American Bar Association  
Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar  

MEMORANDUM  

DATE: August 12, 2015  

TO: Deans of ABA-Approved Law Schools  
University Presidents  
Chief Justices of State Supreme Courts  
Bar Admissions Authorities  
Deans of Unapproved Law Schools  
Leaders of Other Organizations Interested in ABA Standards  
Student Bar Association Presidents  

FROM: Barry A. Currier, Managing Director of Accreditation and Legal Education  

SUBJECT: Adoption and Implementation of Revised Standards and Rules for Approval of Law Schools  

At its meetings in June and July 2015, the Council approved changes to the *ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools*. The changes had been circulated for Notice and Comment and public hearings were held on April 30 and July 16, 2015. The following amended Standards and Rules of Procedure became effective upon concurrence by the ABA House of Delegates at its meeting on August 3-4, 2015:  

1. Definition (17) and Standard 106 [Separate Locations and Branch Campuses]  
2. Standard 105 [Acquiescence for Major Change in Program or Structure] and Rule 29(a) [Application for Acquiescence in Major Change]  
3. Standard 304 [Simulation Courses and Law Clinics]  
4. Standard 305(e)(6) and Interpretation 305-3 [Field Placements and Other Study Outside the Classroom]  
5. Standard 311(a) and Interpretation 311-1 [Academic Program and Academic Calendar]  
6. Standard 311(f) [Academic Program and Academic Calendar] and Standard 308(a) [Academic Standards]  
7. Interpretation 311-4 [Academic Program and Academic Calendar]  
8. Standard 502(b)(2) [Educational Requirements]  
9. Standard 505(b) [Granting of J.D. Degree Credit for Prior Law Study]  
10. Rule 27 [Application for Provisional or Full Approval] and Rule 28 [Reapplication for Provisional or Full Approval]  
11. Rule 29(d-g) [Application for Acquiescence in Major Change]  
12. Rule 30 [Major Changes Requiring a Reliable Plan]  

Attached are an explanation of the changes and a redlined version of the amended Standards and Rules of Procedure.
1. DEFINITION (17) AND STANDARD 106

Explanation

The definition of “separate location” is changed from one at which “the law school offers more than sixteen credit hours” to one at which “a student may earn more than sixteen credit hours.”

In the 2013-2014 Standards, a “satellite campus” was defined in Standard 106(15) as one “at which a student could take the equivalent of 16 or more semester credit hours.” Standard 105 required schools to provide a certain level of support for satellite campuses including library resources, academic advising, full-time faculty, etc.

During the comprehensive review of the Standards, the term “satellite campus” was eliminated and replaced with the term “separate location.” In the 2014-2015 Standards, a “separate location” is defined as one at which the law school “offers more than sixteen credit hours” of the program of legal education.

Following the comprehensive review, law schools that offered courses at separate locations voiced concern about the revision. If the school offered a number of courses at the location that totaled more than sixteen credits, new Standard 106 required that they provide the level of support required for a separate location even if a student was not permitted to earn more than sixteen credit hours at that location. The change returns the situation to that found before the comprehensive revision, and requires that the school provide the level of support required for a separate location only if a student may earn more than sixteen credit hours.

Interpretation 106-1, which repeated the definition of “separate location” found in the Definitions section, is deleted. Interpretation 106-2 is renumbered to be Interpretation 106-1.

Redline

Definition (17)

“Separate location” means a physical location within the United States: (1) at which the law school offers J.D. degree courses, (2) where a student may earn offers more than sixteen credit hours of the school’s program of legal education, and (3) that is not in reasonable proximity to the law school’s main location.

Standard 106. SEPARATE LOCATIONS AND BRANCH CAMPUSES

...

Interpretation 106-1

“Separate location” and “branch campus” as used in this Standard are defined terms that apply only to locations at which a law school offers more than sixteen credits of the program of legal education.
Interpretation 106-1-106-2
A law school with more than one location may have one dean for all locations.

2. STANDARD 105 AND RULE 29(a)

Explanation

In the 2013-2014 Standards and Rules, Interpretation 105-1 included the following in the list of major changes that require acquiescence: [the same items were included in Rule 21(a)(1) – (3) and Rule 20(a)(13) of the 2013-2014 Standards and Rules]

(1) Instituting a new full-time or part-time division;
(2) Changing from a full-time to a part-time program or from a part-time to a fulltime program;
(3) Establishing a two-year undergraduate/four year law school or similar program;
........
(19) The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure from existing offerings or method of delivery since the last accreditation period.

