Appendix A – Summary of Comments
ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure
2018-19

The Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar (the “Council”) solicited ideas and suggestions regarding issues related to the ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools that the Council might consider during the 2018-2019 year on September 27, 2018. Below is a summary of the comments received. The actual comments are attached.


Standard 206-Diversity and Inclusion. Robert Furnier, a member of the faculty at Northern Kentucky University College of Law, submitted a comment recommending that the Council re-examine Standard 206 and its relationship with Standards 301, 316, and 501, and strengthen its enforcement of Standard 206.

Standard 302-Learning Outcomes. The ABA Commission on Lawyer Assistance Programs, the National Taskforce on Lawyer Well-Being, and the ABA Law Student Division, submitted a comment recommending that well-being be included as part of learning outcomes. The request is to add a competency with the tools needed to promote personal and professional well-being.

Standard 303-Curriculum. The ABA Commission on Lawyer Assistance Programs, the National Taskforce on Lawyer Well-Being, and the ABA Law Student Division, submitted a comment recommending that mental health and substance abuse be added to the professional responsibility requirement.

Standard 308-Academic Standards. Wells O’Byrne submitted a comment proposing that a required grading system required of all ABA Law Schools. Specifically, he suggests that each law school create a group responsible for the creation of exams and assessment criteria and that two examiners be assigned to grade each exam or make an assessment.

Standard 316-Bar Passage. William Patton, Professor Emeritus at Whittier Law School submitted a comment recommending that the national mean MBE score be used as a proxy for determining if Law Schools are providing students with an education sufficient to enable them to pass the bar.

Standard 503-Admission Test. Keith Sutton submitted a comment recommending less reliance on the LSAT.
**Standard 508-Student Support Services.** The ABA Commission on Lawyer Assistance Programs, the National Taskforce on Lawyer Well-Being, and the ABA Law Student Division, submitted a comment recommending that mental health and substance abuse counseling be added to student support services.

**Standard 509-Required Disclosures.** Law School Transparency submitted a comment that does not request a change to a Standard but recommends the collection of more information on student debt, tuition, gender diversity, and racial/ethnic diversity.

**Standard 509-Required Disclosures and Employment Outcomes.** Scott Norberg, Professor, Florida International University College of Law, submitted a comment recommending the reporting of LSAT scores and UGPAs for students in a Law School’s entering class and recommending the adoption of an employment outcomes standard.

**Standard 509-Required Disclosures and Young Lawyer Representation on the Council.** The Iowa State Bar Association (ISBA), submitted a comment recommending that law schools be required to provide every admitted law student with a copy of the 509 Report and the Employment Summary Report as part of the admissions offer. The ISBA also recommended simplifying the Employment Summary Report and simplifying and reorganizing the 509 Report.

The ISBA recommends that the Council require schools to report as part of the annual questionnaire, and for the Section and schools to provide on their websites, (1) disaggregated borrowing data, including subcategories by race and gender; (2) disaggregated data on the amount of tuition paid by class year (1L or upper-level), race/ethnicity, and gender; (3) data on applicants and scholarships by gender and, to the extent the Section does not do so already, by race/ethnicity; (4) data on J.D. program completion and bar passage success.

Finally, ISBA recommends that the Council designate two new lawyers as members of the Council.
Dear Standards Review Subcommittee of the Council,

I would like to ask for your support to include veterans in the ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools. Presently, both Standard 205 (Non-Discrimination and Equality of Opportunity) and Standard 206 (Diversity and Inclusion) of ABA Chapter 2 on Organization and Administration fail to include veterans.

The failure to include veterans in these provisions has consequences which I have experienced first-hand, and is a notable problem within law schools and the legal industry. I recently submitted a complaint (attached) to Northwestern University ‘Pritzker’ School of Law to raise awareness of this issue.

Including veterans in Standards 205 & 206 can help to diminish this problem. I propose the following underlined language in bold be included:

Standard 205. NON-DISCRIMINATION AND EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

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

(b) A law school shall foster and maintain equality of opportunity for students, faculty, and staff, without discrimination or segregation on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, veterans status, or disability.

(c) This Standard does not prevent a law school from having a religious affiliation or purpose and adopting and applying policies of admission of students and employment of faculty and staff that directly relate to this affiliation or purpose so long as (1) notice of these policies has been given to applicants, students, faculty, and staff before their affiliation with the law school, and (2) the religious affiliation, purpose, or policies do not contravene any other Standard, including Standard 405(b) concerning academic freedom. These policies may provide a preference for persons adhering to the religious affiliation or purpose of the law school, but may not be applied to use admission policies or take other action to preclude admission of applicants or retention of students on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, veterans status, or disability. This Standard permits religious affiliation or purpose policies as to admission, retention, and employment only to the extent that these policies are protected by the
United States Constitution. It is administered as though the First Amendment of the United States Constitution governs its application.

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

Standard 206. DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

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

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

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance. Moreover, please let me know the outcome of this request.

Best Regards and Sincerely,

Tyler H. Lippert, PhD, JD
In response to the September 28, 2018 email from Jeffrey Lewis, Diane Bosse, and Barry Currier, I wish to thank the Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar (the “Council”) for soliciting ideas about issues the Council might consider during the 2018-2019 bar year relating to the ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools (“the Standards”). I write in my individual capacity as an ABA member, although I have served as a member of the ABA Commission on Racial and Ethnic Diversity in the Profession the past two years and as a member of the ABA Law Practice Division Diversity and Inclusion the past five years, three of those as chair. Perhaps not surprisingly, because of my strong commitment to diversity and inclusion in the legal profession, I ask that the Council reexamine Standard 206 and its relationship to Standards 301, 316, and 501.

As you know, Standard 206 requires that law schools, “[c]onsistent with sound legal education policy and the Standards, demonstrate by concrete action a commitment to diversity and inclusion, by providing full opportunities for the study of law and entry into the profession by members of underrepresented groups, particularly racial and ethnic minorities.” No doubt, sound legal education policy demands compliance with the Standards, particularly 301, 316, and 501. These standards ensure that law schools admit only students capable of graduating and passing the bar (Standard 501), maintain a rigorous program of legal education (Standard 301), and prepare their students to pass the bar (Standard 316). My fear, however, is that Standard 206 has become less relevant over the past two years as the Council has scrutinized law schools for compliance with Standards 301, 316, and 501, issuing noncompliance letters, placing schools on probation, or withdrawing their accreditation.

For example, in my review of publicly available information concerning the Council’s recent adverse actions, I have noticed that the law schools whose accreditation appears to be in the greatest jeopardy are those with heavy minority enrollments. I do not mean to suggest that the Council is targeting any school because of the racial or ethnic makeup of its student body. To the contrary, I worry that the Council is indifferent to a school’s diversity in enforcing the Standards, especially 301, 316, and 501. In my view, compliance with Standard 206 should be given the same weight as other standards when the Council considers whether a school is operating within sound legal education policy.

Indeed, I suspect that the Council rarely, if ever, has issued a noncompliance letter to a law school based upon Standard 206. Meanwhile, the legal profession lags far behind other professions, and society generally, in becoming truly diverse and inclusive. Consequently, I believe the Council should work with the ABA Goal III entities in the coming bar year to explore how to strengthen Standard 206 to make it more meaningful in the accreditation equation.

To that end, I would welcome the opportunity to open a dialogue between the Council, the Goal III entities, and other interested parties to generate ways that Standard 206 might be strengthened. I appreciate, though, that this process must not dilute the impact of other standards—like Standards 301, 316 and 501—that are critical to prepare law students for admission to the bar and for effective, ethical, and responsible participation as members of the legal profession. Best Wishes, Bob Furnier

Robert R. Furnier
Director, W. Bruce Lunsford Academy for Law, Business + Technology
Director, Small Business & Nonprofit Clinic
Northern Kentucky University | Chase College of Law
546 Nunn Hall | Highland Heights, KY 41099
Office: 859.572.7784
Mobile: 513.604.5449 (Preferred number)
Ms. Erika Nicole Joyce Lessane  
375 East Chicago Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60611  

October 28, 2018  

Mr. Fernando Mariduena  
Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar  
321 N. Clark Street, 21st Floor  
Chicago, IL  60654  

Dear Mr. Mariduena,  

    My name is Erika Lessane and I am a 2L at Northwestern Pritzker School of Law and an executive member of the Law Students Division of the American Bar Association. As the National Delegate of Programming for the Law Student Division, with the support of the rest of the LSD council, I am writing to recommend an amendment to ABA accreditation standards to require that all ABA accredited institutions establish, implement, and publish a process for grade appeals at their institution.

    Now, more than ever, our association has to invest into law students and address their needs if we are to increase student participation in our association. In order to prove ourselves to be a resource to law students and foster relationships, we must find was to address the pressing issues in the lives of the law students of today. An issue across many institutions is the practice, or even the simple perception, of unfair or inconsistent grading. Although addressing all concerns about grading is a long-term project that would require the input of many individuals, we can at least ensure that students have the chance to voice their concerns through a grade appeal protocol required at their school. By implementing that all law schools implement “a process” for grade appeals, allowing the school’s flexibility for what the specific process will be, the ABA can at least lay the groundwork for addressing future needs in grading. Furthermore, since the creation of the standard would give students standing to present grade-related complaints to our association, we can give students a voice while simultaneously better monitoring practices across ABA institutions while we determine future solutions.

    As I myself suffered the consequences of unfair grade without a place to voice my concerns, I can assure you that it is an experience that no student should have to endure. Last year, as a first year student, I was given a “D” in my constitutional law class on account of a purported time violation. Although I had proof that the professor of the course relayed the wrong time for the deadline, with written proof and witnesses, my school simply told me “grades are final.” As a result of the “D,” I not only lost career opportunities but I suffered crippling effects to my mental well-being. I not only had proof of the professor presenting contradicting instructions to students, but I also had proof that even with a time violation, a “D” was highly uncommon. Even with such clear proof of a professor’s mistake or mistreatment, I had no venue to present my concerns since my law school does not have a grade appeals process. Coming from a public institution for my undergraduate studies, I have already seen the immense value in a grade appeals process as a practice that proves beneficial by allowing students to voice their concern, even if their grade is not ultimately changed. As there are already many legal institutions with a
process, the schools needing to establish one could use these institutions as an example. No matter what is ultimately establishes, it would be imperative that schools have “a process” for appealing grades instead of simply relaying the “grades are final” narration that I repeatedly received.

Upon casually discussing my story with the rest of the Law Student Division at SOC, it became apparent that many students share my story across many schools. After partaking in discussion as a council, everyone had themselves suffered unfair or inconsistent grades or knew of someone that had. As a result, it became clear that this is an issue at many institutions that should be addressed by the ABA. Since grades play a heavy role into the mental well being of students, as they are a determining factor of career opportunities available, the standard would also address some of the mental health issues at many schools. Although there are many possibilities for ensuring consistent grades across our institutions for the future (pass/fail options, standardized grades for first years, finding ways to truly ensure anonymous grades, etc.), we should at least start by making sure that students have a place to voice their concerns of unfair or inconsistent grading and determine effective solutions for the future. If we establish a mandatory grade appeals standard at every institution by simply requiring “a process” and giving schools the opportunity to fashion their protocol to their institution, we at least give a voice to the students.

As the ABA, we need to prove that we have value to students if we are to increase student participation to ensure that our association lives on in the years to come. Not only would a standard for an appeals process be of value to students, but also it would show the legal community that the ABA listens and responds to the needs of our constituents. Furthermore, law students are entering the legal field, which is a field that requires them to be the voice for the voiceless members of our society. However, if we are to expect that our law students, as future attorneys, stand up and advocate for others, we have to at least ensure that they have the opportunity to speak up about their own concerns. Additionally, making a grade appeals standard would give students standing to file complaints with our association which will ensure we are aware of any egregious grading practices at institutions and give us the opportunity to address them in a preventative manner. Implementing a standard to require law schools to establish, implement, and publish “a process” for grade appeals will benefit the entire legal community. Therefore, as a fellow executive member of the ABA and simply as a law student, I ask that you make a change to the standards and effectively give our law students, the future leaders of America, a voice.

Sincerely,

Erika N.J. Lessane
October 24, 2018

Mr. Fernando Mariduena
Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar
ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar
321 N. Clark Street, 21st Floor
Chicago, IL 60654
Via email: Fernando.mariduena@americanbar.org

Dear Mr. Mariduena,

On behalf of the ABA Commission on Lawyer Assistance Programs, The National Task Force on Lawyer Well-Being, and the ABA Law Student Division, we are jointly writing and requesting that the Council consider revisions to the ABA Standards on Legal Education.

Law students are experiencing significant challenges in the areas of substance use (including alcohol) and mental health. These needs were confirmed with the publication of Suffering in Silence: The Survey of Law Student Well-Being and the Reluctance of Law Students to Seek Help for Substance Use and Mental Health Concerns (the “Law Student Survey”) by Jerome Organ, David Jaffe and Kate Bender in the Journal of Legal Education (2016). In the same year, a separate study documented the challenges that attorneys, and particularly young attorneys, were confronting in the profession. The Prevalence of Substance Use and Other Mental Health Concerns Among American Attorneys (the “Hazelden Study”) (P.R. Krill, R. Johnson, & L. Albert, 10 J. Addiction Med. 46 (2016). Throughout this time period, national media coverage of some high-profile deaths from suicide has continued to dramatize the urgent and compelling need for action.

In response to these serious and well-documented trends, a national task force of relevant stake-holders convened to discuss next steps. Those deliberations resulted in The Path to Lawyer Well-Being: Practical Recommendations for Positive Change (August, 2017). This comprehensive report, available at lawyerwellbeing.net, outlines an ambitious agenda for institutional changes throughout the legal profession. The ABA House of Delegates, at the 2018 Midyear Meeting in Vancouver, adopted a resolution urging stakeholders to consider the recommendations of the report. These recommendations included the following proposals relating to law schools:
30. INCLUDE WELL-BEING TOPICS IN COURSES ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY.

Mental health and substance use should play a more prominent role in courses on professional responsibility, legal ethics, or professionalism. A minimum of one class session should be dedicated to the topic of substance use and mental health issues, during which bar examiners and professional responsibility professors or their designee (such as a lawyer assistance program representative) appear side-by-side to address the issues. Until students learn from those assessing them that seeking assistance will not hurt their bar admission prospects, they will not get the help they need.

31. COMMIT RESOURCES FOR ONSITE PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS.
Law schools should have, at a minimum, a part-time, onsite professional counselor. An onsite counselor provides easier access to students in need and sends a symbolic message to the law school community that seeking help is supported and should not be stigmatized. Although the value of such a resource to students should justify the necessary budget, law schools also could explore inexpensive or no-cost assistance from lawyer assistance programs. Other possible resources may be available from the university or private sector.

We write to urge the Section on Legal Education to consider the following recommendations that recognize the importance of law student well-being in the ABA Standards. Our request includes:
(1) articulating professional well-being as a fundamental learning outcome in Section 302;
(2) urging by an Interpretation to Section 303 that one hour in the Professional Responsibility course be dedicated to education on substance use and mental health;
(3) ensuring that law school student services as defined in Section 508 include the substance use and mental health counseling desperately needed on every campus in this era.

The Commission on Lawyer Assistance Programs works with state and local lawyer assistance programs around the country whose mission is to serve lawyers, judges, and law students who are struggling with alcoholism, substance and mental health challenges. Many LAPs around the country are already working closely with law schools to provide needed education and counseling. Many law schools are working closely with central University Counseling Centers to provide on-campus services, and in some instances have hired dedicated staff to provide on-site services. These revisions require that every law school have a plan to address these needs but would not require the expenditure of additional funds.
Task Force members, working with multiple sections of the American Bar Association and the Conference of Chief Justices, continue to advocate for institutional change on many fronts, including the bar admission process, continuing legal education requirements, law firm leave policies, and burdens faced by the judiciary. At a time when the entire profession is moving forward on this national agenda for Lawyer Well-Being, we urge the Council to take action on these proposed revisions.

Sincerely,

Bree Buchanan
ABA Commission on Lawyer Assistance Programs

Bree Buchanan, Chris Newbold, William Slease
National Task Force on Lawyer Wellbeing

Negeen Sadeghi-Movahed
ABA Law Student Division
Proposed Changes to the ABA Standards for Approval of Law Schools
Submitted on Behalf of the ABA Commission on Lawyer Assistance Programs, the National Task Force on Lawyer Well-Being, and the ABA Law Student Division

Standard 302. LEARNING OUTCOMES
A law school shall establish learning outcomes that shall, at a minimum, include competency in the following:
(a) Knowledge and understanding of substantive and procedural law;
(b) Legal analysis and reasoning, legal research, problem-solving, and written and oral communication in the legal context;
(c) Exercise of proper professional and ethical responsibilities to clients and the legal system; and
(d) Other professional skills needed for competent and ethical participation as a member of the legal profession, including the tools needed to promote personal and professional well-being.

Standard 303. CURRICULUM
(a) A law school shall offer a curriculum that requires each student to satisfactorily complete at least the following:
(1) one course of at least two credit hours in professional responsibility that includes substantial instruction in rules of professional conduct, and the values and responsibilities of the legal profession and its members;
(2) one writing experience in the first year and at least one additional writing experience after the first year, both of which are faculty supervised; and
(3) one or more experiential course(s) totaling at least six credit hours. An experiential course must be a simulation course, a law clinic, or a field placement as defined in Standard 304.

Interpretation 303-5
Mental health and substance use should play a more prominent role in the required course on professional responsibility. A minimum of one class session should be dedicated to the topic of substance use and mental health issues, during which bar examiners and professional responsibility professors or their designee (such as a lawyer assistance program representative) appear side-by-side to address the issues.

Standard 508. STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES
A law school shall provide all its students, regardless of enrollment or scheduling option, with basic student services, including maintenance of accurate student records, academic advising and counseling, financial aid and debt counseling, substance use and mental health counseling, and career counseling to assist students in making sound career choices and obtaining employment. If a law school does not provide these student services directly, it shall demonstrate that its students have reasonable access to such services from the university of which it is a part or from other sources.
Towards More Reasonably Just Grading Systems at American Bar Association (ABA) Accredited Law Schools

November 2018 ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar Council meeting

Standards Review Sub-Committee

Re: ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools ideas and suggestions

Wells O’Byrne
wells.obyrne@gmail.com
October 29th, 2018
Current problem: Forced arbitrary grading curves at ABA accredited law schools lack basic elements of equity and reasonableness

- Forced arbitrary grading curves at many ABA accredited law schools cause students attending these law schools to lack reasonable certainty that the students’ grades will reasonably reflect the students’ objective performance\(^1\)
  - This can meaningfully deprive ABA accredited law schools’ students and graduates of employment liberty, psychological stability (life), and potential future wages (property)
  - The students’ and graduates’ potential losses from law-school grading-system inequities can be especially grievous since law school often costs three precious years of young adulthood, over a hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and substantial opportunity costs of alternate career paths
  - Forced arbitrary grading curves at ABA accredited law schools arguably lack the due-process requirement of reasonableness

- ABA accredited law schools’ current potentially substantial deprivation of their students’ and graduates’ life, liberty and property through the schools’ forced arbitrary grading curves is especially problematic given that more reasonably just and objective grading-system alternatives exist
  - The Uniform Bar Examination and the California First-Year Law Students’ Examination’s standardized content and reasonably objective assessment methods offer potentially useful models for assessing student performance in ABA accredited law-school core-curriculum courses

Current problem: Forced arbitrary grading curves at ABA accredited law schools lack basic elements of equity and reasonableness, cont.

- Moreover, the forced average curves also disincentivize collaboration among law students that law schools hopefully aspire to encourage among their students and graduates
  - Forced grade-average curves arguably promote zero-sum thinking and the associated anti-collaborative behavior among law-school students and hence potentially also law-school graduates
  - Such behavior can contribute to a negative modern view of lawyers by most Americans
  - This is the opposite of the collaborative behavior that law schools should want to foster in their students and graduates, whom society has traditionally entrusted with upholding the foundations of peace and collaboration
  - Fostering collaboration among law students would help law schools produce graduates who not only know how to write and think about the law, but also represent clients, their alma maters, and the legal profession well
  - Such collaboration may be increasingly important to foster in the modern era given the recent rise of collaborative legal initiatives such as alternative dispute resolution and “virtual law firms” that work largely in the cloud

- Given that time-tested reasonably objective assessment core legal content assessment methods exist, it would be relatively straightforward for ABA accredited law schools to eliminate zero-sum thinking grading-system incentives that are arguably at least partially responsible for any anti-collaborative behavior in the formative years of law school

---

1 See, e.g., https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zero-sum_thinking


Proposed ABA Accredited Law School Grading System:
Outline

• To ensure consistent core-curriculum course content and grade reliability across years and course sections, each ABA accredited law school would establish a Curriculum and Examination Board that would set and approve exams, curriculum, and assessment criteria

• The two main proposed assessment models below would both bring ABA accredited law-school grading systems the much-needed elements of consistency, and transparency, and reasonable objectivity that the due-process requirement of reasonableness arguably requires

• In one potential assessment model, ABA accredited law schools would choose at least two examiners to grade each exam or other major course assessment according to the school’s Curriculum and Examination Board approved assessment criteria
  • For grade and curriculum comparability across schools, ABA accredited law schools would publish their core curriculum exams, course material, and assessment criteria annually
  • At least two examiners for exams or other major course assessments would help protect against the potential inherent bias of a single examiner
  • Examiners would likely consist of a course’s professor and a colleague and/or other qualified volunteers such as alumni and/or community members
  • Such volunteer alumni and/or community examiners could help offset such a system’s potential additional financial costs, as well as help ABA accredited law schools build alumni and community relations
  • Consistent with standardized assessment best practices, if the two examiners’ grades resulted in more than a third of a difference in letter grades, a third examiner would score the exam and a grade reconciliation process would ensue

• In a second potential assessment model, ABA accredited law schools could assess students in core-curriculum classes through an as-yet determined standardized test based on a widely accepted model such as the Uniform Bar Exam and/or the California First-Year Law Students’ Examination
  • ABA accredited law schools could be able to choose which core-curriculum assessment model(s) to implement
Proposed ABA Accredited Law School Grading System: Potential Benefits

- **Greater collaboration among ABA accredited law-school students and graduates**
  - Because ABA law-school students’ attainment of good grades would not harm their classmates’ abilities to also attain good grades under reasonably objective student assessment models such as those described above, students at these schools would have greater incentives to study more collaboratively than under the current forced grading curves
  - Such greater collaboration could elevate these law students’ social skills, information retention, and examination performance\(^1\)
  - This improved student collaboration at ABA accredited law schools would also arguably foster greater collaboration among ABA accredited law-school graduates, thus contributing to changing the currently largely negative public view of American lawyers mentioned above

- **Improved equity in ABA accredited law-school grading systems and hence the market for law-school graduates**
  - By bringing the due-process reasonableness elements of consistency, transparency, and reasonable objectivity to current ABA accredited law-school grading systems, law-student assessment models such as those proposed above could substantially enhance ABA accredited law-school grading-system equity
  - Such improved grading-system equity could substantially reduce wrong hires in the market for graduates of ABA accredited law schools, thereby improving that market’s efficiency
  - This greater market efficiency for graduates of ABA accredited law schools could meaningfully improve ABA accredited law-school graduates’ abilities to lead rewarding personal lives as well as to deliver quality professional goods and services
  - This would arguably further contribute to enhancing the American public’s view of lawyers

• **Enhanced trust in our nation’s system of laws and government**
  • Because law schools often play formative roles in shaping their students’ and graduates’ conceptions of how the legal system works, grading-system fairness at ABA accredited law schools can arguably substantially influence these schools’ students’ and graduates’ perceptions of the U.S. legal system’s basic fairness
  • More reasonably just law-school grading systems such as those proposed above would therefore arguably promote greater trust in the justice and fairness of our nation’s legal system among law-school students and graduates
  • Law-school students’ and graduates’ trust in the legal system’s fairness can substantially influence the extent and nature of their collaboration in the legal services market¹
  • By improving law-school graduates’ delivery of products and services, the increased collaboration and trust in the legal system’s fairness among ABA accredited law-school students and graduates that would arguably result from the proposed grading system reforms described above could also contribute to improving broader public trust in the U.S. system of laws and government, which has been declining in recent years²


²More information about this trend is available at:
Proposed ABA Accredited Law School Grading System: Prospective Implementation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Proposed timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot program at select volunteer ABA accredited law school(s)</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review pilot program: ABA and volunteer school(s)’ faculty input</td>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand pilot program</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full new grading system implementation</td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A Blueprint for a Fairer ABA Standard for Judging Law Graduates’ Competence:
How A Standard Based On Students’ Scores in Relation to the National Mean MBE Score Properly Balances Consumer Safety with Increased Diversity in the Bar
William Wesley Patton*

ABSTRACT
Current and recently proposed American Bar Association (“ABA.”) standards regarding students’ bar passage rates have a significant disparate impact on states that have adopted difficult bar examination passage standards (the Multistate Bar Exam (“MBE” cut scores). Many scholars have demonstrated that the ABA. bar passage standards have a negative impact on diversity in the bar by discouraging law schools from enrolling large numbers of minority students, who have, traditionally, performed below state mean in passage rates on the exam. This study presents a new and supplemental standard for the ABA. to use in monitoring student outcome measures and law schools’ quality of instruction: a comparison of law schools’ mean MBE scores in relation to the national mean MBE score. This new metric levels the playing field among all law schools irrespective of state MBE cut scores, provides an incentive to increase diversity in the bar, and provides significant consumer protection.

