 East Dean Keeton Street

Austin, Texas 78705