In the comprehensive review those subsections were combined in Standard 105 and in Rule 29 to state:

(12) The addition of courses or programs since the most recent AC period, such as that represent a significant departure from existing offerings or method of delivery since the last most recent accreditation period including combined undergraduate and J.D. programs, such as 2/4, 4/2 programs, and programs leading to a J.D. and a first-degree program at foreign institution; instituting a new full-time or part-time division; or changing from a full-time to a part-time program or from a part-time to a full-time program;

Some of the additional language that was added has caused confusion. The proposed change clarifies the language in both Standard 105 and Rules 29, and complies with the Department of Education requirements.

Redline

Standard 105. ACQUIESCENCE FOR MAJOR CHANGE IN PROGRAM OR STRUCTURE

(a) Before a law school makes a major change in its program of legal education or organizational structure, it shall obtain the acquiescence of the Council for the change. A major change in program or structure that requires application for acquiescence includes:

…
(12) The addition of courses or programs since the most recent AC period, such as that represent a significant departure from existing offerings or method of delivery since the latest accreditation period site evaluation, including combined undergraduate and J.D. programs, such as 2/4, 4/2 programs, and programs leading to a J.D. and a first-degree program at foreign institution; instituting a new full-time or part-time division; or changing from a full-time to a part-time program or from a part-time to a full-time program;

…

Rule 29: Application for Acquiescence in Major Change

(a) Major changes requiring application for acquiescence include:

…

(12) The addition of courses or programs since the most recent AC period, such as that represent a significant departure from existing offerings or method of delivery since the latest accreditation period site evaluation, including combined undergraduate and J.D. programs, such as 2/4, 4/2 programs, and programs leading to a J.D. and a first-degree program at foreign institution; instituting a new full-time or part-time division; or changing from a full-time to a part-time program or from a part-time to a full-time program;

…

3. STANDARD 304

Explanation

Subsequent to the comprehensive review of the Standards, several faculty teaching mediation clinics submitted comments that the new definition of a “law clinic” excluded work done by their students serving as mediators, a lawyering role that does not involve advising or representing one or more clients. The change addresses that issue. The language of “serving as a third-party neutral” is used in Rule 2.4 of the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct to describe lawyering work as mediators. In mediation clinics, students serve as third-party neutrals for real parties who are either proceeding pro se or with the assistance of counsel. This is real lawyering work and involves actual individuals. Like other law clinics under the new definition, these mediation clinics provide students with substantial lawyering experience in a real life context.
Redline

**Standard 304. SIMULATION COURSES AND LAW CLINICS**

... 

(b) A law clinic provides substantial lawyering experience that (1) involves advising or representing one or more actual clients or serving as a third-party neutral, and (2) includes the following:

(i) advising or representing a client;

(ii) direct supervision of the student’s performance by a faculty member;

(iii) opportunities for performance, feedback from a faculty member, and self-evaluation; and

(iv) a classroom instructional component.

**4. STANDARD 305(e)(6) AND INTERPRETATION 305-3**

**Explanation**

Prior to the comprehensive revisions, Standard 305(e)(6) allowed a student to participate in a field placement after successfully completing one academic year toward the J.D. degree. Under the revisions to the Standards, Standard 305(e)(6) was changed to require 28 units of instruction prior to participation. Under the former Standard, students who had completed one year of part-time instruction were entitled to enroll in field placements. Under the current Standard, part-time students with one year of instruction are not entitled to participate.

Following the adoption of Standard 306(e)(6), the Council received comments from law schools with part-time programs. They argued for a return to the former rule, especially in light of the greater emphasis on experiential learning. In addition, some of those who commented suggested that emphasis should be placed on the extent of preparation for the field placement program rather than on the number of credits taken prior to participation in a field placement program.

The change allows students to participate in field placement programs if the student has successfully completed sufficient prerequisites or contemporaneously receives sufficient training to assure the quality of the student educational experience in the field placement program.

The addition of Interpretation 305-3 makes it clear that field placement programs must comply with the requirements of Standard 303(a)(3) in order to qualify as an experiential course under Standard 303.
Redline

**Standard 305. FIELD PLACEMENTS AND OTHER STUDY OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM**

…

(e) A field placement program shall include:

…

(6) a requirement that each student has successfully completed sufficient prerequisites or contemporaneously receives sufficient training to assure the quality of the student educational experience in the field placement program; instruction equivalent to 28 credit hours toward the J.D. degree before participation in the field placement program; and

…

**Interpretation 305-3**

To qualify as an experiential course under Standard 303, a field placement must also comply with the requirements set out in Standard 303(a)(3).