INTRODUCTION
The American Bar Association (“ABA.”) Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admission to the Bar’s 2016–2017 proposed modification of ABA. Standard 316, or bar passage standard, was recently rejected by the ABA. House of Delegates after many opponents demonstrated the modification’s probable impact on diversity.¹ Many law schools with highly diverse student populations would have had great difficulty meeting the proposed 75% bar passage’s two-year

* Professor Emeritus, Whittier Law School; Assistant Clinical Vol. Professor, UCLA David Geffen School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry; Lecturer in Law, U.S.C. Gould School of Law.
¹ See Karen Sloan & Celia Ampel, ABA Rejects Tougher Bar Passage Rule for Law Schools, NAT'L L. J., Feb. 6, 2017, LEXIS (describing the effects of testimony given at the ABA’s midyear meeting by law school deans and diversity advocates opposing the proposed measure to modify ABA. Standard 316).
standard. Several opponents have further demonstrated that the proposed bar passage standard would have a severe and disproportionate impact on law schools in states like California that have significantly higher bar passage standards that include Multistate Bar Examination (“MBE”), which cut scores higher than the national mean cut score.

It is critical that the ABA promulgate a way to measure student outcome that does not needlessly decrease diversity in the bar. For instance, according to the United States Census, the percentage of Hispanics in California increased from 32.4% in 2000 to 37.6% in 2010 and comprised 38.9% of the California population in 2016. According to the California State Bar Association, Hispanics comprised 3% of California’s attorneys in 1991, 3.7% in 2001, and 3.8% in 2006. In 2011, the

---

2 See id. (referring to the statistic that “minorities on average score lower on the Law School Admissions Test, which is often viewed as a predictor of future bar exam performance”); see, e.g., Notice and Comment Archive, ABA, https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/resources/notice_and_comment/notice_comment_archive.html (last visited Oct. 15, 2017) [hereinafter Notice and Comment Archive] (providing access to many empirical analyses in opposition to proposed Standard 316) (on file with the Washington & Lee Journal of Civil Rights & Social Justice).

3 See Sloan, supra note 1 (noting that the overall bar pass rate in California has “plummeted” over the last three years, which puts law schools in California at risk of losing their ABA accreditations).


6 See HERTZ RESEARCH, FINAL REPORT OF RESULTS, MEMBER SERVICES SURVEY 12 (2006) (providing the demographic makeup of the California State Bar); see also RICHARD HERTZ CONSULTING, FINAL REPORT, CALIFORNIA BAR JOURNAL SURVEY 4 (2001) (indicating that the growth in California State Bar membership among Hispanics from 1991 to 2001 was smaller than the growth rate among Asians).
most recent survey, Hispanics comprised only 4.2% of California attorneys. There are currently 189,187 attorneys licensed to practice law in California. But, based on the 2011 survey results, only 7,837, or 4.2%, are Hispanic attorneys despite the fact that there are approximately 14,013,719 Hispanics living in California. In 2003, Hispanics composed the largest group of individuals that were served by at least one form of low income access to justice programs in California, with 39% accessing these services.

This Article presents several new empirical analyses demonstrating the fundamental unfairness of using the ABA.’s one-size-fits-all bar passage standard for accreditation and proposes the addition of a new and alternative standard that better balances the ABA.’s complimentary goals of consumer protection, quality legal education, and increased diversity in the bar:

At least 75% of a law school’s graduates in a calendar year who sat for a bar examination must have either passed a bar examination

---

7 See Hertz Research, Summary Results, Survey of Members of the State Bar of California 8 (2011) (hereinafter Hertz Research) (indicating the percentage of California State Bar members amongst the 1,820 survey respondents that categorized their “ethnic or racial background” as “Latino/Hispanic”; but see Hertz Research, Summary Results, Survey of Members of the State Bar of California at 10 (explaining that “the margin of sampling error would be approximately plus or minus three percent, with a confidence level of 95 percent,” and that “[t]he margin of sampling error for subgroups of respondents is higher than it is for the overall results”).


9 See Ennis et al., supra note 4 (listing the Hispanic or Latino population for California as found in the 2010 census).

10 See Ctr. for Family, Children & the Courts, Admin. Office of the Courts, Judicial Council of Cal., Equal Access Fund: A Report to the California Legislature 54 (2005) (noting that Hispanics or Latinos are the largest group served by partnership projects, which are self-help centers staffed by attorneys “generally available to provide assistance to persons with limited or no reading and writing proficiency and to persons with limited or no English language proficiency”).
administered within four years of their date of graduation, or the law school’s mean MBE score must be within “X” standard deviations from the national mean MBE score for three out of the last five years.

The appropriate “X” standard deviation from the national MBE mean will be determined after the ABA compiles sufficient data on the annual MBE mean scores for each ABA law school in each state. Although some states, such as California, already compile MBE score data for all in-state law schools, as of February 2017, the National Conference of Bar Examiners (NCBE) will supply all ABA law schools with that MBE data. Setting the appropriate standard deviation is a policy issue based upon the ABA’s decision regarding students’ minimal acceptable mean MBE

11 Although I do not agree with the ABA legal education council’s 75% in two years rule and have written several empirical analyses that demonstrate how that standard will reduce diversity in bar in states with high MBE cut scores, I propose an alternative standard of 75% in four years rather than the current ABA. Standard 316 of 75% in five years. See Notice and Comment Archive, supra note 2 (providing links to author’s empirical research in opposition to the 75% in two year rule).

12 See 2015 Statistics, THE BAR EXAMINER, 1, 39 (Mar. 2016), http://www.ncbex.org/assets/media_files/Bar-Examiner/articles/2016/BE-March2016-2015Statistics.pdf (using a shaded map of the United States to indicate which states use and do not use the MBE, showing that Louisiana is the only state that does not use the MBE) (on file with the Washington & Lee Journal of Civil Rights & Social Justice); see 2015 Statistics at 25 (indicating the Louisiana bar passage right for first-time takers is 69%); see also Managing Director’s Guidance Memo, ABA. SEC. OF LEGAL EDUC. & ADMISSIONS TO THE B. 1 (Aug. 2016) (indicating that the score standard proposed conforms with ABA standard 316) (emphasis added).

13 See Request for State Bar Records from William Patton, Professor Emeritus, Whittier Law School; Assistant Vol Professor, UCLA David Geffen School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry, to the Comm. of Bar Exam’r of the State Bar of Cal. (Jan. 6, 2017) (requesting information on California law schools’ bar examination results from 2005-2015 contained in “Supplemental Statistics Report”) (on file with the Washington & Lee Journal of Civil Rights & Social Justice); see also Letter from the California State Bar to William Patton (Jan. 17, 2016) (indicating agreement to provide the data for a cost of $8.60) (on file with the Washington & Lee Journal of Civil Rights & Social Justice).

14 See Letter from Erica Moeser, President, National Conference of Bar Examiners, to Law School Deans (August 31, 2016) (“[W]e [, NCBE,] will be releasing information to the jurisdictions that will show the national percentile into which individual examinees fall in each of the seven MBE subjects . . . [and] the decision about whether to release this information to examinees belongs to the jurisdictions.”) (on file with the Washington & Lee Journal of Civil Rights & Social Justice).
scores as a proxy for attorney competency and the quality of law schools’ program in legal education.\textsuperscript{15}

Assume, for example, that in our hypothetical sample there are 10 law schools. School I has a mean 2017 MBE score of 160.0, School II 155.0, School III 152.5, school IV 148.5, school V 145.0, School VI 139.5, School VII 135.5, School VIII 134.0, School IX 133.0, and School X 132.0. The mean of all ten schools would be 143.5. A standard deviation from that 143.5 mean is 10.14. Therefore, under a “one standard deviation rule,” any school with a mean 2017 MBE score below 133.36 would fail to meet the annual national mean MBE score. In this example, Schools IX and X scored below 133.36 and would be considered out of compliance for 2017. Since two out of the ten schools are out of compliance, there is a 20% failure rate under the proposed ABA standard. The ABA may determine that a much lower failure rate provides sufficient consumer protection.\textsuperscript{16} If so, the ABA could easily modify the standard deviation from that mean. For instance, if a standard


\textsuperscript{16} In order to determine how many standard deviations from the mean the ABA. standard should employ we need to first obtain from the National Conference of Bar Examiners [NCBE] the annual MBE mean scores for each ABA. approved law school. With those numbers one can determine whether the curve is bell-shaped or non-bell shaped. If the curve is bell shaped, then under a “within 2 standard deviations from the national mean MBE score” it is expected that 95% of ABA. approved law schools will meet that standard annually, and if a “within 3 standard deviations from the national mean MBE score” is used then 99.7% of schools would meet the standard. However, there is a chance that individual ABA. schools’ mean MBE scores will not fall on a bell-shaped curve. In that case, an alternative called the “Chebyshev’s Rule or Theorem” would be used to determine the number of standard deviations from the norm to calculate the appropriate ABA. standard. Under the “Chebyshev’s Rule it may require a modification of the standard deviation chosen. See generally B.G. AMIDAN ET AL., DATA OUTLIER PROTECTION USING THE CHEBYSHEV THEOREM (2005), https://www.researchgate.net/publication/224624985_Data_outlier_detection_using_the_Chebyshev_theorem (on file with the Washington & Lee Journal of Civil Rights & Social Justice).
deviation of 1.1 were used (11.16), or a required mean score of 132.34, only School X would violate the standard and only 1 in 10 schools, or 10% would be out of compliance for 2017. Because under the proposed ABA standard a law school is only out of compliance if it fails to achieve the annual mean MBE score in three out of the last five years, none of the ten law schools in the sample would lose ABA accreditation based solely on its failure to meet the 2017 national mean MBE score.

Part I of this Paper discusses the benefits of including the national mean MBE score as a proxy for determining whether ABA accredited law schools are truly providing students with an education sufficient to enable them to pass the state bar examination. Part II presents an empirical analysis of four California ABA accredited law schools that admit a high percentage of minority law students and that have frequently scored in the bottom quarter of California ABA law schools on the California bar examination. The study demonstrates that those four law schools’ students usually meet or exceed the national mean MBE score and meet, or exceed, state MBE bar examination cut scores needed to pass other states’ bar examinations. Part III demonstrates the need to have a two-part student outcome model, as only using a standard deviation from the national mean will impact some

---

18 See infra Part II (demonstrating that California law schools admit a high percentage of minority law students and that those students generally score lower than other California law students on the bar).
19 Id.
law schools with very high minority/ethnic populations who score lower than the national mean MBE score, but who nonetheless pass the bar examination. Part IV discusses new empirical evidence that demonstrates the current and the Council’s rejected proposed bar passage standards disproportionately impact law schools that provide students with lower entering LSAT and GPA’s a “value-added” education defined as performance that meets or exceeds the annual national mean MBE score. This new empirical study compares California ABA law schools with several New York law schools in terms of students’ entering credentials and their bar passage rates. Part V presents several empirical studies that demonstrate the devastating impact on diversity in the legal profession if the ABA substantially increases its bar examination standards similarly to the Council’s recent rejected proposal. Finally, Part VI presents a blueprint for obtaining the evidence needed to determine the appropriate standard deviation from the national mean MBE score that will protect the public by demonstrating law student competency, ensure that student consumers receive a quality legal education, and permit an increase in attorney diversity. In addition, prospective law student consumers will have sufficient information regarding each law schools’ mean MBE score to determine whether attending a particular law school meets that student’s goal of practicing in any particular state.21

20 See infra Part III (showing that schools with high minority populations generally have a lower mean MBE score than other schools).
21 See infra Part VI (explaining how the purposed method will help law students choose their school). For instance:
I. The Bar Examination Landscape Is Radically Changing, and a New Standard for Judging Law Students’ Competency that Levels the Playing Field Among All ABA Law Schools Must Be Promulgated.

Until recently, state bar examinations differed greatly in structure and in content.\textsuperscript{22} It was impossible for the ABA to promulgate a student competency outcome standard that compared all law schools using a single measure. The historical student competency proxy chosen by the ABA included law schools’ bar passage rates, as that data was easily obtained and reported.\textsuperscript{23} The problem, of course, was that bar examination passage rates were principally determined by the “cut scores” chosen by state supreme courts and state bar associations\textsuperscript{24} rather than a comparative assessment of students to a national standardized examination like in Medical School accreditation.\textsuperscript{25} The radical difference in states’ bar examination

If state X has an MBE cut score of 138, but a school in that state the student is considering only has a mean MBE score of 135, the student may not choose to take the risk of passing that state’s bar exam. However, under the identical hypothetical, if the student wants to practice in another state with an MBE cut score of 133, attending the school with a mean MBE of 135 would not provide a disincentive for the student to attend that law school.

\textit{Id.} \textsuperscript{22} \textsuperscript{22} See generally Roger M. Jarvis, \textit{An Anecdotal History of the Bar Exam}, 9 GEO. J. LEGAL ETHICS 359 (1996) (providing a history of the bar examination in the United States); see also Michael K. McChrystal, \textit{Legitimizing Realities: State-Based Bar Admission, National Standards, and Multistate Practice}, 3 GEO. J. LEGAL ETHICS 533 (1990) (“States differ in their application of criteria in that they sometimes apply the same criterion with differing rigor.”); see also Dorothy E. Finnegan, \textit{Raising and Leveling the Bar: Standards, Access, and the YMCA Evening Law Schools, 1890-1940}, 55 J. LEGAL EDUC. 208, 227 (2005) (explaining how prior to the ABA, gaining authority, some states permitted students “gain admittance to the bar by right of their graduation.”).


\textsuperscript{25} See generally ASS’N AM. MED. C., https://www.aamc.org/members/osr/committees/48814
passage “cut scores” continues today, and according to the NCBE the current MBE cut scores range from 129 (Wisconsin) to 145 (Delaware), and the national mean cut score is 134.26 State bar examination passing “cut scores” are sometimes promulgated without significant empirical analysis.27 For instance, recently “responding in an Assembly Judiciary Committee hearing, [California] State Bar executive director Elizabeth Rindskopf Parker said there was “no good reason” for California's higher standard.”28 As demonstrated throughout this Article, in Sections III, IV, and V, a one-size-fits all bar examination ABA passage rate unfairly places law schools in jurisdictions with very high cut scores at a serious disadvantage in relation to all other ABA law schools and provides an incentive for

those high cut score law schools to limit access to the bar for students, including many Black and Hispanic students, who have lower LSAT/GPA scores but who have a probability of passing a bar examination in almost every state. It is important to remember that the current ABA bar passage standard does not require a specific bar passage rate based on students’ in-state bar examination passage rates, but permits schools to cumulate their students’ bar passage rates from all state bar exams.\(^{29}\)

We are now in a transitional bar examination period.\(^{30}\) Almost all states’ bar examinations continue to become more similar.\(^{31}\) Today, twenty-five states have adopted the Uniform Bar Examination (UBE) and most of the other states have bar exams have an almost identical format, which includes: (1) the Multi-State Bar Exam (MBE), that includes 200 multiple-choice questions written by the NCBE; (2) an essay portion written by either the state bar or the NCBE; and (3) a performance section written either by the state bar or the NCBE.\(^{32}\) The MBE is the single

\(^{29}\) See ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure, supra note 17 (articulating specific requirements in order to pass the bar). The standard states:

In demonstrating compliance under sections (1)(i) and (ii), the school must report bar passage results from as many jurisdictions as necessary to account for at least 70 percent of its graduates each year, starting with the jurisdiction in which the highest number of graduates took the bar exam and proceeding in descending order of frequency.


\(^{31}\) See id. (“What seemed very unlikely, if not impossible, in 1995 has now flowered into reality, with 25 jurisdictions having adopted the UBE.”); see also Dianne F. Bosse, A Uniform Bar
element of bar testing that is shared by all state bar examinations except
Louisiana. Unlike in the past, the United States now has objective tests to
measure law students’ competency, and virtually all law students attending all
accredited law schools in the nation must take. There is no longer the need to
only use bar examination passage rates as the sole proxy for judging law students’
competency and law schools’ quality of instruction. Abandoning bar examination
passage rates and only adopting a national mean MBE standard will detrimentally
affect diversity in law schools, located in states with lower bar passage cut scores,
such as Atlanta John Marshall whose students usually perform below the national
mean MBE score, but who pass the Georgia bar examination at very high rates
and become productive members of the bar. In order to level the playing field
among law schools in different states, my proposal is to use the national mean MBE
score, creating an ABA Standard that can be met either by demonstrating a
particular bar passage rate or a successful mean MBE scoring pattern.

Examination: The Journey From Idea To Tipping Point, 85 B. EXAMINER NO. 3, at 19, 23 (Sept. 2016)
http://www.ncbex.org/pdfviewer/?file=%2Fassets%2Fmedia_files%2FBarExaminer%2FArticles%2F2016%2FBE-Bosse-850316.pdf (stating that 25 jurisdictions have adopted the UBE) (on file with the


34 See generally Moeser, supra note 31; see generally Bosse, supra note 32.


Some may object to placing so much emphasis on MBE scores in formulating an ABA student bar examination outcome measure. They allege that the MBE is as biased against women and minorities as are similar multiple-choice examinations such as the MCAT and LSAT. The NCBE has admitted that women and minorities perform worse on the MBE than white males. Susan M. Case, one of the NCBE’s psychometricians, found that “men outperform women on the MBE by about 5 points, which is about 1/3 of a standard deviation . . . .” The NCBE’s study of the 2005 and 2006 New York bar examination demonstrated a significant gender

---

37 See Dwight Davis et. al., Do Racial and Ethnic Group Differences in Performance on the MCAT Reflect Test Bias?, 88 ACAD. MED. 593 (2013) (discussing bias and/or predictability of the MCAT); see generally Mohammadreza Hojat et. al., Close But No Bananas: Predicting Performance, 75 ACAD. MED. S28 (2000); see generally Clara A. Callahan et. al., The Predictive Validity of Three Versions of the MCAT in Relation to Performance in Medical School, Residency, and Licensing Examinations: A Longitudinal Study of 36 Classes of Jefferson Medical College, 85 ACAD. MED. 980 (2010); see generally Tyrone Donnon, The Predictive Validity of the MCAT for Medical School Performance and Medical Board Licensing Examinations: A Meta-Analysis of the Published Research, 82 ACAD. MED. 100 (2007); see Vernellia R. Randal, The Misuse of the LSAT: Discrimination Against Blacks and Other Minorities in Law School Admissions, 80 ST. JOHN’S L. REV. 107 (2006) (debating the bias and predictability of the LSAT); see also Alex M. Johnson, Jr., Knots in the Pipeline For Prospective Lawyers of Color: The LSAT is Not the Problem and Affirmative Action Is Not the Answer, 24 STAN. L. & POL’Y REV. 379 (2013) (looking at how the race of students sitting for the LSAT as well as other factors has created a need to increase the number of diverse and underrepresented individuals in law school); see also Scott Johns, Testing the Testers: The National Conference of Bar Examiner’s LSAT Claim and a Roller Coaster Bar Exam Ride, 35 Miss. C. L. Rev. 436 (2017) (explaining how student’s LSAT score corresponds with their bar exam score); see also Katherine L. Vaughns, Towards Parity in Bar Passage Rates and Law School Performance: Exploring the Sources of Disparities Between Racial and Ethnic Groups, 16 T. MARSHALL L. REV. 425, 431 (1991) (studying the low passage bar examination passage rates of minorities and whether intervention programs are effective); see also Leslie G. Espinoza, The LSAT: Narratives and Bias, 1 AM. U. J. GENDER & L. 121 (1993) (discussing how “only through the exposure and disclosure of standardized tests that true eradication of bias can occur.”).


39 Id.
difference on the MBE score results. The MBE mean for men was 635.72 and 614.60 for women. The NCBE has also stated that Hispanic and Black test takers perform lower on the MBE, but the NCBE has determined that lower scores are predicted by objective non-biased factors such as minority students’ lower LSAT and LGPA performance, indicating that “[m]inority performance on the MBE is not materially better or worse than it is on other portions of the bar examination.”

The NCBE found that in a study of repeat takers on the New York bar examination that Black test takers’ MBE scores only increased an average of 4.8 points compared to the all takers repeater increase of 15 points. Stephen P. Klein, a psychometrician who has worked with the NCBE and state bar associations for decades, concurs with the NCBE conclusion that the MBE is not racially biased, but

40 Michael Kane et al., New York Bar Examination Performance in February and July 2006 for Candidates Failing for the First Time in July 2005 (2007) (examining and comparing the bar passage rates based on several factors, such as gender).
41 Id. at 44.
43 Kane, supra, note 38, at 44.
rather reflects differences in students’ LSAT and LGPA statistics. Critics have argued that other data demonstrates that the NCBE and Klein conclusions regarding the correlation between LSAT, LGPA, and the MBE is erroneous and have demonstrated that increases in MBE scores and bar passage rates have occurred even when students’ LSAT scores decreased.