5. STANDARD 311(a) AND INTERPRETATION 311-1,
6. STANDARD 311(f) AND STANDARD 308(a), and
7. INTERPRETATION 311-4

**Explanation**

Subsequent to the comprehensive revision of the Standards and Rules, the Council requested that the Standards Review Committee reexamine Standard 311 (Academic Program and Academic Calendar) to see if the requirements regarding the academic calendar could be streamlined.

Standard 311 contains four specific requirements that impact the nature and length of the academic program: a) 140 days of regular instruction including examinations; b) 83 credits of minimum instruction to earn the JD; c) the limitation that a degree may not be earned earlier than 24 months or later than 84 months; and d) limitation prohibiting a law school from allowing a student to be enrolled at any time in more than 20% of total credit hours required for graduation.

The Council recognizes that it is important to maintain requirements to ensure that the required minimum program of study provides a rigorous program of legal education. The Council also understands that students must have the opportunity for adequate time for study and reflection. The Council determined that those requirements can be met by maintaining three of the four requirements set out in Standard 311. The Council concluded that there was no need to prescribe a minimum of 140 days of instruction, given that the other three requirements offer sufficient protection to ensure an academic calendar that is of sufficient length and breadth, and given the newly stated requirements found in Standard 310 regarding credit hours. Removal of the 140
days of instruction requirement does not change the amount of work that a student must do to earn a degree, but does remove a vestigial requirement that may hamper law schools’ abilities to be innovative in how their J.D. programs are structured and delivered. Therefore, the Council eliminated Standard 311(a) and Interpretation 311-1.

Standard 311(f) focuses on the law school’s obligation to adopt, publish, and adhere to a written policy requiring regular attendance. The Council retained this Standard, but moved it to Standard 308(a), which contains similar obligations for other academic standards.

Under Standard 505(c), a law school may admit a student and grant credit for courses completed at a law school outside the United States if the admitting law school would have granted credit towards satisfaction of J.D. degree requirements if the courses had been completed at the admitting school. Pursuant to Standard 505(f), a student admitted under 505(c) may receive up to one-third of the total number of credits required by the admitting school for the J.D. degree.

Students admitted under 505(c) must, of course, complete all of the requirements for the J.D. degree at the admitting law school. Since they are earning up to one year’s credit, they may need to spend at least two years at the admitting law school. For a student from a law school outside the U.S., that might mean that they have already studied for three to five years abroad. If the course of study for the J.D. degree is considered to have started when the student began studies at the foreign law school, the student will have a limited amount of time to complete studies at the admitting ABA-approved law school.

Interpretation 311-4 was intended to explain that the time for determining the commencement of law studies under Standard 311(c) is different for students accepted with credits for prior law study outside the United States and attempts to further clarify the interplay between 505 and 311. An example is provided to further clarify how the Interpretation works.

As written, Interpretation 311-4 was not clear. The change clarifies the ambiguities and simplifies the Interpretation. The change limits the Interpretation to an explanation of how Standard 311(c) applies when credit is given for prior law study outside the United States and attempts to further clarify the interplay between 505 and 311. An example is provided to further clarify how the Interpretation works.

Redline

**Standard 311. ACADEMIC PROGRAM AND ACADEMIC CALENDAR**

(a) A law school shall have an academic year of not fewer than 140 days on which classes and examinations are regularly scheduled in the law school, extending into not fewer than eight calendar months. The law school shall provide adequate time for reading periods and breaks, but such time does not count toward the 140-day academic year requirement.

(b) A law school shall require, as a condition for graduation, successful completion of a course of study of not fewer than 83 credit hours. At least 64 of these credit hours shall be in
courses that require attendance in regularly scheduled classroom sessions or direct faculty instruction.

(c) A law school shall require that the course of study for the J.D. degree be completed no earlier than 24 months and, except in extraordinary circumstances, no later than 84 months after a student has commenced law study at the law school or a law school from which the school has accepted transfer credit.

(d) A law school shall not permit a student to be enrolled at any time in coursework that exceeds 20 percent of the total credit hours required by that school for graduation.

(e) Credit for a J.D. degree shall only be given for coursework taken after the student has matriculated in a law school. A law school may not grant credit toward the J.D. degree for work taken in a pre-admission program.

(f) A law school shall adopt, publish, and adhere to a written policy requiring regular class attendance. [MOVED TO STANDARD 308(a)]

Interpretation 311-1
A law school may not count more than five class days each week toward the 140-day requirement.