45 See Nicholas Georgakopoulos, Bar Passage: GPA and LSAT, Not Bar Reviews, 9–10 Robert H. McKinney School of Law Legal Studies Research Paper No. 2013-30, 2013 (finding that the LSAT is a weak indicator of bar passage and that LGPA is the best indicator, the “LSAT is overweighted compared to other, less univariate academic metrics such as a broad view of not only UGPA but college quality and college major . . . ”); see Alexia Brunet Marks & Scott A. Moss, What Predicts Law Student Success: A Longitudinal Study Correlating Law Student Applicant Data and Law School Outcomes, 13 J. OF EMPIRICAL LEG. STUDIES 205, 256 (2016) (discussing how having a high LSAT score and a low undergraduate GPA might not be a significant predictor to high law school grades); see generally William C. Kidder, The Bar Examination and the Dream Deferred: A Critical Analysis of the MBE, Social Closure, and Racial and Ethnic Stratification, 29 L. & SOCIAL INQUIRY 547 (2004) (concluding that “the psychometric research sponsored by the National Conference of Bar Examiners consistently minimizes and obscures the disparate impact and unfairness of the bar exam for people of color”); see also Kathryn Rubino, Surprise! Despite All Expectations To The Contrary, Bar Exam Scores Went Up This Year!, ABOVE THE LAW (2016), http://abovethelaw.com/2016/09/surprise-despite-all-expectations-explaining-that-even-though-students-LSAT-scores-remained-on-a-downward-adjournment-the-national-mean-MBE-score-increased-from-139-9-in-july-2015-to-140-3-in-july-2016/ (on file with the Washington & Lee Journal of Civil Rights & Social Justice); see also Paul Caron, July 2016 Bar Exam Scores Rise, But Remain Near All-Time Low Amidst Declining LSAT Scores (2016), taxprof.typepad.com/taxprof_blog/2016/09/merrittmbe-scores-rise-in-2016.html (stating that increased preparation by law schools is the most likely cause of rising MBE scores) (on file with the Washington & Lee Journal of Civil Rights & Social Justice).
Neither the NCBE nor Klein has discussed another inherent bias in the current bar examination. “Selection bias” is defined as when “persons receiving treatment . . . . systemically differ in unmeasured but relevant ways from those who not receive that treatment . . . . [and] [s]election bias exists only to the extent that variables that affect outcomes, or good proxies for them, are not included in a model.”46 For instance, a particular testing mechanism, such as an oral examination, may assist to level the playing field for minority applicants, but that testing component may be rejected based on “feasibility” or “the degree to which the assessment method selected is affordable and efficient for the testing purpose . . . .”47 In one study Klein found that Black student performance on the California bar examination was improved when an “oral task” section was added to the exam. On the “oral task” section “blacks earned about the same average score as Asians and Latinos . . . .”48 Klein rejected the inclusion of an “oral task” section on the California bar due to costs, exam security, extended time for score reporting, and reliability.49 Therefore, the California Bar Examination includes selection bias because it omits oral tasks as a testing method, that might close the scoring gap

49 See id. (outlining many ways in which oral tasks contribute to bias on the bar exam).
among different racial/ethnic groups, and which artificially depresses certain minorities comparative bar examination scores.\(^{50}\)

States’ use of MBE scores may further lower minorities’ bar examination scores through the bar scaling process.\(^{51}\) The NCBE states that since the MBE is consistently more reliable than the essay portion of the bar that the essay must be “scaled” to the MBE: “Scaling the written scores to the MBE takes advantage of the equating done to MBE scores so that MBE scores have a constant interpretation across test administrations.”\(^{52}\) The problem is that even though scaling does not have an impact on the percentage of examinees who fail, the particular examinees that fail will be different from those who would fail strictly from the MBE alone.\(^{53}\) Therefore, scaling together with a state’s determination of the weight of the MBE on the grading process may impact which students fail the bar examination.\(^{54}\)

Other evidence demonstrates that students’ increases in scaled mean essay scores increase more than their scaled mean MBE scores on repeat bar examinations.\(^{55}\) In a study of Texas bar examination repeat test takers, Klein found

\(^{50}\) See id. (stating that oral tasks are not permitted as a testing method on the California bar examination).

\(^{51}\) See Mark A. Albanese, The Testing Column: Scaling: It’s Not Just For Fish or Mountains, 83 THE B. EXAMINER, Dec. 2014 (explaining how and why written portions of the MBE should be scaled).

\(^{52}\) Id. at 50.

\(^{53}\) See id. at 55 (“The purpose of scaling raw multiple choice scores is to adjust these scores for possible variations in average questions difficulty from one exam to the next because most of the questions asked on one exam are not the same as those asked on a prior exam.”).

\(^{54}\) See id. (“While combining the scaled essay scores with the MBE scores will not have an impact on the percentage of examinees who fail, the particular examinees who fail will be different from those who would fail strictly from the MBE alone.”).

\(^{55}\) See Stephen P. Klein & Roger Bolus, Initial and Eventual Passing Rates of July 2004 First Timers at 3, GANSK & ASSOCIATES (June 9, 2006) (stating that the “mean total scores increased with each attempt [of the bar exam], but the magnitude of the increase varied between attempts; with the largest differences occurring between the last two tries”).
a scaled mean essay score increase of 8.9 in students’ second bar exam but only a
scaled mean increase of 6.2 on the MBE. There is currently no discernable
empirical evidence that studies the differential mean MBE and essay exam scores
among law schools in individual states, and no evidence of whether the comparison
of mean MBE and mean Essay scores are different for schools that admit a large
percentage of minority students. The following study analyzes the relative MBE
mean and Essay mean scores for five California ABA law schools that historically
have admitted a high percentage of racial/ethnic students.

### TABLE 1
A COMPARISON OF MEAN MBE AND MEAN ESSAY SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Exam Date</th>
<th>First Time Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate</td>
<td>Feb. 2014</td>
<td>1396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>Feb. 2014</td>
<td>1443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern</td>
<td>Feb. 2014</td>
<td>1446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jefferson</td>
<td>Feb. 2014</td>
<td>1417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>Feb. 2014</td>
<td>1543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western State</td>
<td>Feb. 2014</td>
<td>1512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>1414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>1405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>1412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jefferson</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>1416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>1506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western State</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>1433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56 See id. (demonstrating that an increased mean essay score can increase more than a scaled
MBE score).

57 See Request for State Bar Records from William Patton, supra note 13 [hereinafter Table 1]
(requesting information on California law schools’ bar examination results from 2005–2015
contained in “Supplemental Statistics Report”).
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Table 1 demonstrates that the six California ABA law schools with the highest percentages of Hispanic and Black law students typically score a much higher mean on the Essay section of the California Bar Examination than on the MBE section. Although Table 1 includes only four administrations of the California Bar Examination, these six law schools scored higher means on the Essay than on the MBE on eighteen out of twenty-four, or 75%, of the administrations of the California bar examination. In addition, the examination results for La Verne are surprising, and inconsistent, with Klein’s and the NCBE’s research, finding that MBE scores are predicted by students’ LSAT scores.58

58 See Stephen P. Klein, An Analysis of Possible Variations in Pass/Fail Standards on the California Bar Examination at 4, GANSK & ASSOCIATES (Jan. 15, 1981) (stating that there is “a strong correlation between [students’] MBE and essay scores . . . .” and “the differences among racial/ethnic groups are just as large on the MBE . . . . as they are on the essay and Performance sections . . . .”) [hereinafter An Analysis of Possible Variations in Pass/Fail Standards]; see also Stephen P. Klein, An Evaluation of the Multistate Bar Examination, GANSK & ASSOCIATES (Aug. 30, 1982) at 3 (“MBE scores correlate well with scores on state developed essay and multiple choice bar examination . . . .”); see also Klein, supra note at 46 (stating that “the differences among racial/ethnic groups are just as large on the MBE . . . . as they are on the essay and Performance sections . . . .”); see generally William C. Kidder, The Bar Examination and the Dream Deferred: A Critical Analysis of the MBE, Social Closure and Racial and Ethnic Stratification, 29 LAW & SOC. INQUIRY 547 (2004)
Verne outscored the other five California ABA law schools on the MBE for every administration of the test. As demonstrated in Table 2, the entering median LSAT scores for La Verne students were lower than those of Southwestern, Golden Gate, Whittier, and Western State, and only one point higher than those of Thomas Jefferson. The La Verne MBE data adds to the growing research demonstrating that there may not be a direct or predictive relationship between the LSAT and MBE and bar passage. The La Verne MBE mean anomaly warrants further investigation to determine whether it has identified pedagogical methodologies that increase at risk students’ bar examination performance.

Even in light of the MBE’s potential differential impact on women and minorities there are three central reasons for selecting the national mean MBE score as an ABA standard for assessing law students’ competency and the quality of law school pedagogy. First, all jurisdictions, except Louisiana, already use the MBE, and it is unlikely that the MBE will be abandoned as a part of bar testing.

(rebutting both Klein’s and the NCBE’s explanations of racial/ethnic disparities on bar examinations).

59 See Table 1, supra note 55 (showing MBE scores from 2014–2015).
60 See ABA Required Disclosures, ABA. SEC. OF LEGAL EDUC. & ADMISSIONS TO THE B., http://www.abarequireddisclosures.org (last visited Oct. 19, 2017) (allowing one to search the database and find that the LSAT medians in 2013 were: Southwestern 152, Golden Gate 150, Whittier 149, Western State 150, Thomas Jefferson 146, and La Verne 147) (on file with the Washington & Lee Journal of Civil Rights & Social Justice).
62 See To The Legal Community and Interested Members of the Public: Request for Comment, SUP. CT. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE UNIFORM B. EXAMINATION 1 (Oct. 28, 2015), http://www.nj
Further, the MBE is the only standard currently being used by almost every state for determining minimal attorney competence, the ultimate goal of attorney licensing testing.64

Second, if the MBE is biased against women and minorities, the proposed ABA standard can correct for that bias by selecting the appropriate standard deviation from the national MBE mean score as an appropriate accreditation standard.65 If it is recognized that inherent in the MBE is both selection bias and performance differential, one can peg the standard deviation from the national MBE mean sufficiently to effectively mediate for effects that could lead some law schools to lower admission rates for diverse student populations.66

Third, although the MBE may detrimentally affect certain demographics of students on the bar examination, a national mean within “X” standard deviation accreditation standard will provide law schools in high MBE cut score states an incentive to increase diversity in the admission process.67 As demonstrated, California ABA law schools that enroll a high percentage of minority students usually score near or above the national mean MBE score.68 Thus, adding the

courts.gov/courts/assets/supreme/reports/2015/ube2015.pdf (“The MBE is a multiple choice test consisting of 200 questions covering a broad range of topics and is currently administered in all states except Louisiana.”) (on file with the Washington & Lee Journal of Civil Rights & Social Justice).

64 See id. (“At this time, 17 jurisdictions have elected to adopt the UBE.”).
65 See Espinoza, supra note 35 at 122–23 (stating that evidence of “biased, disturbing questions” published in the LSAT information book has been documented).
66 See An Analysis of Possible Variations in Pass/Fail Standards, supra note 56 (discussing the possible reasons for disparities among different groups’ MBE scores).
67 See id. (noting that the MBE may be biased against certain demographics).
68 See generally Hertz Research, supra note 7 (discussing the racial and ethnic diversity members of the California bar).
national median MBE score as an accreditation standard may enhance diversity in the profession in many states without sacrificing consumer protection.

Opponents of this purposed national mean MBE standard will probably argue that it does not provide sufficient consumer protection for prospective law students because it does not require a specific minimum bar passage standard for graduates who take the bar examination in the law school’s resident state.69 Although the argument that a student should be able to pass the bar in the state where he/she attended law school has intuitive appeal, there are a number of reasons why such an ABA standard would lead to negative consequences.

First, the current ABA bar passage standard does not require a specific passage rate within the state where the law school is located, but rather permits law schools to meet the minimum bar passage rate by cumulating bar passage among all jurisdictions in which students take the bar examination.70 Even the most serious law school critics, such as the group Law School Transparency, do not demand a specific in-state bar passage percentage. Instead, these credits require an education that will provide students the ability to pass a bar examination: “Provide a quality education that enables bar passage and the successful practice of law.”71

69 See ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure, supra note 17 at 3 (urging the ABA to adopt more stringent requirements for law school accreditation).
70 See id., supra note 17 at 24 (“In demonstrating compliance under sections (1)(i) and (ii), the school must report bar passage results from as many jurisdictions as necessary to account for at least 70 percent of its graduate search year, starting with the jurisdiction in which the highest number of graduates took the bar exam and proceeding in descending order of frequency.”).
As Erica Moeser, President of the NCBE, noted, as more jurisdictions adopt the Uniform Bar Examination [UBE], “

[T]he opportunities for graduates to take the UBE and apply for admission in a jurisdiction that has a more benign pass/fail line—as jurisdictions are free to choose—will mean that many unsuccessful examinees may be able to find a practice home without retaking the bar examination.\(^72\)

In addition, this proposal requires each law school to submit its annual mean MBE scores to the ABA for publication in the ABA’s Standard 509 reports that currently provide prospective students information about admission statistics, bar passage rates, employment, and attrition.\(^73\) Student consumers will thus have information to decide whether to attend a school where the student may not pass the in-state bar on the first attempt, but which will provide the student a quality education that enables bar passage in one the student’s other target states within which to practice law.\(^74\) This Paper rejects opponents’ paternalistic argument that we simply cannot trust prospective law students to make good pedagogical decision even when armed

\(^72\) See Moeser, supra note 31 at 4, 6.


\(^74\) See David Yellen, Advancing Transparency in Law School Employment Data: The ABA’s New Standard 509, THE B. EXAMINER 1, 6 (Dec. 2012) http://www.ncbex.org/assets/media_files/Bar-Examiner/articles/2012/810412beAbridged.pdf (“Recently, the American Bar Association’s Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar . . . took a major step to ensure that prospective law students will have access to a great deal of detailed information about the employment outcomes of each law school’s graduates.”) (on file with the Washington & Lee Journal of Civil Rights & Social Justice).
with sufficient information about a law school’s admission requirements, attrition rates, bar passage percentages, mean MBE scores, and employment data.

Second, the ABA like other national professional accreditors should apply a uniform standard to all diploma granting institutions, stating that “law should join every other profession in bringing uniformity to its testing for entry-level licensure while leaving the matter of actual licensing decisions to the states.”75 The following example illustrates the absurdity of an ABA standard that is set to individual state licensing decisions.76 In 2003, the Florida Supreme Court debated increasing its MBE pass/fail cut score.77 After considering empirical evidence, the Florida Supreme Court increased Florida’s 131 MBE cut score to 133 in July 2003 and to 136 in July 2004.78 The empirical studies demonstrated that by raising the cut score from 131 to 136 that minority passage rates would decline by up to 14% compared to a decline of 11% by white examinees.79

The Florida MBE example demonstrates both the dislocating effects of rapid state judicial changes in bar passage standards as well as the unfairness of using those state legislative measures as the litmus test for meeting ABA national

75 See Moeser, supra note 31, at 4.
77 See id. at 7 (“Based upon the foregoing, we conclude that the Board’s justifications for the proposed amendments are sound and adopt them as reflected in the appendix to this opinion.”).
78 See id. (“The pass/fail line is increased to 133 effective July 1, 2003, and raised further to 136 on July 1, 2004.”).
79 See id. at 8 (“The pass rate for blacks would have declined by 6 percent at a passing score of 133 and 14 percent at a passing score of 136, compared to a 4 percent decline at a score of 133 and a 11 percent decline at a score of 136 for white test-takers.”).
accreditation standards. As the ABA uses a one-size-fits all 75% bar passage standard, schools like those in Florida could fall below that ABA threshold even though they made no changes in their admission criteria and no changes in their pedagogical programs. Law schools could be threatened with ABA dis-accreditation based upon a factor, state bar passage adjustments, totally outside the control of the law schools and unrelated to the quality of the legal education program offered. This proposal, which uses schools’ mean MBE scores in relation to the national MBE median, solves this problem by using a uniform national standard that is not affected by state bar passage changes.

II. A Longitudinal Study of California Law Schools’ Mean MBE Scores in Relation to Their California State Bar Examination Passage Scores.

This is the first study to investigate the historical relationship between a state’s law schools’ mean MBE scores as it relates to those students’ bar passage rates on the state’s bar examination. This analysis includes six California law schools that have traditionally scored in the bottom one-third on the California bar examination. In addition, these six law schools (Golden Gate, Southwestern, Thomas Jefferson, the University of San Francisco, the University of La Verne, and Whittier) have consistently enrolled a very large percentage of minority law

80 See generally id.
81 See Managing Director’s Guidance Memo, supra note 12 at 1 (requiring that all accredited law schools attain a 75% bar passage rate every year for at least three of the last five calendar years).
82 See generally id.
83 See Table 1, supra note 55.
students who often have lower LSAT and GPA scores.\textsuperscript{84} It is hypothesized that these schools will consistently have both low California bar passage rates and low mean MBE scores as compared to the national mean MBE scores for each bar examination administration. If the data demonstrates that the hypothesis is untrue, then two conclusions can be drawn from that data: (1) those law schools are providing their students with a “value-added”\textsuperscript{85} legal education, demonstrated by their MBE performance that exceeds statistical prediction; and, (2) the quality of those law school students’ performance on the MBE demonstrates their competence in regards to legal concepts at a sufficient level to pass the bar examination in a majority of states that have a bar examination MBE “cut score” well below California’s 144.\textsuperscript{86}

A. Golden Gate Law School Mean MBA Scores and California Bar Exam Passage Rates.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{GOLDEN GATE}
\end{table}


\textsuperscript{86} See Moeser & Guback, \textit{supra} note 26 (showing that California’s cut off score for bar passage is 144).

\textsuperscript{87} Letter from the Cal. State Bar Ass’n to Professor William W. Patton, \textit{supra} note 72.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Mean MBE</th>
<th>GG MBE 1st Time</th>
<th>GG MBE All Taker</th>
<th>1st/All Bar %</th>
<th>National Mean MBE</th>
<th>GG MBE 1st Time</th>
<th>GG MBE All Taker</th>
<th>1st/All Bar %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEB. 2007</strong></td>
<td>137.6</td>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>57%/54%</td>
<td>143.7</td>
<td>147.4</td>
<td>143.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY 2007</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEB. 2008</strong></td>
<td>137.7</td>
<td>144.6</td>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>60%/46%</td>
<td>145.6</td>
<td>148.6</td>
<td>144.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY 2008</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEB. 2009</strong></td>
<td>135.7</td>
<td>142.8</td>
<td>140.3</td>
<td>51%/40%</td>
<td>144.5</td>
<td>149.1</td>
<td>145.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY 2009</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEB. 2010</strong></td>
<td>136.6</td>
<td>142.5</td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>61%/41%</td>
<td>143.6</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>140.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY 2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEB. 2011</strong></td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>139.0</td>
<td>140.3</td>
<td>41%/40%</td>
<td>143.8</td>
<td>148.2</td>
<td>144.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY 2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEB. 2012</strong></td>
<td>137.0</td>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>141.8</td>
<td>54%/51%</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>145.0</td>
<td>142.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY 2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEB. 2013</strong></td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>138.7</td>
<td>138.9</td>
<td>50%/39%</td>
<td>144.3</td>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>141.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY 2013</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEB. 2014</strong></td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>139.6</td>
<td>139.6</td>
<td>52%/50%</td>
<td>141.5</td>
<td>141.4</td>
<td>139.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY 2014</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEB. 2015</strong></td>
<td>136.2</td>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>139.5</td>
<td>36%/42%</td>
<td>139.9</td>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>138.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Golden Gate mean MBE and bar passage rates from 2007–2015 demonstrate critical facts regarding the use of the bar percentage passage rate standard for law accreditation for law schools located in states with tremendously high MBE cut scores, like California (144).88

First, Golden Gate, which enrolls a very high percentage of minority law students, either equaled or surpassed the National Mean MBE score on nine out of

---

88 *Id.*
the nine in the February Administration of the California Bar Examination, which includes nine out of nine for first-time takers and nine out of nine for all-takers including repeaters, and five out of nine July test administrations for first-time takers.\textsuperscript{89} Further, the four July first-time test-takers mean rates were barely below the national mean rates. The mean rates were merely .2 points below the July 2010 national mean, 1.2 below the July 2013 national mean, .1 points below the July 2014 national mean; and, .5 points below the July 2015 national MBE mean.\textsuperscript{90}

Second, if the Golden Gate 2007–2015 MBE mean scores were applied to each of the other state’s MBE “cut scores”, Golden Gate first-time bar examination test takers would have scored higher than the required state MBE cut scores in every state except:

- Feb. 2007: Ca. and Del.
- Feb. 2008: met all states
- Feb. 2009: Ca. and Del.
- Feb. 2010: Ca. and Del.
- July 2007: met all states
- July 2008: met all states
- July 2009: met all states
- July 2010: Ca. and Del.
- July 2011: met all states
- July 2012: met all states
- July 2013: Ca. and Del.
- July 2014: Ca. and Del.
- July 2015: Alaska, Ca., Del., Nev., N.C., Or., Va.\textsuperscript{91}

This evidence is astounding. It demonstrates that even in the years of the poorest bar examination performances by Golden State students, they would have met the

\textsuperscript{89} Id.
\textsuperscript{90} Id.
\textsuperscript{91} Id.
state MBE cut scores in 86% of states, forty-three out of fifty, and, in eighteen administrations of the California bar examination from 2007–2015, they would have met the state MBE cut scores in forty-eight out of fifty states in thirteen out of those eighteen tests. These test takers would only fail to meet state MBE cut scores in California and Delaware.\textsuperscript{92}

Third, this data demonstrates the absurdity of using an ABA accreditation standard based solely on law schools’ bar examination passage rates rather than including schools’ student outcome measures in relation to the national mean MBE scores.\textsuperscript{93} Even though Golden Gate’s students met or exceeded the national MBE mean through the administration of fourteen out of nineteen bar examinations from 2007–2015, and was very close to that national mean in the five other tests during that period, Golden Gate never had a first-time California bar passage rate of 75%. In twelve out of those eighteen tests, or in 67% of the administrations, Golden Gate had a bar passage rate below 60%. That percentage is the standard published by Law School Transparency as the minimum first-time bar passage standard necessary in order to have a cumulative 75% bar passage rate after four bar examination administrations.\textsuperscript{94} A more nuanced analysis of the data in Table 2 demonstrates the lack of correspondence between meeting the national mean MBE

\textsuperscript{92} Id.

\textsuperscript{93} Id.

\textsuperscript{94} Id.; cf. Letter from Kyle McEntee, Exec. Dir., Law Sch. Transparency’s Nat’l Advisory Council, and David Frakt, Chair, Law Sch. Transparency’s Nat’l Advisory Council, to the Council of the Am. Bar Ass’n Section on Legal Educ. & Admissions to the Bar (July 2016) (“Even using a very pessimistic scenario of a 50% drop in the pass rate . . . a school with a 60% initial pass rate would still be able to make the 75% rate within four exam administrations.”) (on file with the Washington & Lee Journal of Civil Rights & Social Justice).
score and successful California bar examination passage rates.\textsuperscript{95} In February 2007, Golden Gate students beat the national mean by 5.2\% but only scored a 57\% for first-time passage rate on the California bar examination.\textsuperscript{96} That pattern of scoring higher than the national mean MBE score, but scoring less than a 60\% first-time California bar passage percentage occurred in July 2007, Feb. 2009, Feb. 2011, Feb. 2012, Feb. 2013, Feb. 2014, and Feb. 2015.\textsuperscript{97} During those years, when Golden Gate Students almost met the national mean MBE score, they scored well below 60\% on the California bar. (July 2010 a GG MBE score of only .2 less than the National mean resulted in a 57\% passage rate; July 2014 a GG MBE score of only .1 less than the national mean resulted in a 44\% passage rate; and in July 2015 a GG MBE score of only .5 less than the national mean resulted in a 39\% California bar passage rate).\textsuperscript{98}

Something is terribly wrong when a national accreditation standard leads to the dis-accreditation of a law school, namely, Golden Gate, that almost always meets or exceeds the national mean MBE score and which would result in the school’s students being able to meet forty-eight out of fifty states’ bar examination MBE passage cut scores.\textsuperscript{99} Instead of threats of dis-accreditation, schools like Golden Gate that admit many minority students with low predictive indices (LSAT

\textsuperscript{95} See Letter from the Cal. State Bar Ass’n to Professor William W. Patton, supra note 72 (highlighting the difference between the median MBE score and bar passage).

\textsuperscript{96} Id.

\textsuperscript{97} Id.

\textsuperscript{98} Id.

\textsuperscript{99} Id.
and GPA) who outperform their predictive scores on the MBE\textsuperscript{100} should be congratulated for providing students an excellent value-added law school education and an opportunity to become members of the legal profession.

B. Southwestern Law School Mean MBA Scores and CA Bar Exam Passage Rates.

\textbf{TABLE 3\textsuperscript{101}}

\begin{center}
\textbf{SOUTHWESTERN}
\end{center}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Mean MBE</th>
<th>SW MBE 1\textsuperscript{st} Time</th>
<th>SW MBE All Taker</th>
<th>1\textsuperscript{st}/all Bar %</th>
<th>National Mean MBE</th>
<th>SW MBE 1\textsuperscript{st} Time</th>
<th>SW MBE All Taker</th>
<th>1\textsuperscript{st}/All Bar %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEB. 2007</td>
<td>137.6</td>
<td>144.3</td>
<td>142.8 60%/52%</td>
<td>JULY 2007</td>
<td>145.2</td>
<td>144.5</td>
<td>144.5 56%/54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB. 2008</td>
<td>137.7</td>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>142.0 59%/55%</td>
<td>JULY 2008</td>
<td>147.0</td>
<td>145.8</td>
<td>145.8 72%/65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB. 2009</td>
<td>135.7</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>137.9 53%/40%</td>
<td>JULY 2009</td>
<td>145.7</td>
<td>143.6</td>
<td>143.6 63%/55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB. 2010</td>
<td>136.6</td>
<td>141.1</td>
<td>141.1 56%/41%</td>
<td>JULY 2010</td>
<td>145.2</td>
<td>144.2</td>
<td>144.2 59%/53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB. 2011</td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>140.9</td>
<td>143.2 56%/56%</td>
<td>JULY 2011</td>
<td>145.0</td>
<td>143.9</td>
<td>143.9 64%/56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB. 2012</td>
<td>137.0</td>
<td>144.6</td>
<td>143.4 58%/56%</td>
<td>JULY 2012</td>
<td>145.2</td>
<td>143.9</td>
<td>143.9 64%/56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB. 2013</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>144.3</td>
<td>143.1 68%/56%</td>
<td>JULY 2013</td>
<td>147.7</td>
<td>145.7</td>
<td>145.7 74%/66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB. 2014</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>144.6</td>
<td>144.5 64%/61%</td>
<td>JULY 2014</td>
<td>141.2</td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>140.1 54%/47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB. 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JULY 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{100} See id. (explaining that Golden Gate admits many minority students with low predictive indices, but outperform their predictive MBE scores).

\textsuperscript{101} Id.
Southwestern Law School met or beat the national mean MBE score on seventeen out of eighteen California bar examinations from 2007–2015 on first-time takers and met that standard on sixteen out of eighteen all-taker examinations. Even with that stunning student outcome measure for one of the most diverse law schools in the country, Southwestern never met the ABA 75% bar passage standard on any of the eighteen California bar examinations. Southwestern students’ first-time taker mean MBE scores met or exceeded other states’ MBE bar passage cut scores for almost all eighteen administrations of the California bar examination:

- Feb. 2007: met all but Del.
- Feb. 2010: met all but Ca., Del., Or.
- Feb. 2011: met all but Ca., Del., Or.
- Feb. 2012: met all but Del.
- Feb. 2013: met all but Del.
- Feb. 2014: met all but Del.
- Feb. 2015: met all but Ca., Del., Or.
- July 2007: met all states
- July 2008: met all states
- July 2009: met all states
- July 2010: met all states
- July 2011: met all states
- July 2012: met all states
- July 2013: met all states
- July 2014: met all but Ca., Del., Or.
- July 2015: met all but Ca., Del., Or.

Even though Southwestern students’ performed well above the national mean MBE score on almost every exam and above almost all states’ MBE bar passage cut scores, according to Law School Transparency’s required 60% first-time passage
rate, Southwestern would have had a very difficult time meeting the ABA Council’s rejected “75% passage rate in 2 years” proposal.\textsuperscript{106} Southwestern students scored 60% or better on only 39% of the eighteen California bar examination administrations from 2007–2015, seven out of eighteen.\textsuperscript{107} Again, an ABA standard based exclusively on a “one-size-fits-all” bar passage percentage punishes schools like Southwestern which enroll high numbers of students with lower GPA/LSAT scores, and who are provided a value-added education and who beat statistical MBE predictions.\textsuperscript{108}

\section*{C. Whittier Law School Mean MBA Scores and CA Bar Exam Passage Rates.}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\hline
\textbf{National Mean MBE} & \textbf{WH BE} & \textbf{WH MBE 1st Time} & \textbf{WH MBE All Taker} & \textbf{1st/All Bar %} & \textbf{National Mean MBE} & \textbf{WH MBE 1st Time} & \textbf{WH MBE All Taker} & \textbf{1st/All Bar %} \\
\hline
\textbf{FEB. 2007} & & & & & \textbf{JULY 2007} & & & \\
137.6 & 139.9 & 137.6 & 35%/29% & 143.7 & 142.9 & 140.1 & 54%/53% \\
\hline
\textbf{FEB. 2008} & & & & & \textbf{JULY 2008} & & & \\
137.7 & 140.8 & 137.6 & 56%/46% & 145.6 & 149.3 & 144.4 & 84%/61% \\
\hline
\textbf{FEB. 2009} & & & & & \textbf{JULY 2009} & & & \\
135.7 & 138.3 & 137.3 & 44%/32% & 144.5 & 143.5 & 140.6 & 61%/47% \\
\hline
\textbf{FEB. 2010} & & & & & \textbf{JULY 2010} & & & \\
136.6 & 133.6 & 136.9 & 13%/27% & 143.6 & 141.3 & 140.2 & 53%/45% \\
\hline
\textbf{FEB. 2011} & & & & & \textbf{JULY 2011} & & & \\
138.6 & 143.1 & 140.6 & 55%/42% & 143.8 & 142.3 & 139.2 & 56%/40% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Whittier Law School Mean MBA Scores and CA Bar Exam Passage Rates.}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{106} See Patton, \textit{supra} note 11 (showing the recently rejected bar passage rate for law school accreditation).
\textsuperscript{107} Letter from the Cal. State Bar Ass’n to Professor William W. Patton, \textit{supra} note 72.
\textsuperscript{108} \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Id.}
First-time taker students from Whittier Law School met or exceeded the national mean MBE score on eleven out of eighteen California bar examination administrations, 61%, and scored within one point or less of the national mean on four examinations (July 2007; July 2009; July 2014; and July 2015).  

Even though Whittier students met or exceeded the national MBE mean on 61% of the examinations, Whittier’s bar passage met the ABA 75% standard only twice, and scored 60% or higher on only six out of eighteen test administrations, 33.3%.  

Even though Whittier’s California bar passage rates seldom rose to 60%, Whittier graduates’ first-time test takers mean MBE scores met or exceeded other states’ MBE bar passage cut scores for almost all 18 administrations of the California bar examination:

Feb. 2008: met all but Ca., Del., Or.
July 2008: met all states
Feb. 2009: met all but Alaska, Ca., Del.,

110 Id.
111 Id.
July 2009: met all but Ca. and Del., Nev., N.C., Or., Va.
Feb. 2010: met seventeen states’ scores
July 2010: met all but Ca. and Del.
Feb. 2011: met all but Ca. and Del.
July 2011: met all but Ca. and Del.
Feb. 2012: met all but Ca. and Del.
July 2012: met all states
Feb. 2013: met all states
July 2013: met all states
Feb. 2014: met all but Del.
July 2014: met all but Ca., Del., Or.
Feb. 2015: met all but Ca., Del, Or.
July 2015: met all but Alaska, Ca., Del., Nev., N.C., Or., Va.112

Even though Whittier’s longitudinal bar passage data demonstrates that it would have likely lost accreditation under the Council’s rejected 75% passage in 2-year standard113, Whittier students, including a very large percentage of minority graduates, demonstrated that they received an excellent education, as the outscores the national mean MBE and almost all other states’ MBE cut scores regularly.114 Judging Whittier students on the current one-size-fits all bar passage standard rather than using a standard of the schools’ mean MBE scores in relation to the national mean MBE scores would needlessly restrict access for countless minorities into the legal profession based solely on California’s bar cut score.

D. Thomas Jefferson Law School Mean MBA Scores and CA Bar Exam Passage Rates.

**TABLE 5**115

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National TJ MBE</th>
<th>TJ MBE</th>
<th>TJ</th>
<th>National TJ MBE</th>
<th>TJ MBE</th>
<th>TJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

112 Id.
113 Patton, *supra* note 11.
114 Letter from the Cal. State Bar Ass’n to Professor William W. Patton, *supra* note 72.
115 Id.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean MBE</th>
<th>1st Time</th>
<th>All Taker</th>
<th>Bar %</th>
<th>Mean MBE</th>
<th>1st Time</th>
<th>All Taker</th>
<th>Bar %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEB. 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JULY 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.6</td>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>61%/41%</td>
<td>143.7</td>
<td>143.8</td>
<td>139.8</td>
<td>60%/58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEB. 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JULY 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.7</td>
<td>143.8</td>
<td>139.0</td>
<td>61%/46%</td>
<td>145.6</td>
<td>148.7</td>
<td>145.5</td>
<td>76%/63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEB. 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JULY 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.7</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>137.9</td>
<td>53%/40%</td>
<td>144.5</td>
<td>139.8</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td>46%/35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEB. 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JULY 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.6</td>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>138.2</td>
<td>52%/37%</td>
<td>143.6</td>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>139.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%/43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEB. 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JULY 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>138.4</td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>45%/41%</td>
<td>143.8</td>
<td>139.6</td>
<td>137.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%/25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEB. 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JULY 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.0</td>
<td>142.6</td>
<td>141.4</td>
<td>59%/46%</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>141.3</td>
<td>139.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52%/42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEB. 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JULY 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>139.6</td>
<td>45%/40%</td>
<td>144.3</td>
<td>142.0</td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%/42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEB. 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JULY 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>141.7</td>
<td>141.2</td>
<td>50%/43%</td>
<td>141.5</td>
<td>141.6</td>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>45%/34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEB. 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JULY 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.2</td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>45%/53%</td>
<td>139.9</td>
<td>140.4</td>
<td>137.7</td>
<td>51%/34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effects of California’s extremely high 144 MBE cut score are nowhere more apparent than in Thomas Jefferson students’ California bar passage rates. Even though they met or exceeded the national mean MBE score in twelve of eighteen bar examination administrations, 67%, they scored 60% or higher on only
four of those eighteen California bar exams (22%). Thomas Jefferson enrolls a high number of minority students and students defined as high risk of failure by Law School Transparency. Even so, Thomas Jefferson usually beats the national mean MBE score. An ABA standard based solely on bar percentage success would lead to a substantial decrease in the number of minority students enrolled in Thomas Jefferson in order for it to assure continuing ABA accreditation.

Based on Thomas Jefferson students’ mean MBE scores they consistently met or exceeded other states’ MBE bar examination passage rate cut scores:

- Feb. 2007: met all but Ca., Del., Or.
- July 2007: met all but Ca., Del.
- Feb. 2008: met all but Ca., Del.
- July 2008: met all
- Feb. 2009: met all but Alaska, Ca., Del.,
- Feb. 2010: met all but Alaska, Ca., Del., Nev., N.C., Or., Va
- July 2010: met all but Alaska, Ca., Del., Nev., N.C. Or., Va..
- Feb. 2011: met all but Alaska, Ca., Del.
- Feb. 2012: met all but Ca., Del.
- July 2012: met all but Ca., Del., Or.
- Feb. 2013: met all but Alaska, Ca., Del.
- July 2013: met all but Ca., Del., Nev., N.C., Or., Va.
- Feb. 2014: met all but Ca., Del., Or.
- July 2014: met all but Ca., Del., Or.
- Feb. 2015: met all but Alaska, Ca., Del.,

---

117 Id.
120 Letter from the Cal. State Bar Ass’n to Professor William W. Patton, supra note 72.
July 2015: met all but Ca., Del., Or., Nev., N.C., Or., Va.\footnote{121}

Using the proposed accreditation model that includes a comparison of a law school students’ mean MBE scores in relation to the national MBE mean will support diversity in states with high MBE cut scores and provide consumer protection by assuring that law schools are producing competent lawyers whose MBE scores demonstrate the capacity to pass the bar examination in almost every other state.

III. \textit{Maintaining the Current ABA Standard on Bar Passage Is Important In Order Not to Disrupt Admissions in Some Traditionally Black Law Schools.}

The ABA must assure that any student outcome measure does not disproportionately affect schools that historically have had a large percentage of minority law students. Under current ABA Standard 316\footnote{122} many of those high minority enrollment schools meet the bar passage standard, especially if the law school is located in a state with a moderately difficult MBE cut score.\footnote{123} Moving exclusively to a student outcome measure that abandons bar passage percentages in favor of a national mean MBE score may detrimentally affect those schools. The following discussion focuses on the application of both a bar examination passage standard and a national mean standard to Atlanta John Marshall Law School.

\footnotetext[121]{Id.} \footnotetext[122]{See ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure, supra note 17, at 24 (requiring that all accredited law schools have at least a bar passage rate of 75\% three calendar years out of the last five).} \footnotetext[123]{See Letter from the Cal. State Bar Ass’n to Professor William W. Patton, supra note 72.}
Atlanta John Marshall Law School enrolls a very high percentage of Black law students: (1) 2015 [52.6%]; (2) 2014 [38.6%]; (3) 2013 [30.9%]; (4) 2012 [29.2%]; (5) 2011 [28.5%]. As the chart below demonstrates, although Atlanta John Marshall students pass the Georgia bar examination at rates above the Law School Transparency 60% litmus test, they rarely meet the annual national mean MBE score:

**TABLE 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th>JM MBE</th>
<th>JM 1st Time</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>JM MBE</th>
<th>JM 1st Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean MBE</td>
<td>All Taker</td>
<td>Bar %</td>
<td>Mean MBE</td>
<td>All Taker</td>
<td>Bar %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


129 See Bar Exam Difficulty, L. SCH. TRANSPARENCY, https://www.lawschooltransparency.com/reform/projects/investigations/2015/data/other-stats/?show=cutscores (last visited on Oct. 20, 2017) (showing that the Georgia bar examination MBE cut score is 135, compared to California’s 144).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136.9</td>
<td>131.7</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>143.7</td>
<td>140.3</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>137.7</td>
<td>138.7</td>
<td>145.6</td>
<td>143.8</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>135.7</td>
<td>131.5</td>
<td>144.5</td>
<td>138.9</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>136.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Atlanta John Marshal scored above 60% on the bar examination on 67% (twelve/eighteen) of bar administrations from 2007 to 2015. The law school’s students met or exceeded the national mean MBE score on only two of eighteen bar examinations. As Atlanta John Marshall has been successful at enabling hundreds of minority law students to become members of the bar, an ABA student outcome measure that relies solely on a national mean MBE score would

---


133. See supra notes 120–21 and accompanying text.
significantly reduce diversity in their bar.\textsuperscript{134} Therefore, the ABA should promulgate a dual standard that requires law schools to meet either a standard deviation from the national mean MBE score or a minimum bar examination passage rate.

IV. A Comparison of California and New York Law Schools’ Admission Statistics and Bar Examination Passage Rates.

The proposed national mean MBE score standard will not only cure the significant unfairness of the current one-size-fits all states bar passage rule, but also will illustrate why that modification will level the playing field among all ABA law schools by mollifying states’ wildly divergent cut scores as a disadvantage in ABA accreditation. To demonstrate the effectiveness and fairness of this bar examination proposal, the following will compare the input and output measures of five California law schools (Southwestern, University of San Francisco, La Verne, Golden Gate, and Thomas Jefferson) with five New York law schools (St. John’s, SUNY-Buffalo, Pace, New York Law School, and Touro) on the July 2016 California and New York bar examinations. The MBE cut score on the California bar exam is 144 and is 133 on the New York exam.\textsuperscript{135} The following chart demonstrates the unfairness of the Council’s recently rejected 75\% passage in two-years standard\textsuperscript{136} and shows how the addition of the national mean MBE score for two of the last three years will cure that unfairness.

\textsuperscript{134} Id.
\textsuperscript{135} Moeser & Guback, supra note 26.
\textsuperscript{136} See Notice and Comment Archive, supra note 11 (showing the recently rejected standard for accreditation).
### Table 7

**Comparative Bar Passage Rates on the July 2016 California and New York Bar Examinations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>July 2016 NY/CA Passage</th>
<th>GPA 75th</th>
<th>GPA 50th</th>
<th>GPA 25th</th>
<th>LSAT 75th</th>
<th>LSAT 50th</th>
<th>LSAT 25th</th>
<th>HISPANIC Students</th>
<th>HISPANIC Students %</th>
<th>BLACK Students</th>
<th>BLACK Students %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NY/CA Bar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern</td>
<td>74% (38%)</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. S.F.</td>
<td>72% (36%)</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnivLaVerne</td>
<td>68% (31%)</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate</td>
<td>67% (31%)</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jeff.</td>
<td>66% (31%)</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW YORK Bar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY-BUFF.</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

137 See; see also


139 The number in parenthesis is the California ABA law school’s bar passage rate on the July 2016 California bar examination.
The five California law schools had passage rates on the July 2016 California bar exam so low (31%-38%) that it would be virtually impossible for them to have met the Council’s proposed 75% in 2-years standard.\textsuperscript{140} As demonstrated in the chart, those five California ABA law schools would have been required to obtain passage rates ranging from 66% to 74%, if their students had taken the July 2016 New York bar examination.\textsuperscript{141} Those five California law schools would easily have met the Council’s proposed 75% in 2 years standard if located in New York, but would fail miserably if judged, not by the quality of their students’ scores on the MBE in relation to the national mean MBE score, but rather on the unproven and unrealistically high California MBE cut score that is out of those schools’ ability to control.\textsuperscript{142}

There has been a great deal of discussion about the relatively low LSAT scores of law students admitted into some of California’s ABA law schools.\textsuperscript{143} The data in the Table 7 demonstrates that even the lowest performing California law

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lcccccccccc}
\hline
School & Pass Rate & MBE & MBE & MBE & Total Pass & Total Pass & Total Pass & Total Pass & Total Pass & Total Pass \\
\hline
Pace & 71.0\% & 3.51 & 3.21 & 2.92 & 153 & 151 & 147 & 17 & 9.4\% & 11 & 6.1\% \\
NYLS & 70.3\% & 3.43 & 3.17 & 2.87 & 153 & 151 & 149 & 51 & 15.8\% & 25 & 17.8\% \\
Touro & 62.0\% & 3.34 & 3.02 & 2.75 & 150 & 148 & 145 & 37 & 18.0\% & 21 & 10.2\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{141} See Caron, \textit{supra} note 138.
\textsuperscript{142} See \textit{id.} (“If California used the same passing score as New York . . . California schools would have had passage rates above 80%, and all of them would be well within striking distance of the ABA’s proposed 75% passage rate in two years.”).
schools provide a value-added legal education which results in their students performing better on the MBE and on other bar examinations than students from comparable law schools in other states.\textsuperscript{144}

A. \textbf{Southwestern v. SUNY-Buffalo}

First, compare Southwestern with SUNY-Buffalo. SUNY-Buffalo’s 2013 entering class with LSAT scores of (158/154/150)\textsuperscript{145} which are substantially higher than Southwestern’s (155/152/150).\textsuperscript{146} In addition, SUNY-Buffalo admitted students with much higher grade point averages (3.66/3.48/3.21)\textsuperscript{147} than Southwestern (3.42/3.17/2.91).\textsuperscript{148} All predictive models would suggest that SUNY-Buffalo students would pass the New York bar at a significantly higher rate than Southwestern students.\textsuperscript{149} Just the opposite occurred. Southwestern’ s MBE scores resulted in a 74\% New York bar passage rate, while SUNY-Buffalo’s pass rate was only 73\%.\textsuperscript{150}

Southwestern’ s New York bar passage rate is particularly remarkable because the students passed the July 2016 California bar exam at a rate of only

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{144} See \textit{supra} note 137 and accompanying text.
\bibitem{147} See Univ. of Buffalo-SUNY 2013 Standard 509 Information Report, \textit{supra} note 145.
\bibitem{149} See \textit{supra} note 127 and accompanying text.
\bibitem{150} \textit{Id.}
\end{thebibliography}
38%. But another variable makes Southwestern’s New York bar passage rate even more remarkable in relation to SUNY-Buffalo’s. As the chart demonstrates, SUNY-Buffalo has a very small number and percentage of Black (6.6%/13) and Hispanic (6.1%/12) students compared with Southwestern (Black, 4.2%/16 students and Hispanic, 19.8%/83 students).152

Although no information has been published regarding New York law schools’ mean MBE scores on the July 2016 bar examination, the California bar examiners have published the mean MBE scores for all California law schools.153 Even though Southwestern students only passed the California bar at 38%, Southwestern students’ “all taker” mean MBE score for the July 2016 exam was 139.9 compared with the national “all taker” MBE mean of 140.3.156

151 Id.  
152 See supra note 137 and accompanying text. It is impossible to draw any definitive conclusions about the number and percentage of minority students who were admitted to SUNY-Buffalo and to Southwestern who actually took a bar examination because that data is not available to the public. One relevant factor is the schools’ academic attrition rates. SUNY-Buffalo in 2014 had no students academically disqualified, but Southwestern had 25. However, even if one were to speculate that a majority of Southwestern students academically disqualified were minority students (and there is no data to support that speculation), Southwestern would still have a substantially larger minority student population taking the bar examination (Southwestern total Black and Hispanic students admitted (94 minus 25 disqualified) equals 69 minority bar takers) than SUNY-Buffalo with total 30 Black and Hispanic bar takers. 
154 Id.  
155 Id.  
The Southwestern analysis demonstrates the irrational and unjust consequences of the Council’s proposed 75% bar passage in 2-years standard. Southwestern would have little chance of meeting that proposed ABA standard even though its students scored very close to the national mean on the MBE and even though its students, had they taken other easier bar examinations like the New York exam, would have scored higher than comparable New York law schools whose students have better entering LSAT/GPA credentials. But worse, Southwestern is one of the California law schools that admit a significant number of Black and Hispanic law students. The dis-accreditation of Southwestern would be a significant setback to not only increasing, but also to merely maintaining, diversity in the California bar.