Interpretation 311-2
(a) In calculating the 64 credit hours of regularly scheduled classroom sessions or direct faculty instruction for the purpose of Standard 311(b) (a), the credit hours may include:
   (1) Credit hours earned by attendance in regularly scheduled classroom sessions or direct faculty instruction;
   (2) Credit hours earned by participation in a simulation course or law clinic in compliance with Standard 304;
   (3) Credit hours earned through distance education in compliance with Standard 306; and
   (4) Credit hours earned by participation in law-related studies or activities in a country outside the United States in compliance with Standard 307.

(b) In calculating the 64 credit hours of regularly scheduled classroom sessions or direct faculty instruction for the purpose of Standard 311(b) (a), the credit hours shall not include any other coursework, including, but not limited to:
   (1) Credit hours earned through field placements and other study outside of the classroom in compliance with Standard 305;
   (2) Credit hours earned in another department, school, or college of the university with which the law school is affiliated, or at another institution of higher learning;
   (3) Credit hours earned for participation in co-curricular activities such as law review, moot court, and trial competition; and
   (4) Credit hours earned by participation in studies or activities in a country outside the United States in compliance with Standard 307 for studies or activities that are not law-related.
Interpretation 311-3 2
Whenever a student is permitted on the basis of extraordinary circumstances to exceed the 84-month program limitation in Standard 311(c), (b), the law school shall place in the student's file a statement signed by an appropriate law school official explaining the extraordinary circumstances leading the law school to permit an exception to this limitation. Such extraordinary circumstances, for example, might include an interruption of a student’s legal education because of an illness, family exigency, or military service.

Interpretation 311-4 3
For purposes of Standard 311(c), the time for determining the commencement of law study is ordinarily the time when a student commences law study at any institution. For example, if a law school accepts transfer credit from another institution the time begins when the student commenced study at the law school from which the transfer credit is accepted. If a law school accepts a student grants credit for prior law study who has completed law studies at a law school outside the United States as permitted under Standard 505(c), only the time commensurate with the amount of credit given counts toward the length of study requirements of Standard 311(c). For example, if a student has studied for three years at a law school outside the United States and is granted one year of credit toward the J.D. degree, the amount of time that counts toward the 84 month requirement is one year. The student has 72 months in which to complete law school in the United States.

Standard 308. ACADEMIC STANDARDS

(a) A law school shall adopt, publish, and adhere to sound academic standards, including those for regular class attendance, good standing, academic integrity, graduation, and dismissal.

(b) A law school shall adopt, publish, and adhere to written due process policies with regard to taking any action that adversely affects the good standing or graduation of a student.

8. STANDARD 502(b)(2)

Explanation

Standard 502(b)(2) was changed to remove the word “legal.” The Standard speaks to the requirements for education received by a student prior to attending law school, and the phrase “program of legal education” should have been “program of education.”

Redline

Standard 502. EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

…

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a law school may also admit to its J.D. degree program:
1) an applicant who has completed three-fourths of the credits leading to a bachelor's degree as part of a bachelor's degree/J.D. degree program if the institution is accredited by an accrediting agency recognized by the United States Department of Education; and

2) a graduate of an institution outside the United States if the law school assures that the quality of the program of legal education of that institution is equivalent to that of institutions accredited by an accrediting agency recognized by the United States Department of Education.

9. STANDARD 505(b)

Explanation

Prior to the comprehensive review, Standard 506(a) had permitted ABA-approved law schools to admit students with advanced standing and allow credits for studies at law schools not approved by the ABA if the unapproved law school had been granted the power to confer the J.D. degree by the appropriate governmental authority in the unapproved school’s jurisdiction, or if graduates of the unapproved school were permitted to sit for the bar examination in that jurisdiction. Following the comprehensive review, Standard 505 stated that credits could be transferred only if graduates of the unapproved law school were permitted to sit for the bar examination in that jurisdiction; the section regarding transfer of credits from unapproved law schools that had been granted the power to confer the J.D. degree by the appropriate governmental authority had been removed.