B. University of San Francisco v. NYLS.

New York Law School’s (NYLS) 2013 entering class had statistics (LSAT 153/151/149 and GPA 3.43/3.17/2.87) slightly lower than the University of San Francisco’s (USF) statistics (LSAT 158/153/151 and GPA 3.51/3.28/2.95). NYLS had a 70.3% passage rate on New York’s July 2016 bar exam, and, if applied to New
York State’s standards, USF would have had a 72% passing rate on the New York exam. Under the Council’s proposed 75% passage rate, in 2 years, NYLS will easily meet the proposed standard. Because USF had a passage rate of only 36% on California’s July 2016 bar examination, the school would almost certainly fail to raise its passage rate to 75% within the next three bar examination administrations, and could potentially lose ABA accreditation.163

Both NYLS and USF admit many minority law students. The 2013 NYLS entering class had a combined 23.6% of Black and Hispanic law students compared to USF’s combined 27.4% Black and Hispanic students. Under the Council’s proposal NYLS would have easily been able to meet the rejected 75% in 2-year bar passage standard, and New York residents would be able to enjoy and benefit from that increased diversity in the New York bar association. Even though USF’s students would have scored higher than NYLS’ students on New York’s July 2016 bar, USF would fail the Council’s 75% in 2-year standard and would lose ABA accreditation.168

163 See supra note 137 and accompanying text; see also Table 7, supra note 137.
164 See NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL 2013 STANDARD 509 INFORMATION REPORT, supra note 147 and accompanying text (showing a chart containing J.D. Enrollment and Ethnicity for the academic year), see also UNIV. OF SAN FRANCISCO LAW SCHOOL 2013 STANDARD 509 INFORMATION REPORT, supra note 148 and accompanying text (providing the ethnicity of students enrolled at University of San Francisco Law School).
165 See NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL 2013 STANDARD 509 INFORMATION REPORT, supra note 160.
166 See UNIV. OF SAN FRANCISCO LAW SCHOOL 2013 STANDARD 509 INFORMATION REPORT, supra note 161.
167 See supra note 137 and accompanying text.
168 See id.
The five California ABA law schools studied in this report had a combined mean July 2016 California bar passage rate of 33.4%, even though they would have had a combined mean passage rate of 69.4% on the July 2016 New York bar examination. Under the Council’s proposed 75% passage in 2-years rule, all five of these California ABA law schools would lose ABA accreditation. What effect on diversity in the California bar will the loss of these five law schools have? In 2014, these five California schools enrolled 208 Hispanic law students and 83 Black law students. If these five California law schools lose ABA accreditation, there will be a 36% reduction in the number of Black law students and 31% fewer Hispanic law students attending California ABA law schools.

C. Out-of-State ABA Students’ Poor Performance on the California Bar Exam

---

169 See id.

170 See id.

It is not just students from middle to bottom tier law schools that face serious problems passing the California bar examination. Table 8 compares California ABA approved law school students’ bar results with out-of-state ABA law students’ California bar examination passing percentages. The 14,252 out-of-state ABA students who took the California bar examination from February 2007 to July 2015 is a statistically significant sample size to support a reliable analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>CA ABA ABA</th>
<th>Out-of-State ABA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2007</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 2007</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2008</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 2008</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2009</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 2009</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2010</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 2010</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2011</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 2011</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2012</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 2012</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2013</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 2013</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2014</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 2014</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See generally supra note 138 and accompanying text (explaining that the California bar exam results were very low across all California law schools).

See supra note 112 and accompanying text.
Table 8 provides many interesting data points. First, students who attend California ABA law schools have substantially outperformed out-of-state ABA students on every July California bar examination for the past 9 years.\textsuperscript{175} Over the past nine years, students who attend ABA accredited schools out-of-state and sit for the California bar earn a passage rate almost 10% lower than in-state students. The mean score for students who attended school in California was 75.6% versus an out-of-state mean of 65.8%.\textsuperscript{176} This bar passage differential cannot be overstated. For instance, in other states, like New York, the in-state ABA bar passage percentage is barely higher than that of the out-of-state ABA test takers:\textsuperscript{177}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
\hline
 & Feb. 2015 & Jul. 2015 \\
\hline
53.9 & 68.2 & \\
40.5 & 58.8 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{California Bar Exam Pass Rates}
\end{table}

\textbf{New York Bar First-Time Bar Passage Results}\textsuperscript{178}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.Y. ABA</th>
<th>Out-of-State ABA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean differential between students at New York ABA accredited law schools and out-of-state test takers is merely 2.53%. New York students earn an

\textsuperscript{175} Id.
\textsuperscript{176} Id.
\textsuperscript{177} Id.
average of 82.58 versus out-of-state ABA 80.05, compared to the California ABA
versus out-of-state ABA differential of 10%. 179

Many students from law schools rated in the top half of all law schools in the
U. S. News Law School Rankings have great difficulty passing the California bar
examination. 180 For instance, the mean differential between these out-of-state ABA
law school’s home state bar passage rates and their passage rates on the California
bar examination from February 2010 to July 2014 were: (1) Washington St. Louis
115 students (home state bar 94% but 67% CA bar); (2) Georgetown 391 students
(home state bar 92% but CA 77%; (3) Northwestern 166 students (home state bar
95% but 82% CA bar); and (4) George Washington 236 students (home state bar
93% but 77% CA bar). 181

One might consider several reasons as to why students from even an ABA
top-20 rated law school would perform so much worse on the California bar
examination than on their home states’ bar examinations. [ADD: THE
FOLLOWING SECTIONS DISCUSS THOSE POSSIBLE REASONS.]

1. The Number of State Specific Topics on a Bar Examination

179 See generally id. (adding the data provided by the N.Y. ABA); see also California Bar Exam
Statistics, THE STATE B. OF CAL., http://www.calbar.ca.gov/Admissions/Law-School-Regulation/Exam-
Statistics (last visited on Oct. 21, 2017) (providing data from the past California bar examinations) (last
180 See Best Law Schools, U.S. NEWS (2017), https://www.usnews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-
law-schools/law-rankings (listing the top half of all law schools in the United States with respective
(offering ABA Standard 509 information about law schools’ bar passage rates) (on file with the
Washington & Lee Journal of Civil Rights & Social Justice); see also Exam Statistics for the
California Bar, supra note 179 (listing data from each administration of the California Bar
examination from February 2007 to July 2015); see generally id.
Perhaps the California bar examination tests too many “California-specific” legal topics, not taught in out-of-state ABA law schools.\textsuperscript{182} That explanation is contradicted by the evidence. During the period of bar examinations for this study, which ranged from February 2010 until July 2014, California only tested one California specific legal area: California community property.\textsuperscript{183} During that time, there was a 10% higher mean bar passage rate for all students who attended California law schools and who took the California bar examination than for all ABA out-of-state test takers.\textsuperscript{184} If the hypothesis is that in-state and out-of-state test takers’ bar passage rate is correlated with the numbers of “state-specific” legal areas tested, then that hypothesis is clearly disproven by New York’s bar results. New York has traditionally tested New York Constitutional law, New York family law, and New York jurisdiction and procedure.\textsuperscript{185} Based on the number of state subjects tested, one would therefore predict that the New York differential between


\textsuperscript{184} See California Bar Examination Statistics, THE ST. B. OF CAL., http://www.calbar.ca.gov/Admissions/Law-School-Regulation/Exam-Statistics (last visited Oct. 21, 2017) (publishing the percentage of California ABA law students and the percentage of out-of-state ABA law students who pass the examination for each bar administration which provides the data to calculate the out-of-state ABA law students’ examination data) (on file with the Washington & Lee Journal of Civil Rights & Social Justice).

in-state and out-of-state test takers would be substantially higher than California’s. The mean differential between the New York ABA and the out-of-state ABA test takers is in fact only 2.53%, with New York students earning 82.58 versus out-of-state students earning 80.05).  

2. Do Only Low-Performing Out-of-State ABA Students Take the California Bar?

Another hypothesis is that only the poorest performing students from out-of-state law schools take the California bar examination. Unfortunately, the data necessary to test that hypothesis is not publicly available as California does not publish specific information about individual out-of-state test takers’ UGPA, LSAT scores, or LSGPA. This hypothesis is inconsistent with common sense arguments because it is unlikely that a significant percentage of poorly qualified graduates from ABA out-of-state schools would just happen to spend the thousands of dollars to take the California bar examination where the passage rate for out-of-state test takers is so low. In addition, because the out-of-state schools’ samples in this study are large, for instance Georgetown University Law Center (391 students), The George Washington University Law School (236 students) and American University Washington College of Law (221 students), it is unlikely that low

---

performing out-of-state students predominate those test takers at levels to explain the passage differentials.

3. Differences Between California’s MBE Cut Score and Out-of-State Cut Scores Account for the Low Passage Rates of Out-of-State ABA Students on the California Bar

The third hypothesis—and, admittedly, the most likely explanation for the difference in bar passage rates—suggests that the discrepancy results from the significant difference between an out-of-state law school’s state bar MBE cut score and the much higher California MBE cut score. There is significant empirical evidence that a rise in the MBE cut score results in a lowering of a state’s bar passage rates.\(^{191}\) For instance, a decline of 2.8% in the MBE mean score on the July 2014 bar examination predicted a decrease in the bar passage rate of only 2.9% in a state with a cut score of 129, but predicted a reduction in the bar passage rate of 8.7% in a state with an MBE cut score of 145.\(^{192}\)

My proposal to amend ABA Standard 316 by adding an alternative standard deviation from the national mean MBE score in two of the last three years will both cure the unfairness to schools located in states with very high MBE cut scores, and

---


\(^{192}\) See Albanese, *supra* note 138.
assure that law schools’ students perform well on the MBE to demonstrate their knowledge of substantive law.

V. *Increasing the Rigorousness of the ABA Bar Passage Standard Will Substantially Impact Attorney Diversity in Jurisdictions That Have Very High MBE Cut Scores*

The ABA Council approved the ABA Standards Review Committee’s proposed modification of ABA Standard 316 and forwarded that proposal to the ABA House of Delegates for approval.\(^\text{193}\) The rejected proposal would have provided that “[a]t least 75 percent of a law school’s graduates in a calendar year who sat for a bar examination must . . . [pass] a bar examination administered within two years of their date of graduation.”\(^\text{194}\) The central issue with the Council’s proposal was that it would have caused a tremendous upheaval for law schools, like those in California, that enroll high numbers of minority law students in a jurisdiction that has a very high MBE cut score. Table 9 demonstrates the low first-time bar passage rates for Hispanic and Black law students in California.\(^\text{195}\) According to Law School Transparency, it is extremely unlikely that these bar passage

\(^{193}\) *See generally Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar Revised Standards for Approval of Law Schools, ABA (Feb. 2017)*
https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/images/abanews/2017%20Midyear%20Meeting%20Resolutions/110b.pdf (showing the purposed amendments to Standard 316 and that they were rejected) (on file with Washington & Lee Journal of Civil Rights & Social Justice).

\(^{194}\) *See Memorandum from The Hon. Rebecca White Berch & Barry A. Currier on ABA Standards for Approval of Law Schools Matters for Notice and Comment 1, 6 (Mar. 25, 2016)*

\(^{195}\) *See Exam Statistics, supra note 175 and accompanying text.*
percentages would rise to the required accreditation standard of 75% within just four administrations of the California bar examination.\textsuperscript{196}

\textbf{TABLE 9}
California ABA Hispanic & Black First-Time Bar Examination Pass Rates\textsuperscript{197}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMINATION DATE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TEST TAKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2009/ JULY 2009</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2010/ JULY 2010</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2011/ JULY 2011</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2012/ JULY 2012</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2013</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2014/ JULY 2014</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2015/ JULY 2015</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2016/ JULY 2016</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{TABLE 10}
California ABA Hispanic & Black Repeat Bar Examination Pass Rates\textsuperscript{198}

\textsuperscript{196} See supra note 71 (concluding that a first-time bar passage rate must meet or exceed 60% for the 2-year bar passage rate to meet or exceed the proposed 75% bar passage in two years).

\textsuperscript{197} See Exam Statistics, supra note 175 (combining the California State Bar individual first-time examination results from February 2009 to July 2016 to calculate the annual number of Black and Hispanic test takers and their annual California bar passage rates to determine law schools’ chances of meeting a specific ABA bar passage standard).

\textsuperscript{198} See id. (combining the California State Bar individual repeat examination results from February 2009 to July 2016 to calculate the annual number of Black and Hispanic test takers and their annual California bar passage rates to determine law schools’ chances of meeting a specific ABA bar passage standard).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMINATION DATE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF REPEAT TEST TAKERS</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Taking</td>
<td>Passage</td>
<td>Number Taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2009/ JULY 2009</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2010/ JULY 2010</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2011/ JULY 2011</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2012/ JULY 2012</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2013 JULY 2013</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2014/ JULY 2014</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2015/ JULY 2015</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 2016/ JULY 2016</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 9 and 10 illustrate several critically important findings. According to Law School Transparency's table discussing the 60% bar passage criteria, it is clear that, under California's high 144 MBE cut score, many Black and Hispanic first-time and repeater rates will pose serious problems for the six historically low performing California law schools.\textsuperscript{199} The data demonstrates that the mean first-time bar passage rate for Black students in California from 2009–2016 was only 52% and the Black repeat test taker mean was only 27%.\textsuperscript{200} In addition, the mean first-time Hispanic bar passage rate for the same range was only 62%, and the Hispanic repeat mean rate was only 33%.\textsuperscript{201} These bar passage rates were the

\textsuperscript{199} Id.
\textsuperscript{200} Id.
\textsuperscript{201} Id.
California statewide ABA mean percentages, which include schools such as UCLA, Berkeley, Stanford, USC, and UCI.\textsuperscript{202} Although California does not publish the minority bar passage rates for each California ABA law school, it is likely that many minority/ethnic students in schools at the bottom quarter of the state’s bar passage rate score substantially lower than the statewide mean based on their lower LSAT/GPA credentials. Consequently, these minority students would almost certainly fail to meet the ABA Council’s rejected 75% in two-year standard.

The trend in Hispanic and Black first-time and repeat California bar passage scores from 2013 to 2016 has steadily decreased.\textsuperscript{203} The Hispanic first-time test taker in 2013 had a passage rate of 68%, which fell to 50% in 2016. Over that same period, the Hispanic first-time rate fell for that same period from 55% to 41%.\textsuperscript{204} From 2013 to 2016, the Hispanic repeat test taker rate fell from 40% to 32% and the Black repeater rate fell from 32% to 21%.\textsuperscript{205} Under the Law School Transparency bar passage model, it is clear that the Hispanic and Black bar passage rates will not come close to reaching the 75% passage within 2 years required under the Council’s rejected bar examination proposal.\textsuperscript{206} It would be shocking if California ABA law schools in the bottom quarter of bar passage results did not consider the effects of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{202} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{203} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{204} See Exam Statistics, supra note 175 (showing the Hispanic first-time bar passage rate dropped).
\item \textsuperscript{205} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{206} See generally supra note 71.
\end{itemize}
admitting Hispanic and Black law students based on their probability of meeting more rigorous ABA bar passage standards.\textsuperscript{207}

VI. A Blueprint For Future Research On Bar Examination Student Competence Outcome Measures.

Currently, the attorney licensing system in the United States is dysfunctional for a number of reasons. First, there is currently no requirement or mechanism for the ABA, state bar associations, the NCBE and law schools to share data about bar examination statistics. The ABA does not require law schools to report certain critically important data like a law school’s students’ mean MBE scores because law schools do not control the data supplied to them by State Bar Associations.\textsuperscript{208} State Bar Associations often do not on their own collect and/or do not seek data from the NCBE,\textsuperscript{209} and even if they collect bar examination data they often do not publish that information.\textsuperscript{210} Further, the NCBE, a private non-profit corporation,\textsuperscript{211} often refuses to supply researchers with bar examination data that the NCBE they maintain is proprietary and legally protected.\textsuperscript{212} Some law schools refuse to provide non-ABA required information for fear of infecting the school’s

\textsuperscript{207} See supra notes 84, 81, 99, 105 and accompanying text (computing information for the first-time July bar passage mean [2007-2015] for these schools: Golden Gate (60.55%), Southwestern (62.8%), Thomas Jefferson (51.5%), and Whittier (58.2%)).

\textsuperscript{208} See generally Managing Director’s Guidance Memo Standard 509, ABA, SEC. OF LEGAL EDUC. & ADMISSIONS TO THE B. (Rev. July 2016) (articulating Standard 509 and the required disclosure from law schools).

\textsuperscript{209}

\textsuperscript{210}


\textsuperscript{212}
reputation and/or U. S. News ranking.  In order to intelligently investigate and draft better and fairer national law school accreditation standards, this lack of information vortex must end.

This paper proposes a 3-step process for creating a bar examination information sharing ethos:

First, the ABA, the Conference of Chief Justices, the National Center for State Courts, the NCBE and the ABA Council of Legal Education and Admission to the Bar need to cohost a conference on bar examinations and law student data sharing. The conference should invite a wide range of decision makers, academics, researchers, and psychometricians to participate on panels related to the issues and possible solutions to the bar examination data gap dilemma. The bar licensing system will only improve if all stakeholders can come to consensus on the importance of and procedures to share data.

Second, researchers and other interested persons should exhaust state remedies to seek available bar examination data that has not been published by state bar associations. “All 50 states also have public records laws which allow members of the public (including non-residents) to obtain documents and other public records from state and local government bodies.” Although some state public records acts limit the types of data and the governmental agencies covered by disclosure statutes, some statutes specifically include state bar associations. For

---

instance, the “[e]ffective January 1, 2016, the State Bar of California is subject to the California Records Act (CPRA) (Gov. Code sections 6250, et. seq.).” 215 In fact, the data used in Part II, supra, regarding California ABA law schools’ mean MBE scores was only attainable from the California State Bar Association by filing a California Public Records Request. 216

3. Significant reform in the National Conference of Bar Examiners’ monopoly over law license testing in the United States and access to NCBE’s test data is required in order to intelligently assess and reform state and ABA bar examination standards. Except for states like Wisconsin who use a diploma privilege for licensing rather than a bar exam for certain students, and Louisiana that does not use portions of the NCBE bar testing machinery, every other law student in the country must take some form of licensing test written by, administered by and graded by the NCBE. Historically, until the middle of the 1970’s the NCBE had little involvement in the bar licensing process. For example, California did not adopt the MBE until 1972 and until 1980, before adopting the MPRE, California wrote, administered, and graded its own professional responsibility examination. 217 According to the California State Bar Association

216 See Letter from the Cal. State Bar Ass’n to Professor William W. Patton, supra note 72. (stating how author received information regarding California ABA law schools’ mean and MBE scores)
217 See California Bar Examination Information and History, THE ST. B. OF CAL., 1-2 (explaining how the California State Bar intends to discontinue administration of the California Professional Responsibility Examination and instead will take and pass the Multiple Professional Responsibility Exam); Interview with Gayle Murphy, Senior Director, State Bar Admissions, (Mar. 13, 2013) (speaking about California’s adoption of the MBE and MPRE); see also Email from Kellie Early, NCBE, to Professor Patton on December 5, 2016 (“NCBE has brought all MBE test development
and the NCBE, California no longer has any involvement in the writing, administering or grading of the MBE and MPRE.\textsuperscript{218}

Because the NCBE now has the largest data base on bar examination statistics in the United States, researchers and public policy makers have no access to that data that would earlier have been in the possession of individual state bar associations and subject to discovery under a state public records request. Although the NCBE publishes some of its bar examination statistics, it does not provide the public or researchers access to their non-published data. When the NCBE was contacted for non-published MPRE data for another article, the NCBE responded with the following response: “The information on our web site is the only data available to the public. I am sorry we cannot be of further assistance.”\textsuperscript{219} The lack of access to the NCBE data base is not only problematic for independent researchers, it also infects the credibility of NCBE’s many statistical reports and analyses. Without access to the raw data there is no way for independent researchers to validate the NCBE reports, and the lack of outside peer review of

activity in-house, and...the California State Bar Committee of Examiners does not play any role.”) (email on file with author).

\textsuperscript{218} See Letter from The Committee of Bar Examiners of the State Bar of California to William Wesley Patton (Aug. 29, 2016) (on file with author) (explaining how the MBE is owned by the National Conference of Bar Examiners and they can determine the format, scope, topics, questions, and grading process).

\textsuperscript{219} See E-mail from Kellie Early, \textit{NCBE Publications and Research}, to Professor Patton (May 24, 2016) (on file with author) (stating the only information available is the public information on the website).
article published in the NCBE's journal, the Bar Examiner, raises questions regarding the neutrality and accuracy of NCBE analyses.220

There is a potential remedy in some states to make up for the lack of access to NCBE non-published bar examination data. Some states prohibit governmental organizations from entering into contracts or delegating governmental work to organizations that refuse to provide public access to information otherwise discoverable if that data were to be maintained by the governmental agency.221 For instance, in California a “[s]tate or local agency may not allow another party to control the disclosure that is otherwise subject to disclosure pursuant to this chapter [California Public Records Act].”222 In California, the State Bar Act provides that the Committee of Bar Examiners is vested with authority over three state attorney licensing functions: (1) “to administer the requirements for admission to practice law”; (2) “to examine all applicants for admission”; and, (3) “to certify to the Supreme Court for admission those applicants who fulfill the

220 In response to my question, “I looked at the members of the editorial board, but I did not see any experts on methodological design such as psychometricians. Is that part of the editorial process handled by the NCBE staff?, the NCBE responded, “Should an article require evaluation of a psychometric nature, we would engage NCBE psychometric staff to participate in the review.” (I would consider moving the first part of this footnote to the actual text of the note). See E-mail from Professor Patton , NCBE, to Claire J. Guback (July 26, 2016, TIME EST) (on file with author)(questioning whether an article requiring evaluation of a psychometric nature would engage NCBE psychometric staff to participate in the review). “The public’s interest in a fair and transparent licensing process outweighs the interests of an entity. We need time to have this change [in UBE format] studied by a disinterested party to validate NCBE’s representatives.” (I would put this in the actual text of the note); see Suzanne Darrow-Kleinhaus, A Reply to the National Conference of Bar Examiners: More Talk, No Answers, so Keep on Shopping 15 (stating how public interest outweighs interest of an entity with licensing processes).

requirements.” The California Committee of Bar Examiners delegated to the NCBE its duty to “examine all applicants for admission,” even though it originally exercised the function of writing, administering, and grading the California General Bar Exam. As it is the Committee’s duty to examine what information has been transferred to the NCBE, and because the NCBE is a private corporation that is not directly covered by the California Public Records Act, the State Bar violated California Government Code § 6253.3. To cure this violation of the California Public Records Act, the public and researchers have access to several procedural remedies. First, they could attempt to negotiate with the State Bar to obtain information maintained and privately held by the NCBE that would otherwise be discoverable under the public records act. This option provides the State Bar with an incentive to work with the data requester in order to avoid litigation that could result in a court prohibiting the State Bar Association from delegating bar testing to the NCBE. If the negotiation fails, then a data requester could sue in superior court for a writ of mandate and/or prohibition to either obtain the data or cease the relationship between the State Bar Association and the NCBE. For instance, in Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City the court found that

defendant illegally retained a “private consultant” and relied on the consultant’s data to decide the City’s eminent domain redevelopment power. The trial court held that the City violated California Government Code § 6253.3 because it failed to keep control of data otherwise discoverable by petitioners under the CPRA. The Court of Appeals stated that no “bad faith finding” is required under the CPRA, and that the “City is not justified in arguing that it did everything it could or should have to do, or that all the fault lay with its contractor RSG.” The Court of Appeals upheld the trial court’s declaratory relief and mandated that the City “make reasonable efforts to facilitate the location and release of the information.”

In *Sander v. State Bar of California* the California Supreme Court held that the public has a legitimate interest in the state bar licensing process and that it has a right to non-confidential information regarding the reliability, fairness, and the bar examination’s possible disparate impact based upon race, ethnicity and gender. Obviously, if law suits were lodged in several states, the NCBE might be sufficiently incentivized to agree to abide by state public records acts except for disclosure of student identifying data and NCBE’s proprietary test data.