The change made to this section during the comprehensive review could be detrimental to students enrolled in some unapproved schools who seek to transfer to ABA-approved law schools. In some jurisdictions, the authority to start a law school is granted by an agency that has no authority to grant graduates of the school permission to sit for the bar examination in that jurisdiction. Indeed, some law schools have started with permission from a state agency so that they can obtain provisional accreditation and their graduates be permitted to sit for the bar examination in that jurisdiction. If ABA-approved law schools can accept credits only from those unapproved schools whose graduates have been granted permission to take the bar examination in their jurisdiction, students enrolled in unapproved law schools during that period between the granting of authority by a state agency and the granting of approval to take the bar examination, if separate operations, would be unable to transfer. The change to Standard 505 restores the ability of students to seek to transfer credit if they are enrolled in an unapproved law school that has been granted the power to confer the J.D. degree by the appropriate governmental authority in the unapproved school’s jurisdiction.
Standard 505. GRANTING OF J.D. DEGREE CREDIT FOR PRIOR LAW STUDY

(b) A law school may admit a student and grant credit for courses completed at a law school in the United States that is not approved by the Council if the unapproved law school has been granted the power to confer the J.D. degree by the appropriate governmental authority in the unapproved law school's jurisdiction, or if graduates of the unapproved law school are permitted to sit for the bar examination in the jurisdiction in which the unapproved law school is located, provided that:

1. the courses were undertaken as a J.D. degree student; and
2. the law school would have granted credit toward satisfaction of J.D. degree requirements if earned at the admitting school.

10. RULE 27 AND RULE 28

Explanation

Under the Rules of Procedure, a law school seeking provisional or full approval may request a site evaluation in the spring semester by filing an application no later than October 15 of the preceding fall semester. This timetable provides insufficient time to appoint a site evaluation team and arrange for a visit by the spring semester. The changes to Rules 27 and 28 would require that a law school seeking approval file a written notice of intent to seek approval no later than March 15 in the academic year prior to the academic year in which the law school will apply for approval and indicate the semester in which it would prefer to have a visit.

Rule 27: Application for Provisional or Full Approval

(a) A law school seeking provisional or full approval shall file with the Managing Director a written notice of intent to seek approval, submit its application to the Managing Director after the beginning of fall term classes but no later than October 15 in the academic year in which the law school is seeking approval.

1. The notice shall be filed no later than March 15 in the academic year prior to the academic year in which the law school will apply for approval and shall indicate the law school's preference for a fall or spring site evaluation visit. If the law school is seeking a site evaluation in the fall academic term it shall also file with the Managing Director,
during the month of March of the preceding academic year, a written notice of its intent to do so.

(2) Upon receipt of written notice of a law school’s intent to seek provisional or full approval, the Managing Director shall arrange for a site evaluation as provided under Rule 5.

(3) A law school may not apply for provisional approval until it has completed the first full academic year of operating a full-time program of legal education.

(2)(4) A provisionally approved law school may apply for full approval no earlier than two years after the date that provisional approval was granted.

(3)(5) Upon notice to the Managing Director of its intent to seek provisional approval, a law school seeking provisional approval shall comply with Standard 102(f) regarding communication of its status.

(b) The application for provisional or full approval is due at least eight weeks prior to the scheduled site evaluation visit and must contain:

(1) A letter from the dean certifying that the law school has completed all of the requirements for seeking provisional or full approval or that the law school seeks a variance from specific requirements of the Standards and that the law school has obtained the concurrence of the president in the application;

(2) All completed forms and questionnaires, as adopted by the Council;

(3) In the case of a law school seeking provisional approval, a copy of a feasibility study that evaluates the nature of the educational program and goals of the law school, the profile of the students who are likely to apply, and the resources necessary to create and sustain the law school, including relation to the resources of a parent institution, if any;

(4) A copy of the self-study;

(5) Financial operating statements and balance sheets for the last three fiscal years, or such lesser time as the institution has been in existence. If the applicant is not a publicly owned institution, the statements and balance sheets must be certified;

(6) Appropriate documents detailing the law school and parent institution’s ownership interest in any land or physical facilities used by the law school;

(7) A request that the Managing Director schedule a site evaluation at the law school’s expense; and,

(8) Payment to the Section of any required fee, the application fee.
(c) A law school may not apply for provisional approval until it has completed the first full academic year of its program.

(d) A law school must demonstrate that it or the university of which it is a part is legally authorized under applicable state law to provide a program of education beyond the secondary level.

(e) A law school shall disclose whether an accrediting agency recognized by the United States Secretary of Education has denied an application for accreditation filed by the law school, revoked the accreditation of the law school, or placed the law school on probation. If the law school is part of a university, then the law school shall further disclose whether an accrediting agency recognized by the United States Secretary of Education has taken any of the actions enumerated above with respect to the university or any program offered by the university. As part of such disclosure, the law school shall provide the Managing Director with information concerning the basis for the action of the accrediting agency.