CONCLUSION

An ABA Standard based solely on law school bar percentage passage rates results in inequitable application in states that have promulgated much higher

---

227 *Id.* at 1428–29.
228 *Id.*
229 *Id.* at 1429.
231 See *id.* at 324-325 (2013) (finding that the public has an interest in the state bar licensing process and has a right to non-confidential information).
than national mean MBE cut scores. This bar passage percentage standard creates an incentive for schools in high MBE cut score states not to admit students with slightly lower LSAT/GPA credentials, including minority/ethnic applicants, to maintain ABA accreditation. The best method to level the playing field for minorities among all states, maintaining and/or increasing diversity in the bar, and assuring consumer protection is to add a within “X” standard deviation from the national mean MBE score for 3 out of the last 5 years for maintaining ABA accreditation regarding students’ outcome measures as a proxy for legal competence and the quality of law school instruction. It is time for the ABA and the NCBE to combine their resources and share all existing MBE data, to determine the appropriate “X” standard deviation from the national mean MBE score, and to use a new element of Standard 316 to judge the quality of student competence on the bar examination.
Dear American Bar Association,

My name is Keith Sutton, a wanted to let you know that first of all I have two associates degrees one in general studies with a concentration in biology, and also in nursing. I also have my Bachelors in nursing, and a masters in nursing from a top 20 program when I graduated. I am currently in a Doctorate of nurse practitioner program(DNP), after this semester I have one class left to complete this degree. I am considered a minority in nursing for two reasons one is because I am a male in a dominated female professional, and secondly I am black.

Nursing programs are like being in the military, they usually harp on grammar big time like law school dose. If you are one point away from a A- they don’t round off your grade but if I was in medical school they wouldn’t do that.

So what I’m getting at is there are a lot of other considerations that you should allow than constantly relying on the LSAT, it doesn’t make a person a better lawyer. The reason I can say this is because nursing schools use to want and rely heavily on the graduate record exams for entry into the nurse practitioner programs. I was a head of my time and argued that this doesn’t make you a better nurse practitioner. Then they basically got rid of that requirement!!

It is time to change because you are leaving out a lot of minority’s like me that has the medical knowledge to be able to challenge death penalty cases brilliantly if I had a law degree. I am honest I have had a history of have diabetes and most recently went through treatments for cancer over the year and a half, and finishing my DNP will be hard but a huge challenge because it is like a military program again instead if I went to medical school they don’t grade the students low at all in their clinical rotations at all. I know this because at one time my father told me this and he is a medical doctor that use to teach with a medical school. You are going to not have more diversity of minority candidates if you don't start to change the heavy reliance on the LSAT. Schools are feeling pressured because you guys are coming down on them way to hard, such as in Arizona, North Carolina, just to name a few of them.

Even if schools can include the consideration based also on the minority admissions it is interesting to me that the LSAT is usually considered the most. The reason why I know this is because I have spoken to many law schools around the country!! I appreciate your tine and consideration of my concerns.

Thank You
Keith Sutton FNP/BC
October 24, 2018

Mr. Fernando Mariduena
Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar
ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar
321 N. Clark Street, 21st Floor
Chicago, IL 60654
Via email: Fernando.mariduena@americanbar.org

Dear Mr. Mariduena,

On behalf of the ABA Commission on Lawyer Assistance Programs, The National Task Force on Lawyer Well-Being, and the ABA Law Student Division, we are jointly writing and requesting that the Council consider revisions to the ABA Standards on Legal Education.

Law students are experiencing significant challenges in the areas of substance use (including alcohol) and mental health. These needs were confirmed with the publication of Suffering in Silence: The Survey of Law Student Well-Being and the Reluctance of Law Students to Seek Help for Substance Use and Mental Health Concerns (the “Law Student Survey”) by Jerome Organ, David Jaffe and Kate Bender in the Journal of Legal Education (2016). In the same year, a separate study documented the challenges that attorneys, and particularly young attorneys, were confronting in the profession. The Prevalence of Substance Use and Other Mental Health Concerns Among American Attorneys (the “Hazelden Study”) (P.R. Krill, R. Johnson, & L. Albert, 10 J. Addiction Med. 46 (2016). Throughout this time period, national media coverage of some high-profile deaths from suicide has continued to dramatize the urgent and compelling need for action.

In response to these serious and well-documented trends, a national task force of relevant stake-holders convened to discuss next steps. Those deliberations resulted in The Path to Lawyer Well-Being: Practical Recommendations for Positive Change (August, 2017). This comprehensive report, available at lawyerwellbeing.net, outlines an ambitious agenda for institutional changes throughout the legal profession. The ABA House of Delegates, at the 2018 Midyear Meeting in Vancouver, adopted a resolution urging stakeholders to consider the recommendations of the report. These recommendations included the following proposals relating to law schools:
30. INCLUDE WELL-BEING TOPICS IN COURSES ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY.

Mental health and substance use should play a more prominent role in courses on professional responsibility, legal ethics, or professionalism. A minimum of one class session should be dedicated to the topic of substance use and mental health issues, during which bar examiners and professional responsibility professors or their designee (such as a lawyer assistance program representative) appear side-by-side to address the issues. Until students learn from those assessing them that seeking assistance will not hurt their bar admission prospects, they will not get the help they need.

31. COMMIT RESOURCES FOR ONSITE PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS.
Law schools should have, at a minimum, a part-time, onsite professional counselor. An onsite counselor provides easier access to students in need and sends a symbolic message to the law school community that seeking help is supported and should not be stigmatized. Although the value of such a resource to students should justify the necessary budget, law schools also could explore inexpensive or no-cost assistance from lawyer assistance programs. Other possible resources may be available from the university or private sector.

We write to urge the Section on Legal Education to consider the following recommendations that recognize the importance of law student well-being in the ABA Standards. Our request includes:

1. articulating professional well-being as a fundamental learning outcome in Section 302;
2. urging by an Interpretation to Section 303 that one hour in the Professional Responsibility course be dedicated to education on substance use and mental health;
3. ensuring that law school student services as defined in Section 508 include the substance use and mental health counseling desperately needed on every campus in this era.

The Commission on Lawyer Assistance Programs works with state and local lawyer assistance programs around the country whose mission is to serve lawyers, judges, and law students who are struggling with alcoholism, substance and mental health challenges. Many LAPs around the country are already working closely with law schools to provide needed education and counseling. Many law schools are working closely with central University Counseling Centers to provide on-campus services, and in some instances have hired dedicated staff to provide on-site services. These revisions require that every law school have a plan to address these needs but would not require the expenditure of additional funds.
Task Force members, working with multiple sections of the American Bar Association and the Conference of Chief Justices, continue to advocate for institutional change on many fronts, including the bar admission process, continuing legal education requirements, law firm leave policies, and burdens faced by the judiciary. At a time when the entire profession is moving forward on this national agenda for Lawyer Well-Being, we urge the Council to take action on these proposed revisions.

Sincerely,

Bree Buchanan
ABA Commission on Lawyer Assistance Programs

Bree Buchanan, Chris Newbold, William Slease
National Task Force on Lawyer Wellbeing

Negeen Sadeghi-Movahed
ABA Law Student Division
Proposed Changes to the ABA Standards for Approval of Law Schools
Submitted on Behalf of the ABA Commission on Lawyer Assistance Programs, the National Task Force on Lawyer Well-Being, and the ABA Law Student Division

Standard 302. LEARNING OUTCOMES
A law school shall establish learning outcomes that shall, at a minimum, include competency in the following:
(a) Knowledge and understanding of substantive and procedural law;
(b) Legal analysis and reasoning, legal research, problem-solving, and written and oral communication in the legal context;
(c) Exercise of proper professional and ethical responsibilities to clients and the legal system; and
(d) Other professional skills needed for competent and ethical participation as a member of the legal profession, including the tools needed to promote personal and professional well-being.

Standard 303. CURRICULUM
(a) A law school shall offer a curriculum that requires each student to satisfactorily complete at least the following:
(1) one course of at least two credit hours in professional responsibility that includes substantial instruction in rules of professional conduct, and the values and responsibilities of the legal profession and its members;
(2) one writing experience in the first year and at least one additional writing experience after the first year, both of which are faculty supervised; and
(3) one or more experiential course(s) totaling at least six credit hours. An experiential course must be a simulation course, a law clinic, or a field placement as defined in Standard 304.

Interpretation 303-5
Mental health and substance use should play a more prominent role in the required course on professional responsibility. A minimum of one class session should be dedicated to the topic of substance use and mental health issues, during which bar examiners and professional responsibility professors or their designee (such as a lawyer assistance program representative) appear side-by-side to address the issues.

Standard 508. STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES
A law school shall provide all its students, regardless of enrollment or scheduling option, with basic student services, including maintenance of accurate student records, academic advising and counseling, financial aid and debt counseling, substance use and mental health counseling, and career counseling to assist students in making sound career choices and obtaining employment. If a law school does not provide these student services directly, it shall demonstrate that its students have reasonable access to such services from the university of which it is a part or from other sources.
MORE TRANSPARENCY, PLEASE

Kyle McEntee*

I. Introduction .................................................................................................................. 1

II. Data Proposals ........................................................................................................... 5
   A. Student Borrowing ................................................................................................. 5
   B. Tuition Prices and Discounts ............................................................................... 10
   C. Gender Diversity .................................................................................................. 14
   D. Racial and Ethnic Diversity .................................................................................. 16
   E. Additional Diversity Data ...................................................................................... 18

III. Costs of Additional Data Collection and Reporting ............................................. 19

IV. Costs of Additional Data Publication ................................................................. 21

V. Conclusion .................................................................................................................. 23

I. INTRODUCTION

Transparency comes in many forms, from data to documents. Yet what matters most is what transparency does. It reveals. Through revelation, transparency can reduce information asymmetry to help markets, policymakers, and even decisionmakers at the institutions subject to scrutiny. It exposes blind spots and signals opportunities for change. As such, transparency is not a final step in progress—it is an early step. Whatever transparency reveals, the value is severely limited without action because progress is not inevitable. Progress depends on what people and institutions do with what is revealed.

This is both a blessing and a curse. Transparency is easy to be in favor of and disproportionately difficult to be against. It can also be the easy way out when confronted with a problem. Increasing transparency may let policymakers off the hook without passing additional laws, regulations, or standards. The phrase caveat emptor comes to mind. Of course, because transparency is easier to achieve than more onerous limits on behavior, it also

* Executive Director, Law School Transparency (“LST”). Founded in 2009, LST is a nonprofit dedicated to making entry to the legal profession more transparent, affordable, and fair. The author thanks members of the Iowa State Bar Association Young Lawyers Division, including Kyle Fry, Thomas Hillers, Abhay Nadipuram, Rob Poggenklass, and Maggie White, for co-authoring A Way Forward: Transparency in 2018. This article draws on that report. The author also thanks Olympia Duhart, Kimber Russell, Marissa Olsson, Deborah Merritt, Susan Poser, and Caren Ulrich Stacy for the essential part each played in LST’s Women in the Law. That mini-series about the challenges women face in the legal profession sparked several recommendations made in this article.
provides the opportunity to build genuine progress over time while values catch up. Transparency can therefore operate as a powerful, ironically discrete tool.

At times the American Bar Association ("ABA") Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar ("Section"), the accreditor of law schools, has acknowledged and responded to problems in legal education through transparency measures. The ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools ("Standards"), for example, now expressly prohibit schools from providing false, incomplete, or misleading consumer information. The Standards also require law schools to publish detailed employment data on their websites.

The impetus for these changes began in 2010, but were caused by deceptive marketing practices that had become the norm over several decades. Specifically, law schools overstated job and salary outcomes. The lack of transparency and accountability resulted in inflated enrollment, inadequate job prospects, and higher prices. Once identified, covered by the legal and mainstream press, and remedied through changes to the Standards and voluntary disclosure norms, law school enrollment fell dramatically, job prospects improved, and tuition increases slowed or in some cases declined.

Conditional scholarships provide another example of how transparency can meaningfully affect law schools. "A conditional scholarship is any financial aid award that depends on the student maintaining a minimum grade point average or class standing, other than that ordinarily required to remain in good academic standing." The New York Times described conditional scholarship programs as a "bait and switch" tactic. The programs raised

---

2 Id.
4 Id.
6 After 1L enrollment peaked in 2010 at 52,404 new students, enrollment fell dramatically in each of the next three years, followed by four years of even lower, but steady enrollment between 37,000 and 38,000 new 1Ls. Id. While smaller class size certainly helps the percentage of the class who can get a lawyer job, the entry-level market remains structurally weak. Since 2013, fewer graduates obtained full-time lawyer jobs each year than the prior year. Law School Job Outcomes, LAW SCH. TRANSPARENCY, https://data.lawschooltransparency.com/jobs/legal-jobs/ (last visited Aug. 21, 2018).
fairness concerns because students did not fully understand their terms—law school grading curves are a harsh reality for students who achieved all A’s and B’s in college—and because students were disposed not to re-assess continued enrollment once the price drastically changed in the middle of their studies, something law schools took advantage of to maximize tuition revenue. Starting in 2013, the Section required law schools to publish the number of students who receive conditional scholarships and the number of those students who lost some or all their scholarship value due to law school performance.\textsuperscript{9} By the 2016-17 academic year, 36 law schools had eliminated these programs, a reduction of 29%\textsuperscript{10}.

The motivation behind the change is tough to definitively pin down. Schools fiercely competed for students in that time as the number of law school applicants tumbled.\textsuperscript{11} And some applicants successfully negotiated their scholarship conditions away. However, schools also came under significant fire from their own faculty, at academic conferences, and in the press. Hard data highlighted schools that utilized these scholarship programs and showed how students fared. Individuals at schools were forced to assess how these practices comported with their values, as well as the school’s. The nation’s top law schools in particular fled to higher moral ground.\textsuperscript{12}

With both employment data and conditional scholarships, transparency measures were designed to address known problems. With the former, the law school applicant market responded to new information to produce change. But rebounding applicant demand despite a flat job market is likely to showcase the shortcomings of relying on transparency to create a system of legal education that suits its important place in society. The Section’s transparency measures allow observers to see worsening job prospects for graduates coming, but the Standards do not attempt to limit enrollment through, for example, a minimum employment rate as the Section does with the minimum bar passage standard.\textsuperscript{13} Likewise the Section could have banned conditional scholarships, but instead opted to institute mandatory disclosures. Open data access enables researchers to produce new

\textsuperscript{9} Conditional Scholarships, supra note 7.

\textsuperscript{10} Id. The number of law schools with conditional scholarship programs was flat for the first three years of data. However, these data were cemented before the new mandatory disclosures. Once the data were in the open, the number of schools with these programs fell, first slowly and then more quickly.


\textsuperscript{13} AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, supra note 1, at 24; see also Scott F. Norberg, J.D.s and Jobs: The Case for an ABA Accreditation Standard on Employment Outcomes, 67 J.L.E. 1035 (2018).
information by combining datasets, as illustrated in Part A.3. It also allows problems to be identified earlier and systematically, instead of by anecdote. Yet the impact on progress—however measured—is limited by what comes after transparency, whether standards, market adjustments, or self-correction in the face of a moral dilemma.

The proposals in this article are the product of discussions with young lawyers, law students, legal academics, and leadership in various sections and divisions in the ABA. Part A outlines transparency proposals related to student debt, scholarships, and diversity. Part B considers the costs to law schools and the Section from additional data collection and reporting. Part C considers constraints related to making the resultant datasets public. Finally, Part D provides concluding remarks about the balance between the costs and benefits of these proposals.

The Council already has the authority to collect and require schools to publish all the data described below. Standard 104 permits the Council to collect these data “in the form, manner, and time frame” it specifies each year. Rule 49(b) permits the Council to publish these data when “authorized under Standard 509 or [when] . . . made public by the law school.” Standard 509 allows the Council to require schools to publish these data “in the form and manner and for the time frame designated by the Council.”

If enacted, these proposals will shed light on law student debt, inequitable pricing practices, and lasting inequality. The resultant data will allow legal educators and policymakers to confront difficult realities and to direct resources in directions that strengthen and stabilize the law school pipeline. Better consumer information will help students make sense of their choice, while also shedding light on legal education’s contributions to the legal profession’s diversity. It will also lay bare certain decisions schools make in how and why they allocate resources.

This aligns squarely with the Section of Legal Education’s mission and values. The Section is the nationally recognized accreditor of law schools, but its mission is broader. Its mission is also “[t]o be a creative national force in providing leadership and services to those responsible for and those who benefit from a sound program of legal education and bar admissions.” In July 2017, the Section convened a roundtable of legal education stakeholders to discuss how to modify the Standards to encourage innovation and address challenges related to cost, declining job opportunities, and

---

14 Id. at 5.
15 Id. at 76.
16 Id. at 35.
18 Id.
declining bar passage rates. One theme that emerged from the roundtable is
the necessity of more transparency. While transparency is not a magic bullet,
the foundation for reform is good data. In the meantime, the following
recommendations will expand access to valuable data to spark reforms that
advance the United States legal system.

II. DATA PROPOSALS

A. Student Borrowing

The typical law student borrows a significant sum of money to attend
law school. In 2017, the average private law school graduate who borrowed
received $130,145 in student loan disbursements during law school.\(^\text{19}\) The
average public law school graduate who borrowed received $92,997 in
student loans.\(^\text{20}\) Notably, borrowing averages do not reflect the amount of
debt owed when repayment begins six months after graduation. For the 2018-
19 academic year, interest immediately begins to accrue for students at 6.6%
for Stafford Loans (up to $20,500 per year) or 7.6% for Graduate PLUS loans
(up to the full cost of attendance).\(^\text{21}\) The government does not subsidize law
student interest payments during school, thus the cost of the first-year loan
increases by nearly 25% while the student is studying and before a single
loan payment is due if the student does not make interest payments or repay
principal during law school.

These national averages come from school-level borrowing averages.
Each school’s average includes any graduate who borrowed at least $1 during
law school, whether they borrowed for just one semester—perhaps $5,000 to
pay for a trip—or they borrowed the full cost of attendance each year. While
the average can tell us about the entire population, it tells us little about
individual students. With cost of attendance in 2017-18 as high as $95,883 at
Stanford Law School, student borrowing can vary wildly based on
scholarships and ability to pay.\(^\text{22}\) The latest available data show that 55% of
Stanford Law students pay full price.\(^\text{23}\) After accounting for interest that
accumulates during law school, a Stanford graduate who paid full price for

\(^{19}\) Law School Debt, LAW SCH. TRANSPARENCY,

\(^{20}\) Id.

\(^{21}\) 2018-19 Federal Student Loan Interest Rates, ACCESSLEX, https://www.accesslex.org/2018-

\(^{22}\) Stanford University Costs, LAW SCH. TRANSPARENCY,

\(^{23}\) Id.
all three years may owe over $300,000 when the first payment is due, even factoring in a 2L summer associate salary.

The public does not know how many (if any) graduates actually borrow the full amount, just that 80% of Stanford Law graduates in 2017 borrowed at least $1 and that the average graduate borrowed $131,745.\(^{24}\) Perhaps borrowing several hundred thousand dollars from one of the nation’s elite law schools is not a matter of public interest or concern. But the debt loads at schools with worse job and bar exam outcomes can reach astronomical levels too.

Take, for example, Southwestern Law School. Its annual cost of attendance was $82,600 in 2017-18.\(^{25}\) Half of its students paid full price.\(^{26}\) Only 43% of its 2017 graduates obtained a long-term, full-time job that requires bar passage within ten months of graduation.\(^{27}\) Only 52.3% of 2017 graduates passed the California bar exam on the first try.\(^{28}\) The public does not know how many, if any, graduates actually borrowed nearly a quarter of a million dollars at this school. But unlike for Stanford, the public does not know the average amount borrowed at Southwestern Law School because the school has not disclosed graduate borrowing data since 2012, when the average amount borrowed for the 78.9% of graduates who borrowed was $147,976.\(^{29}\) Since that time, tuition at the school is up 23%; net tuition is up 8%; cost of living is up 12%; the median and 75th percentile scholarship has not changed; and the 25th percentile scholarship has declined by a third.\(^{30}\)

Given the cost of legal education and the expected entry-level salaries, many graduates face consequential financial strain. The amount of strain


\(^{26}\) Id.


differs greatly based on the amount an individual owes. Financial advisors typically recommend devoting no more than 10 or 15% of income to debt service. A graduate who borrows $110,000 owes roughly $125,000 at first payment, which translates to a monthly payment of about $1,400 on the standard ten-year plan. To remain in range of the recommendation, the graduate must make between $112,000 (for 15%) and $168,000 (for 10%). This graduate would devote 24% of her pre-tax salary if she earns the median entry-level salary of $70,000 for 2017 graduates in long-term, full-time law jobs. She would devote 34% of her pre-tax salary if she borrowed $147,976 (Southwestern’s 2012 average amount borrowed). The burden accelerates with a greater amount borrowed, a lower salary, or both.

The Section of Legal Education does not publish any school-level borrowing data, although the Section does collect related data as part of its annual questionnaire to law schools. Each law school must report the total amount borrowed by all J.D. students for the previous academic year, as well as the number of J.D. students who borrowed. From this, the Section can calculate the average amount borrowed for a single year of law school. When combined with the total J.D. enrollment, the Section can also calculate the percentage who borrowed. In the past, the Section measured the cumulative
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32 NAT’L ASS’N FOR LAW PLACEMENT, CLASS OF 2017 NATIONAL SUMMARY REPORT (2018), https://www.nalp.org/uploads/Classof2017_NationalSummaryReport.pdf. These salary numbers are not perfect, but they overstate rather than understate salaries. The percentage of a graduating class employed in jobs that require a law license is sensitive to two distinct supply figures: total graduates and total available jobs. For example, if graduates increase and the number of jobs stays the same, the percentage will decline. The percentage of graduates obtaining full-time entry-level legal jobs was quite high in the 1980s, peaking at 84.5% in 1988. The average rate in the mid to late 1980s was 82.9%. The next two decades (90s and 00s) each had an average that was ten points lower, 73.7% in the 90s and 71.4% in the 00s. This decade, so far, the average is 61.7%—an additional ten points lower. National Report on Law School Job Outcomes, LAW SCH. TRANSPARENCY, https://data.lawschooltransparency.com/jobs/legal-jobs/ (last visited Aug. 21, 2018). Strikingly, these shifts appear to reflect enrollment management decisions by law schools instead of demand for new lawyers. Between 1976 and 2000, law schools steadily enrolled between ~40,000 and ~44,000 new students each year. From 1976 to 1987, the average was 40,973. From 1988 to 2000, the average was 43,497—a little over 6% higher. But between 2000 and 2002, law schools increased first-year enrollment 11.2%. In subsequent years, enrollment steadily crept up, with minor ebbs and flows, until peaking in 2010 at 52,404. The number of jobs, on the other hand, has been far steadier. Between 1985, the first year for which we were able to analyze data, and 2010, the number of new full-time law jobs each year generally stayed between 27,000 and 30,000. Increased enrollment and a steady number of jobs spell a lower employment rate for law school graduates. Id.

33 Using a weighted interest of 7.2%, she would owe just over $169,000, which translates to just shy of a $2000 monthly payment on a standard ten-year plan.

amount a graduating class borrowed for law school. This old measurement produces the figures peppered throughout this article.

Up-to-date graduate borrowing figures are possible because *U.S. News & World Report* continued to request the data after the Section changed the cohort and time period for which they measured student borrowing. Accordingly, public borrowing data for all years of law school come from voluntary disclosures by law schools to *U.S. News*. This comes with several clear consequences.

Consumers, schools, and researchers lose out because the only source for law school borrower data is a news magazine that muddies the decision-making process for consumers and schools alike. The Section encourages people to visit the *U.S. News* website through its decision not to publish these borrowing data. These data are not as reliable as they would be if they were reported to and published by the Section. Every year, more than a handful of schools make erroneous disclosures to *U.S. News*, which only occasionally get corrected. For example, some law schools routinely report to *U.S. News* the average borrowed by all J.D. students who borrow, presumably because school administrators assume the *U.S. News* survey instrument matches the Section’s questionnaire. One additional consequence of a voluntary publishing regime is that, every year, a dozen or so schools decline to publish the average amount borrowed by graduates.35

That said, the average amount borrowed by graduates and the percentage borrowing are limited in utility to consumers, although there is value in confronting consumers with figures that account for several years of schooling instead of just the annual cost of attendance. The average amount borrowed also helps journalists, advocates, and policymakers to contextualize bar passage and employment rates, as well as entry-level salaries. It is important for the Section to return to collecting borrower data for graduates in addition to borrower data during a single academic year, even if graduate borrowing data are imperfect. For example, a transfer student who graduates from the school after the first year will not have all borrowing captured. Graduate borrowing figures also exclude those who never graduated, whether they failed out or left voluntarily.

Beyond publishing the data the Section used to collect, the Section would do a great service to legal education if it enabled consumers, researchers, and internal influencers, such as faculty, to peer underneath the surface figures (average borrowed) to see the borrower makeup. Shedding light on underlying borrowing data may stir policymakers, faculty, and administrators to think more clearly and realistically about the problem of student debt. One way to do this is through a frequency distribution, which

---

35 *Debt by Law School for 2017 Graduates*, supra note 24.
“displays the frequency of various outcomes in a sample.” The following data table, Table A, uses $10,000 bands. Figure A applies the data table in graphic form (axes/data labels omitted), along with a modified box-and-whisker plot to represent the median and the interquartile range.

### Table A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Borrowed</th>
<th># Graduates</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$60,000-$69,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$130,000-$139,999</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 - $9999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$70,000-$79,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$140,000-$149,999</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$80,000-$89,999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$150,000-$159,999</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$90,000-$99,999</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$160,000-$169,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$100,000-$109,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$170,000-$179,999</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$110,000-$119,999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$180,000-$189,999</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $59,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$120,000-$129,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$190,000-$199,999</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median of Borrowers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$104,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean of Borrowers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$106,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In legal education, the most famous application of a frequency distribution is NALP’s bi-modal salary distribution curve (shown below, Figure B). This curve continues to shape how policymakers, researchers, consumers, and the public understand entry-level salaries. The mean salary may have been $82,292 for 2014 graduates, but very few graduates made at or near that amount. Instead graduates fell into one of two “humps”—

---

$160,000 on the one side and between $40,000 and $65,000 on the other. It is impactful because readers must confront the individuals that make up the averages.

Figure B

In an ideal world, the public would know how much graduates owe when the first payment is due including interest, but this is not possible without federal legislation. Instead, the Section should collect data on student loan borrowing outcomes for graduates and publish those outcomes using a frequency distribution table, including non-borrowers, using its authority under Standard 104 and Rule 49(b).

This proposal poses no additional collection burden and minimal reporting burden for law schools. As evidenced by roughly 90% of law schools voluntarily disclosing the average amount borrowed to U.S. News each year, the burden would be negligible for schools to report the relevant figures once again to the Section. Further, the reason law schools can calculate an average at all is that the schools process student loans for their students. Reporting individual records, properly anonymized in the same way as employment outcome records, would require minimal staff time and produce valuable data for public consumption.

B. Tuition Prices and Discounts

Over the past several decades, law school tuition has increased dramatically, well above inflation. Compared to tuition in 1985, private and public law school tuition is 2.7 and 5.8 times as expensive after accounting

for inflation. The average private law school tuition was $46,329 in 2017, with residents at public schools paying an average of $26,425 per year. The range of tuition, however, demonstrates remarkable variability. At public schools, one year of resident tuition ranged from $7,383 to $58,300. At private schools, the range was $16,418 to $67,564 per year. While the average tuition at top performing law schools is much higher than the rest, prices do not scale with job outcomes elsewhere. The average tuition at the lowest performing schools is similar to the average for mid-range schools.

Law schools engage in significant tuition discounting through grants and scholarships. Although the nominal tuition price has increased, it does not tell the whole story. About 30% of students pay full price. For the 70% receiving a discount, the discounts have shifted away from need-based discounts based on ability to pay towards merit-based discounts based on LSAT and undergraduate GPA. Those with the highest LSATs and GPAs receive the discounts. As such, the students who are least likely to complete school, pass the bar, and get a job subsidize the students who are more likely to succeed. These also tend to be the students who are the most disadvantaged.

The Section of Legal Education collects and publishes useful data related to how much students pay for their legal education. The Section currently requires schools to report and publish for full-time and part-time students: tuition and fees; scholarship data by the median and interquartile range; and scholarship data by the percentage of tuition covered, e.g. what percentage of all students have a scholarship that covers up to 50% of tuition. Moreover, the Section requires schools to report and publish whether and how often they reduce or eliminate scholarships after poor academic performance.
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39 Id.
41 Id.
42 Id.
43 Id.
44 Net Tuition for U.S. Law Schools, supra note 30.
46 Annual Questionnaire, supra note 34.
47 Id.
The Section already recognizes the value of publicly available price information for consumers, researchers, and the public. But with increased discounting and the shift away from need-based aid, additional clarity would add additional value. The utility of data for policymaking and decision-making depends not only on whether data are publicly available, but also data presentation. The Section can further its efforts of helping people understand the cost of legal education with frequency distribution tables for tuition paid by students using relatively narrow distribution bands. The Section should collect data on tuition paid by each enrolled individual and publish up to four frequency distributions tables per law school—one for 1L tuition paid, one for upper-level tuition paid, and a distinction for part-time and full-time as necessary—using its authority under Standard 104 and Rule 49(b).

This proposal poses no additional collection burden and minimal reporting burden for law schools. In fact, rather than a new style of information, this proposal merely improves upon the frequency distribution table the Section already utilizes for how much tuition students pay, referred above as “scholarship data by the percentage of tuition covered.” Table B reproduces a Standard 509 Information Report arbitrarily selected (seriously) from ABArequireddisclosures.org, with several stylistic and linguistic clarifications to showcase its contents. The clearly erroneous part-time column is reproduced without any adjustment.

**Table B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Grant Received</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Any Grant</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>338%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Half Tuition</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>125%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half to Full Tuition</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>113%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Tuition</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Full Tuition</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal (below, Table C) would improve the precision of the table by introducing narrower bands than the first column in Table B. The proposal also reframes, for the sake of precision, the bands from the percentage of tuition to the amount of tuition paid. These simple changes will help people connect tuition prices to the real lives affected by them. The resultant Table C showcases the transactional nature of tuition discounting, rather than a framework that treats scholarships as acts of generosity, which restricts how consumers, policymakers, and internal decision-makers understand and
act on the information. Law school financial aid and admissions administrators frequently and rightfully complain that prospective students focus too much on the scholarship amount, rather than on the price they would pay. Consider a student who receives a $10,000 scholarship at School A with $35,000 annual tuition and a $20,000 scholarship at comparable School B with $45,000 annual tuition. Although the price paid is the same, students in his or her position often complain about disparate scholarship amounts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition Paid, Full Time</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$18,000 - $20,999</td>
<td>[0-48]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 - $2,999</td>
<td>[0-48]</td>
<td>$21,000 - $23,999</td>
<td>[0-27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 - $5,999</td>
<td>[0-48]</td>
<td>$24,000 - $26,999</td>
<td>[0-27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000 - $8,999</td>
<td>[0-48]</td>
<td>$27,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>[0-27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 - $11,999</td>
<td>[0-48]</td>
<td>$30,000 - $32,999</td>
<td>[0-27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>[0-48]</td>
<td>$33,000 - $35,999</td>
<td>[0-27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $17,999</td>
<td>[0-48]</td>
<td>$36,000 - $38,999</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Tuition Paid</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,706</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39,000 - $41,999</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Tuition Paid</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28,071</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C is the author’s best estimate using publicly available data. The range of students for the distribution bands from $1 to $35,999 (75 total students) were derived from the frequency distribution table on the Standard 509 Information Report. The interquartile range and median produced a different distribution across those bands—and the distributions contradicted each other, almost surely due to a data reporting error by the unnamed law school.

As this table merely refashions how the price paid by students is communicated to the public, the burden would be negligible for law schools to report the necessary data to the Section. Every law school can account for how much its students pay—in fact, it is necessary to know this for any school that processes Title IV student loans (all law schools). Reporting individual records, properly anonymized in the same way as employment outcome records, would require minimal staff time and produce valuable data for public consumption. It also has the added benefit of holding law school deans accountable for public and private claims about net tuition.
C. Gender Diversity

In 1965, just 1 in 25 law students was a woman. That number steadily climbed to 1 in 4 in 1975; 1 in 3 in 1980; and since 2000, the proportions have been roughly equal—though slightly more men than women every year except the 2017 entering class. Parity in law school enrollment marked an enormous milestone, but new research demonstrates that national parity masks lurking gender inequality.

The research shows three significant “leaks” in the law school pipeline for women. The first of these leaks involves women applying to law school. Even though women are 57% of college graduates, they account for only about 51% of the law school applicants. If women applied at the same rate as men to law school, applications would increase 16%. The second leak is that women who apply to law school are less likely than men to be admitted. For the class entering in 2015, law schools admitted about 80% of the men who applied, but just 76% of the women who applied. The third leak is that, even when women are admitted, they are not spread evenly across law schools. They instead cluster disproportionately in schools with the weakest employment outcomes and worst reputations.

The first and second leaks go back several decades. The third leak, however, is new and worsening. In 2001, when schools had just gotten to roughly 50/50 nationwide, women were evenly distributed amongst schools. But by 2006 the story had started to change. Although the pattern did not yet reach statistically significant, it had started to emerge. By 2015, the pattern was statistically significant and quite stark. Today, the top 50 schools are the mirror opposite of the bottom 50 schools.

The emerging explanations mostly relate to the U.S. News law school rankings, with the most compelling relating to schools jockeying for higher LSAT scorers to increase the median score, which is a considerable driver of ranking. Over the past 15 years, in their quest to secure or improve their U.S. News ranking, law schools have decided to emphasize LSAT scores more in admissions decisions. This emphasis may explain, in part, the emergence of the third leak over the course of a decade. Women actually score two points worse on average than men on the LSAT, and there are fewer higher scorers.
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as well.\textsuperscript{55} This is typical of standardized tests with predominately multiple choice questions, unlike writing examinations that tend to favor women.\textsuperscript{56} Additional explanations may include an uneven distribution of applicants (perhaps increased median LSATs drive applicants away), uneven distribution of scholarship money (perhaps because schools overvalue the extra two points they get from men), and scholarship negotiation tendencies (perhaps because women are less likely to ask for more or any money). Additional data will provide a more robust understanding of very concerning patterns related to progress for gender diversity in the legal profession.

The Section of Legal Education collects rafts of data from law schools by gender yet publishes almost none of it. The Section has had a standing practice of publishing the gender breakdown of the entire student body, which is how the author discovered the third leak. But only beginning with the 2017-18 academic year did the Section break this out by the year in school, e.g. the number of women 1Ls. However, the number of 1Ls is a different number than the number in the first-year class, which the Section collects but does not publish. The latter does not include, for example, students who were re-admitted after academic dismissal or re-enrolled after voluntarily leaving.\textsuperscript{57} Likewise, the Section collects but does not publish gender data for the number of applicants, the number of admitted applicants, the number of graduates, the number of transfers, and the number attritted.\textsuperscript{58}

The Section should publish these data in the interest of its efforts to diversify the legal profession and to promote fairness using its authority under Rule 49(b). Under the same authority, along with Standard 104, the Section can further these efforts by collecting and publishing gender data related to scholarship amounts, conditional scholarships, and first-year class profiles.

Together and apart, these data may illuminate unknown problems and explain known ones. These data may also help consumers make informed choices. As outlined in the previous subpart on tuition and borrowing, law school is expensive. Reducing the information asymmetry—allowing


\textsuperscript{57} Annual Questionnaire, supra note 34.

\textsuperscript{58} Id. Gender numbers for the first-year class are required to fully understand the three abovementioned leaks because the number of 1Ls is not interoperable with the number of applicants and admitted applicants. In other words, calculating the yield rates for women applicants and women admitted applicants is impossible from the now-public number of women 1Ls.
students to more clearly understand their bargaining position—which would reduce debt and/or enhance the school options. Additionally, these data will help the Section analyze compliance with Standard 206(a). Standard 206(a) provides that “a law school shall demonstrate by concrete action a commitment to diversity and inclusion by providing full opportunities for the study of law and entry into the profession by members of underrepresented groups, particularly racial and ethnic minorities, and a commitment to having a student body that is diverse with respect to gender, race, and ethnicity.”59 If a school, even inadvertently, is biasing enrollment towards men because it is too concerned with chasing a higher ranking, then the school may be out of compliance with the ABA’s Standards.

Most of this proposal involves the Section making public data it already collects from law schools. For the data the Section does not yet collect by gender—scholarship amounts, conditional scholarships, and first-year class profiles—this proposal poses minimal burden. Law schools already classify every student and graduate by gender. Law schools also already possess individual, organized records for each of the proposed data categories. Matching these two datasets, to the extent law schools do not do so already, would require minimal staff time, produce valuable data for public consumption, and help decisionmakers and policymakers meet diversity objectives.

D. Racial and Ethnic Diversity

Whereas tremendous progress has been made towards gender parity, even with the emerging trend of gender clustering at the most and least reputable schools, significant progress remains for enrollment by race and ethnicity.60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>2+ Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 1Ls</strong></td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US Population</strong></td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59 AMERICAN BAR Association, supra note 1, at 12.

Aaron Taylor, the executive director of AccessLex’s Center for Legal Education Excellence, observed similar trends with race and ethnicity as the previous subpart outlined about gender. Taylor found that Black and Hispanic students were more likely to attend schools with lower median LSAT scores, which tend to be less prestigious. Whereas White and Asian students were more likely to attend more prestigious schools with higher LSAT median scores. Taylor told the National Jurist that “[t]his affects long-term outcomes, career trajectories and payoffs from law school investments. There are many implications tied in large part to race and ethnicity.”

Even on the tuition and debt front, the implications are huge. According to the Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE), then-directed by Taylor, “[i]t seems apparent that increased costs of attending law school have placed undue pressures on students from less affluent backgrounds to rely on student loans to finance their education. This burden falls disproportionately on Black and Hispanic students, who are more likely to come from low-wealth backgrounds.” Less than 5% of Black students and less than 10% of Hispanic students expected zero law school debt. For White students, it was about 20% and for Asian students about 25%. On the high end, about 25% of White students expected debt in excess of $120,000, compared to almost 45% of Black students and about 40% of Hispanic students.

Of course, these disparities relate to the “large racial and ethnic wealth disparities in the U.S.” But they also appear to relate to law school scholarship policies, because wealth explains part of the divergence in LSAT scores, which play an outsized role in determining the price a student pays to attend law school. According to LSSSE’s 2016 report, which had a response rate of 53% from 72 different law schools, two in three White students receive a merit scholarship, while just one in two Black and Hispanic students do.

---
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The LSSSE dataset is the only available dataset on race/ethnicity and scholarships, so school-specific data are not publicly available. Using its authority under Rule 49(b) and Standard 104, the Section of Legal Education should collect and publish race/ethnicity data related to scholarship amounts and conditional scholarships.

Despite the lack of race/ethnicity scholarship data, by and large, the Section does a much better job at publishing the race/ethnicity data it collects each year compared to gender data. It publishes breakdowns by race/ethnicity for the number of graduates, the number enrolled by the year in school, the number of transfers, and the number attrited.70 However, as with gender, the Section does not publish the data it collects by race/ethnicity for the number of applicants, offered applicants, and enrollees (first-year class).71 This leaves gaps that relieve schools of accountability in light of common promises to advance diversity. The Section should publish these data using its authority under Rule 49(b).

Enhancing the race/ethnicity dataset may illuminate unknown problems and explain known ones, as well as help consumers more clearly understand their bargaining position and make informed choices. Additionally, these data will help the Section analyze compliance with Standard 206(a). Most of this proposal involves the Section making public data it already collects from law schools. For the data it does not yet collect by gender—scholarship amounts and conditional scholarships—this proposal poses minimal burden. Law schools already classify every student and graduate by race/ethnicity and can match datasets, as with the gender data. This would require minimal staff time, produce valuable data for public consumption, and help decisionmakers and policymakers meet diversity objectives.

E. Additional Diversity Data

For the foregoing reasons outlined in the subparts on race/ethnicity and gender data, the public would also benefit if the data requested in the subparts on tuition prices and student borrowing outcomes were publicly accessible by race/ethnicity and gender. The Section of Legal Education may do so under its current authority under Standard 104 and Rule 49(b). This proposal poses no additional collection burden and minimal reporting burden for law schools—the same dataset matching requirement from the previous two subparts.

---

70 Annual Questionnaire, supra note 34.
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III. COSTS OF ADDITIONAL DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING

The costs of additional data collection and reporting are relevant to any discussion about the value of transparency efforts. As outlined for each proposal in Part A, the Section of Legal Education already has the authority to cause schools to report the relevant data. Not even one of the above proposals requires law schools to collect new data. In some cases, such as the number of women applicants, law schools already report the data to the Section. In other cases, such as scholarship amounts by gender, schools may need to connect two datasets, e.g. the list of students with their genders and the list of students by their scholarship. Regardless, the schools have all the relevant data and the reporting burden for each proposal is minimal.

But this article argues for the adoption of all these proposals—not just one. As such, the aggregate cost of collecting and reporting these data, including the burden born by the Section, is relevant to assessing the value of the efforts relative to the policy goals. Law schools already have direct access to all data proposed above. The cost of reporting, therefore, comes down to how schools submit the data to the Section and how the Section processes the data. These choices belong to the Section through its accreditation authority.

In some cases, the Section chooses to collect data in summary form. The school counts the number of students in a category and reports the total number in an individual cell. That is the equivalent of asking schools to populate a data table, such as Tables A, B, and C embedded earlier in this article. In other cases, the Section chooses to collect raw data and the school reports all students on the equivalent of a spreadsheet. Each row is a different student, distinguished by a unique individual identifier; each column indicates something about the student. The Section previously asked for first-year enrollment data in this way. The school reported a list of all first-year students and their LSAT and GPA. From the list, the Section calculated the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentile LSATs and GPAs.

The second approach allows the Section to more easily audit the reported data and do national analyses with the data. The first approach is less work for the Section and puts the onus on proper summarization on the law schools. As shown in Table B above, schools do not always do that correctly.

For law schools, their reporting burden stems from connecting just two spreadsheets or database tables—depending on how the school organizes its data. The first (Spreadsheet A) is for all graduates in a given year and schools possess it in nearly, if not exactly, this form already.
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Spreadsheet A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate ID</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Borrowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123456</td>
<td>M/F/O</td>
<td>White/Black/Etc</td>
<td>$zz,zzz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Spreadsheet A, the law school can either export the data to the Section or produce the required statistical summaries, whichever the Section chooses. The second (Spreadsheet B) is for all students in a given year. Some schools may already have a spreadsheet or database table like this, but each can readily generate it because each column is associated somewhere in a law school’s records with a unique individual identifier.

Spreadsheet B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>201x - 201x Academic Year Student Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition &amp; Fees Paid</th>
<th>Tuition Discount</th>
<th>Conditional Scholarship</th>
<th>Reduced or Eliminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$zz,zzz</td>
<td>$zz,zzz</td>
<td>Yes/No/Blank</td>
<td>Yes/No/Blank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These spreadsheets produce all the data necessary for the above proposals, except for data in two categories. The first category includes data that the Section already collects, e.g. the number of women who applied, were admitted, and who enrolled. The schools and Section have no additional reporting burden. The second category has only one dataset: first-year class profiles by gender. The Law School Admissions Council (LSAC) can generate these data for law schools through the organization’s ACES² student management software, which every law school uses. Already the Section relies on LSAC to help schools report first-year enrollment data to the Section. To report these statistical profiles for gender, LSAC would only need to add a gender column to the list it already provides schools. LSAC, having been apprised of this proposal, has agreed to do so.

In sum, schools can create two spreadsheets from existing datasets and download a report from LSAC with ease. For the Section of Legal Education, the additional burden is well worth it, even if it chooses the more laborious task of maintaining individual records for each new dataset. The effort

---
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produces significant, valuable data that advances its mission that reaches beyond accrediting law schools, as well as helps it to enforce Standard 204 and Standard 509.

IV. COSTS OF ADDITIONAL DATA PUBLICATION

Not all data the Section of Legal Education collects winds up published. This article has thus far made the case for the Section to publish additional data under its Rule 49(b) authority. The Section currently publishes data in a variety of formats on its website, including national summaries, spreadsheets, and school-specific reports. These data help analysts repurpose the data for presentation, whether as part of scholarship, consumer-facing tools, policy-making research, or internal research. The proposals in Part A are consistent with the Section’s current practices related to making data public for analysts.

Standard 509 also permits the Section to require law schools to publicly disclose information on their websites “in the form and manner and for the time frame designated by the [Section].”74 The Section requires schools to publish a variety of important consumer information on their individual websites, including tabular and summarized data on reports, text descriptions, lists, and more. This information helps consumers decide whether and where to go to law school.

The decision to make data public and to require schools to disclose information in their own materials are related, but can produce divergent results because the audiences, while overlapping, differ. There is little reason to worry about broad disclosures on the Section’s various websites provided the data are contextualized and reliable. The Section also publishes definitions, survey instruments, and guidance memos. A law school can be sanctioned or lose its accreditation for reporting false or incomplete data to the Section.

Open access to data has enhanced data integrity since the Section began to publish spreadsheets with school-level employment data for the class of 2011. Since that time, external parties have caught and reported errors, usually before legal and mainstream press stories. In the early years, schools and the Section made innocent mistakes that would not have been caught in a timely fashion, if at all, but for open access for analysts. Today, there are fewer mistakes in employment data as the Section has refined its pre-release process.75

74 AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, supra note 1, at 35.
75 The importance of open datasets cannot be understated, but it is not a guarantee that the public will catch problems either. The erroneous data the author happened upon, reproduced in Table B, is available to the public as part of a spreadsheet on the Section website. At least seven other schools made
The decision to publish data for consumer use is more complicated. It involves choices about how to organize and summarize a dataset, which translates data from its raw form into meaningful information for use by less sophisticated, more impressionable audiences. With any dataset, the data can be presented in various forms, including charts, graphs, and tables. The best method depends on the audience(s). Presentation choices must balance what the audience wants to know and what they should want to know, along with consideration to information overload, complexity, and utility. Importantly, these choices set the benchmark for what matters to the audience.

The default position should be for schools to publish information that will help consumers decide whether and where to attend law school, provided the Section collects the underlying data through Standard 104 and may require schools to publish through Standard 509. The proposals in Part A are not only pre-authorized for the Section, but will also help students understand important financial details, their bargaining power with schools, and where schools’ priorities lie. However, these proposals add substantially to what a consumer is asked to mine through and understand. The additions may prove to be so overwhelming that consumers ignore important information, making them worse off.