(f) When a law school submits a completed application for provisional or full approval, the Managing Director shall arrange for a site evaluation as provided under Rule 5.

Rule 28: Reapplication for Provisional or Full Approval

(a) If the Council denies an application for provisional or full approval or withdraws provisional or full approval, or if a law school withdraws an application for provisional or full approval, a law school shall not reapply until it is able to certify that it has addressed the reasons for the denial, removal, or withdrawal, explain how it has done so, and is able to demonstrate that it is operating in compliance with the Standards.

(b) Any new notice and reapplication must be filed within the schedule prescribed by Rule 27(a).

11. RULE 29(d-g)

Explanation

Subsequent to the adoption of the revised Rules of Procedure, it came to the attention of the Standards Review Committee that newly adopted Rule 29, which addresses Major Changes, did not include language required by the Department of Education.

The changes to Rule 29(d) comply with U.S. Department of Education requirements regarding the timing of fact finding visits to law schools following acquiescence in certain types of major changes.

New Rule 29(e) restores the language of former Rule 20(b)(1) – (2) regarding applications for a major change that may result in the creation of a new or different law school.

New Rule 29(g) restores the language of former Rule 20(d), which was inadvertently omitted
during the drafting of Rule 29.

Redline

Rule 29: Application for Acquiescence in Major Change

... 

(d) In recommending or granting acquiescence in a major change under Rules 29(a)(1) through 29(a)(9), the Committee or Council may shall appoint a fact finder subsequent to the effective date of acquiescence, as provided in Rule 30(e). The Committee or Council also may appoint a fact finder subsequent to the effective date of acquiescence in a major change under Rules 29(a)(10) through 29(a)(17) for purposes of determining whether the law school remains in compliance with the Standards. In recommending or granting acquiescence under Rule 29(a)(10) in a separate location at which the law school offers more than 50% of the law school’s program of legal education, however, the Committee or Council shall appoint a fact finder to conduct a visit within six months of the effective date of acquiescence or in the first academic term subsequent to acquiescence in which students are enrolled at the separate location.

(e) In addition to satisfying the requirements of Rule 29(b), an application for acquiescence shall contain information sufficient to allow the Accreditation Committee to determine whether the major change is so significant as to constitute the creation of a new or different law school. If the Accreditation Committee determines that the major change constitutes the creation of a new or different law school, then it shall recommend to the Council that the school apply for provisional approval under the provisions of Standard 102 and Rule 27. Factors that shall be considered in making the determination of whether the major change is so significant as to constitute the creation of a new or different law school include, without limitation:

(1) the financial resources available to the law school;

(2) a significant change, present or planned, in the governance of the law school;

(3) the overall composition of the faculty and staff at the law school;

(4) the educational program offered by the law school; and

(5) the location or physical facilities of the law school.

(e)(f) A law school’s approval status remains unchanged following acquiescence in any major change.

(g) A law school’s request for acquiescence in the proposed major change in organizational structure shall be considered under the provisions of Rule 30, and will become effective upon the decision of the Council. The decision of the Council may not be retroactive.
12. RULE 30

Explanation

The revisions to Rule 30 were made in order to ensure compliance with the U.S. Department of Education regulation 34 CFR 602.24 regarding the timing of fact finding visits to law schools following acquiescence in certain types of major changes.

Redline

Rule 30: Major Changes Requiring a Reliable Plan

…

(e) In a case where the Council has acquiesced in a major change subject to (a), the Council shall appoint a fact finder subsequent to the effective date of acquiescence, as provided in (f), (g), or (h), or (i).

(f) In the case of the establishment of a branch campus under Rule 29(a)(9), the fact finding visit finder required in accordance with (e) shall be conducted appointed within six months of the effective date of acquiescence or in the first academic term subsequent to acquiescence in which students are enrolled at the branch campus to verify that the branch campus satisfies the requisites of (b)(2).

(g) In a case involving a substantial change in ownership, control, assets, or finances of the law school under Rule 29(a)(1) through 29(a)(7), the fact finding visit finder required in accordance with (e) shall be conducted appointed within six months of the effective date of acquiescence to verify that the law school is in compliance with the Standards.

(h) In a case involving a substantial change in location of the law school that could result in substantial changes in the faculty, administration, student body, or management of the law school, under Rule 29(a)(8), the fact finding visit finder required in accordance with (e) shall be conducted appointed within one year of acquiescence to verify that the law school is in compliance with the Standards.