Already, each law school publishes four PDF reports prescribed by the Section and “current information on refund policies; curricular offerings, academic calendar, and academic requirements; and policies regarding transfer of credit earned at another institution, including a list of institutions with which the law school has established articulation agreements” in a “readable and comprehensible manner.” \(^{76}\) The first PDF is the Standard 509 Information Report, which details a variety of statistics that help students figure out when to apply, whether they can get in, how much it costs, how diverse the student body is, and at what rate students complete school. \(^{77}\) The second PDF is the Employment Summary Report and includes graduate employment data. \(^{78}\) The third and fourth PDFs are the First-Time Bar Passage and Ultimate Bar Passage reports, which detail bar exam outcomes for two different measurement periods. \(^{79}\)

The Section extracted the employment and bar passage data from the Standard 509 Information Report in recent years. In 2011, the Section

---
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\(^{79}\) The July 2016 Guidance Memo has not been publicly updated for the bar-related information reports.
changed disclosure requirements for graduate employment outcomes. In 2018, the Section changed disclosure requirements for bar exam outcomes. In both cases, the Section changed when schools published information. Likewise, the Section increased how much information schools published. This ensured more timely and more comprehensible publication of important consumer information.

Nevertheless, the Standard 509 Information Report remains dense even with the three additional reports because the Section has continued to add data to benefit consumers. The changes built on an outdated format, however. The Standard 509 Information Report was originally designed two decades ago for print in the LSAC Official Guide. The current PDF is not the optimal method for distributing information given modern advances in technology and design theory.

If the Section finds some or all the proposed disclosures sufficiently valuable for consumers, the Section should reevaluate its approach. The Section should continue to publish most, if not all, of the current data, as well as most, if not all, of the proposed data. But modest changes to how the Section styles, words, and formats the disclosures will maximize comprehension of, and confidence in, the contents. Fear of information overload, however, should only be used as justification to withhold information after alternative presentation formats are dutifully explored.

V. CONCLUSION

The transparency measures outlined in this report have been designed to address some of the most pressing issues in legal education. Every suggestion from this report can be accomplished by the Section of Legal Education without additional authority from the ABA Standards. In many cases, the suggestions can be accomplished without additional reporting burdens for law schools. In other cases, schools already possess the data but are not required to report it as part of the annual questionnaire. On balance, the value of public data will outweigh the costs of reporting in these cases.

Informed policy choices require a diversity of information and voices. What these measures reveal can contribute to change. Whether it amounts to progress will come down to the choices made by regulators, schools, and consumers. Regardless, clarity is in order. The problems facing legal education are as immense as they are important and the foundation for addressing them will be high-quality, smartly presented data.
Adopting these transparency measures:

- Does not require changes to the ABA Standards
- Creates no collection burden and minimal reporting burden for law schools
  - Either the schools or ABA already possess the data for each proposal
- Creates minimal collection burden for the Section of Legal Education and enhances its ability to enforce Standard 204 and Standard 509
- Creates measurable but justified burden for the Section of Legal Education to design and to publish data on ABArequireddisclosures.org
- Creates minimal burden for law schools to publish additional data on their websites

Data Categories:

- Law School Debt – *how much students borrow*
  - Groups: All students; by gender; by race/ethnicity
  - Publication Type: frequency distribution tables
- Law School Tuition Prices – *how much students pay*
  - Groups: All students; by gender; by race/ethnicity
  - Publication Type: frequency distribution tables
- Other Data
  - By Gender
    - Number in the first-year class; first-year class profiles; number of applicants; number of admitted applicants; the number of graduates; the number of transfers; the number attrited; scholarship amounts; conditional scholarships.
  - By Race/Ethnicity
    - Number in the first-year class; number of applicants; number of admitted applicants; the number of transfers; scholarship amounts; conditional scholarships.
  - Publication Type: in the form published for “all students” for the relevant data
Example Frequency Distribution Tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Borrowed</th>
<th># Graduates</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$60,000-$69,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$130,000-$139,999</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 - $9999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$70,000-$79,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$140,000-$149,999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$80,000-$89,999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$150,000-$159,999</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$90,000-$99,999</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$160,000-$169,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$100,000-$109,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$170,000-$179,999</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$110,000-$119,999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$180,000-$189,999</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $59,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$120,000-$129,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$190,000-$199,999</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median of Borrowers: $104,000
Mean of Borrowers: $106,250

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition Paid, Full Time</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$18,000 - $20,999</td>
<td>[0-48]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 - $2,999</td>
<td>[0-48]</td>
<td>$21,000 - $23,999</td>
<td>[0-27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 - $5,999</td>
<td>[0-48]</td>
<td>$24,000 - $26,999</td>
<td>[0-27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000 - $8,999</td>
<td>[0-48]</td>
<td>$27,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>[0-27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 - $11,999</td>
<td>[0-48]</td>
<td>$30,000 - $32,999</td>
<td>[0-27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>[0-48]</td>
<td>$33,000 - $35,999</td>
<td>[0-27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $17,999</td>
<td>[0-48]</td>
<td>$36,000 - $38,999</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median Tuition Paid $25,706
Mean Tuition Paid $28,071

Spreadsheets
Schools can report all data, other than the datasets LSAC will provide through ACES², through spreadsheets with one row per graduate.

Spreadsheet A
Class of 201x Graduate Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate ID</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Borrowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123456</td>
<td>M/F/O</td>
<td>White/Black/Etc.</td>
<td>$zz,zzz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spreadsheet B
201x - 201x Academic Year Student Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>654321</td>
<td>1L/2L/3L</td>
<td>M/W/O</td>
<td>White/Black/Etc.</td>
<td>FT/PT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Tuition & Fees Paid | $zz,zzz |
| Tuition Discount    | $zz,zzz |
| Conditional Scholarship | Yes/No/Blank |
| Reduced or Eliminated | Yes/No/Blank |
In response to the Council’s invitation to submit ideas and suggestions regarding issues related to the ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools, I write to offer two ideas. The first is to consider adoption of an employment outcomes standard. The second is to revise the Annual Questionnaire to have schools report the LSAT scores and UGPAs of the students in their entering classes.

An Employment Outcomes Standard

Most ABA accredited law schools report robust graduate employment outcomes at 10 months after graduation. However, there is a small but significant group of schools that consistently report profoundly weak numbers – with fewer than 30 or 40% of graduates obtaining long-term, full-time bar passage required jobs. In examining the admissions criteria of these schools, it is apparent that almost all of them follow policies that are designed to maintain enrollment without regard to their graduates’ employment prospects. Thus, in almost all cases, they have lowered admissions requirements as applications to law school have declined. The predictable result is that their bar pass rates have declined and their graduates’ employment prospects are further diminished.

This state of affairs reveals a gap in the current ABA standards. The bar passage and admissions/attrition standards leave schools much room to enroll large numbers of students who will not realize the promise of the J.D. degree. This is particularly problematic where the cost of legal education is so high. Most of the schools with the weakest employment outcomes also report relatively high average graduate debt.

I have extensively researched the gap in the Standards in an article published in the Journal of Legal Education: J.D.s and Jobs: The Case for an ABA Accreditation Standard on Employment Outcomes, 67 J.L.E. 1035 (2018). As a starting point for discussion, I proposed the following draft standard:
Standard XXX. Graduate Employment Outcomes

(a) A law school must demonstrate that for at least two of the past five graduating classes:

(1) at least sixty percent of the graduates were employed in full-time, long-term, bar passage-required or J.D. Advantage jobs as of March 15 of the year following graduation; or

(2) at least seventy-five percent of the graduates were employed in full-time, long-term, bar passage-required or J.D. Advantage jobs as of March 15 of the second year following graduation.

No more than fifteen percent of graduates employed in full-time, long-term J.D. Advantage jobs may be counted toward the percentage rates specified in subparagraphs (1) and (2) of this paragraph.

(b) A law school that fails to comply with subsection (a)(1) of this standard with respect to any graduating class must promptly submit a detailed plan for how it will remain in compliance with the standard.

(c) As used in this standard,

(1) “graduating class” is defined as a cohort of graduates who graduated between September 1 and August 30 of the following year, and includes graduates whose employment status is unknown, but excludes graduates who are pursuing a graduate degree full time; and

(2) the terms “full-time,” “part-time,” “long-term,” “short-term,” “bar passage-required,” and “J.D. Advantage” are as defined in the Definitions and Instructions accompanying the ABA Employment Questionnaire, except, however, that graduates employed as solo practitioners shall not be counted as employed.

Annual Questionnaire Reporting of Entering Class LSAT Scores and UGPAs

Many who are familiar with the accreditation process probably assume that the Annual Questionnaire (AQ) already asks schools to report the LSAT scores and UGPAs of the students in the entering class together with a unique identifier, but it does not. (The Site Evaluation Questionnaire asks schools to report this information for the current and past two years.) The burden of reporting the information is absolutely minimal, as schools necessarily maintain this information in their LSAC ACES admissions data bases.

At the same time, the potential uses and benefits of the data are substantial. Aside from being able to verify schools’ reported LSAT score and UGPA percentiles, which is currently done with the assistance of LSAC, the data would allow the Council to track law schools’ student outcomes based on LSAT scores and UGPAs from enrollment through transfer, dismissal, graduation, bar
passage, and employment. As with many of the Standards and AQ questions, this sort of tracking would be necessary or useful only for weaker schools. But for those schools, it would be highly useful in assessing the efficacy of their programs, from admissions and academic standards to curriculum. It would also allow the ABA to evaluate how different schools with similar matriculant profiles add more or less “value” in preparing their students for the bar exam and the practice of law.
To the Council for the Section of Legal Education and Admission to the Bar:

The Iowa Bar Association has undertaken activities aimed at ensuring tomorrow’s young lawyers are less encumbered by the staggering debt loads that have arisen in the legal field. Our Young Lawyers Division formed a task force to address this issue and found that roughly one-half of the young attorneys in Iowa are bearing twice the debt load that can reasonably be serviced by Iowa’s starting median salary.

Earlier this year, the task force partnered with Law School Transparency to produce a report that assessed the issues facing legal education and a slate of proposals related to those issues.

To date, the report has received endorsements from numerous state bar and ABA affiliate entities demonstrating a common goal of reducing these debt loads, in part, through increasing the transparency of information provided by law schools for consumption by their ultimate consumers - prospective students.

We urge you to adopt the transparency measures detailed in the report, which can be found at [www.LSTReport.com](http://www.LSTReport.com).

Tom Levis
President

Maggie White
President, Young Lawyers Division
A Way Forward: Transparency in 2018

Law School Transparency
Kyle McEntee

Iowa State Bar Association
Young Lawyers Division*

* Kyle Fry, Thomas Hillers, Abhay Nadipuram, Rob Poggenklass, and Maggie White contributed to this report on behalf of the Iowa YLD.
Executive Summary

We recommend that the ABA and law schools take the following steps to improve legal education for the benefit of students, the legal profession, and the public.

1. Young Lawyer Representation in Accreditation
   - The ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar should add two young lawyers to its Council in 2018.
   - The ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar should change its bylaws to designate two of 15 at-large Council positions to young lawyers.

2. Increased Data Transparency
   - The ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, using authority it already has under the ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools, should require schools to report as part of the Section’s annual questionnaire, and for the Section and schools to provide on their websites, (1) disaggregated borrowing data, including subcategories by race and gender; (2) disaggregated data on the amount of tuition paid by class year (1L or upper-level), race/ethnicity, and gender; (3) data on applicants and scholarships by gender and, to the extent the Section does not do so already, by race/ethnicity; (4) data on J.D. program completion and bar passage success.

3. User-Friendly Data Presentation
   - The ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar should simplify the Employment Summary Report, which includes graduate employment data.
   - The ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar should simplify and reorganize the Standard 509 Information Report, which includes data related to admissions, attrition, bar passage, price, curricular offerings, diversity, faculty, refunds, and scholarships.

4. Disclosures at Time of Admission
   - The ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar should require law schools to provide every admitted law student a copy of the Standard 509 Information Report and Employment Summary Report as part of each student’s admissions offer.

5. Voluntary Disclosures by Law School
   - Every ABA-approved law school should voluntarily publish its school-specific NALP Report each year.
Introduction

The future of legal education—and by extension the legal profession—depends on the ability of law schools and the profession to attract prospective lawyers. Our profession must become a more welcoming place for an increasingly diverse population, as well as evolve to stay relevant in a changing legal services landscape. Law schools must adapt their business models to become more affordable because the price of legal education has and will threaten new lawyer recruitment. If Congress and the current presidential administration successfully eliminate federal student loan hardship programs and invite private, predatory lenders to supplant the federal government as the all-but-exclusive law student lender, the affordability challenges for law schools will amplify.1 Potential changes to the student loan and repayment program only increase the import of addressing the price of legal education.

Over the past several decades, law school tuition has increased dramatically, well above inflation. Compared to tuition in 1985, private and public law school tuition is 2.7 and 5.8 times as expensive after accounting for inflation.2 The average private law school tuition was $45,329 in 2017, with residents at public schools paying an average of $26,425 per year.3 The range of tuition, however, demonstrates remarkable variability. At public schools, one year of resident tuition ranged from $7,383 to $58,300.4 At private schools, the range was $16,418 to $67,564 per year.5 While the average tuition at top performing law schools is much higher than the rest, prices do not scale with job outcomes elsewhere.6 The average tuition at the lowest performing schools is similar to the average for mid-range schools.7

To pay these high tuition prices, three out of four law students borrow8 at interest rates that are almost double the average home mortgage interest rate.9 A first-year student this academic year will borrow their first $20,500 at 6% and all excess funds (up to $70,000 more) at 7% annual

---


3 Id.


5 Id.

6 Id.

7 Id.

8 Id. at [https://data.lawschooltransparency.com/costs/debt/?scope=national](https://data.lawschooltransparency.com/costs/debt/?scope=national).

interest. The government does not subsidize law student interest payments during school, thus the cost of the first-year loan increases by 21% and 24.5%, respectively, while the student is studying and before a single loan payment is due.

The average graduate will borrow, exclusively for law school, $145,419 from a for-profit school, $134,497 from a private school, and $96,054 from a public school. After accounting for accumulated interest during law school, even the average public law school graduate owes well into six-figures for law school alone when they make their first payment. Financial advisors typically recommend devoting no more than 10 or 15% of income to debt service. A graduate who owes $125,000 at first payment has a monthly payment of about $1,400 on the standard ten-year plan. To remain in range of the recommendation, the graduate must make between $112,000 (for 15%) and $168,000 (for 10%). The median entry-level salary for the 2016 graduates in long-term, full-time law jobs was $66,499.

Servicing these debts is increasingly challenging because any-level lawyer salaries are declining in real terms. In April 2017, Deborah Merritt, a law professor at The Ohio State University, analyzed the most recent U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics data for salaried lawyers. “At the high end, salaries are still increasing faster than inflation,” according to Professor Merritt’s analysis, “but for the majority of salaried lawyers (at least seventy-five percent), salaries are falling in constant dollars and earnings in other occupations are outpacing them.” Of course, these figures all presume a graduate gets and keeps a salaried lawyering job—law schools as a whole still enroll many more graduates than there are entry-level legal jobs.

The percentage of a graduating class employed in jobs that require a law license is sensitive to two distinct supply figures: total graduates and total available jobs. For example, if graduates increase and the number of jobs stays the same, the percentage will decline. The percentage of graduates obtaining full-time entry-level legal jobs was quite high in the 1980s, peaking at 84.5% in 1988. The average rate in the mid to late 1980s was 82.9%. The next two decades (90s and 00s) each had an average that was ten points lower, 73.7% in the 90s and 70.7% in the 00s. This decade,
so far, the average is 60.1%—an additional ten points lower.\textsuperscript{19}

Strikingly, these shifts appear to reflect enrollment management decisions by law schools instead of demand for new lawyers. Between 1976 and 2000, law schools steadily enrolled between ~40,000 and ~44,000 new students each year.\textsuperscript{20} From 1976 to 1987, the average was 40,973.\textsuperscript{21} From 1988 to 2000, the average was 43,497—a little over 6% higher.\textsuperscript{22} But between 2000 and 2002, law schools increased first-year enrollment 11.2%.\textsuperscript{23} In subsequent years, enrollment steadily crept up, with minor ebbs and flows, until peaking in 2010 at 52,404.\textsuperscript{24} The number of jobs, on the other hand, has been far steadier. Between 1985, the first year for which we were able to analyze data, and 2010, the number of new full-time law jobs each year generally stayed between 27,000 and 30,000.\textsuperscript{25} Increased enrollment and a steady number of jobs spell a lower employment rate for law school graduates.

As law schools were pressured to become more transparent about job outcomes beginning in 2010, the media and prospective law students took notice of inflated enrollment, inadequate job prospects, and high prices—and enrollment dropped.\textsuperscript{26} After 1L enrollment peaked in 2010 at 52,404 new students, enrollment fell dramatically in each of the next three years, which was then followed by four years of even lower, but steady, enrollment between 37,000 and 38,000 new 1Ls.\textsuperscript{27} Lower enrollment has created a difficult financial reality for law schools that depend on tuition revenue to keep the lights on.\textsuperscript{28} While smaller class size certainly helps the percentage of the class who can get a lawyer job, the entry-level market remains structurally weak. Since 2013, fewer graduates obtained full-time lawyer jobs each year than the prior year.\textsuperscript{29} Given the cost of obtaining a J.D. and current features of the entry-level job market, law schools are likely to continue to struggle to attract enough qualified students to maintain their business models—even with the “Trump Bump” in law school applicants.\textsuperscript{30}

This poses enormous difficulty for an aging profession that needs a pipeline of law school
graduates who will not only protect and improve the rule of law, but who will also reflect society’s
diverse population. While signs point to fewer lawyers working differently in the future, lawyers
should remain an essential part of our system of justice and private ordering, as well as an essential
line of defense for abuses of power of all kinds. But our legal education system, and thus lawyers’
role in the rule of law, is vulnerable when we price future contributors out of our profession. We
need a pipeline of students who want and can afford to join.

This report makes several basic recommendations aimed at strengthening this pipeline. We begin
by urging that the law school accreditation process be infused with those who have experienced
what dissuades so many people each year from attending law school. It continues with high-quality
data that allows legal educators and policy-makers to confront difficult realities and to direct
resources in directions that strengthen and stabilize the pipeline. Better consumer information will
help students make sense of their choice, while also shedding light on our profession’s way
forward. Data may not be the solution to law school affordability, but it is a necessary first step to
finding and implementing solutions. Informed policy choices require a diversity of information
and voices.

Recommendations

1. Young Lawyer Representation in Accreditation

The ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar should add two young
lawyers to its Council in 2018.

The ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar should change its bylaws to
designate two of 15 at-large Council positions to young lawyers.

The American Bar Association (“ABA”) Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar is
the nationally recognized accreditor of law schools, but its mission is broader.31 Its mission is also
“[t]o be a creative national force in providing leadership and services to those responsible for and
those who benefit from a sound program of legal education and bar admissions.”32 Over the recent
decades, legal education has become significantly more practical, service-oriented, and diverse.
But the Section also oversaw legal education as costs spiraled out of control and schools adopted
predatory admissions practices solely to ensure survival in a time of great tumult.33

Indeed, a Committee of the United States Department of Education recently recommended that the

31 After Trump’s election, more students consider law school, hoping to make a difference, Chicago Tribune, Nov.
32 Id.
Section’s accreditation authority be suspended. At the end of the hearing, Paul LeBlanc, a college president and member of the Education Department’s National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, summarized his view of the Section’s conduct as follows:

This feels like an agency that is out of step with a crisis in its profession, out of step with the changes in higher Ed, and out of step with the plight of the students that are going through the law schools.

Several choices by the Section over the past few decades have negatively impacted legal education in the long term. In 1995, the Section reached a settlement with the Department of Justice after the DOJ’s antitrust division contended that the accreditation process was used to inflate law school faculty salaries and benefits. The beneficiaries of this abuse of accreditation are largely still on staff at law schools, thus the Section’s actions continue to directly affect the cost of providing legal education because salary increases compound, working conditions tend to endure, and law faculty have tenure.

More recently, the Section was slow to act decisively to stop law schools from exploiting students, despite internal and external calls for accountability. In part, this was due to poorly-drafted accreditation standards. In 2008, after determining that a minimum bar passage standard would serve an important consumer protect function, the Section passed a standard so rife with loopholes that law schools with sub-30% bar passage rates have still not been found non-compliant. The bar passage standard, now Standard 316 instead of Interpretation 301-6, remains on the books despite two separate attempts to address the standard’s substantial flaws.

Fortunately, Standard 316 is not the only tool at the Section’s disposal to address predatory admissions and retention practices. The Section has had a standard for decades to prevent schools from...
from enrolling students who do not appear capable of getting through school and the bar. Yet the Section misapplied Standard 501—the prohibition of predatory admissions practices—by presuming compliance with Standard 501 if a school was compliant with the fatally flawed Standard 316. This hampered the Section’s ability to react quickly. The Section leadership determined it was not properly interpreting (and thus enforcing) Standard 501 in late 2015. It subsequently refined its approach and added an additional enforcement layer to the text of the standard. The Section has since found ten law schools out of compliance with Standard 501, with other schools likely to follow.

The Section was also inattentive to problems related to transparency. In 2010, the Section and law schools first came under fire for misleading employment statistics. The most flagrant statistics involved reporting an employment rate, often well above 90%, without indicating that the figure included part-time jobs, short-term jobs, jobs funded by the law school, and non-lawyer jobs. While law schools deserve responsibility for deceptive marketing practices that misled students and the public, the Section collected but did not disclose data from law schools that made these practices apparent. The Section’s annual questionnaire that law schools must accurately complete to remain accredited asked schools for a breakdown of graduates by job types, including whether jobs required bar passage or were part time. However, the Section only published the top-line figure too, just as was common practice by law schools. This information asymmetry favored law schools and allowed them to grow enrollments well beyond reason. Between 2011 and 2012, the Section changed the ABA Standards to address misleading statistics and to force law schools to detail these misleading top-line numbers and disclose real employment statistics. These changes contributed to demand for law school declining dramatically.

The Section’s efforts to make law school admissions fairer may have been a reaction to negative publicity, but for several years the Section’s actions indicated to schools that it would embrace transparency and not tolerate deceptive marketing practices. Indeed, it was a model of transparency for the rest of higher education. The Section refined the public reports schools must publish, adjusted definitions, added an audit protocol, and provided guidance to schools about how not to

39 Supra ABA Standards Archives, note 37.
41 Id.
46 Supra notes 26-30 and accompanying text.
mislead students and the public. However, in just the past year, the Section’s Council took actions that incensed transparency advocates and law schools alike.\(^{47}\) Without public input, the Council changed the mandatory job statistics disclosures.\(^{48}\) In October 2017, the Council reversed course, but not before losing credibility among various stakeholders.

Several of the Section’s specific actions, along with a general inattention to fundamental problems in legal education, have sparked significant interest by young lawyers in the direction of legal education. Young lawyers are interested in the consumer protection aspects of accreditation, as well as in shaping the Council’s perspective in an official capacity as it seeks to be a creative force for the betterment of legal education. All lawyers, but young lawyers in particular, have an interest in a strong profession that can attract qualified people to do the important work of lawyers throughout our democratic society. When legal education falters, the profession’s reputation is harmed. More importantly, those who need high-quality legal services suffer.

Historically, the Section has not had young lawyers on its Council. The nomination rules for the Council are clear, but the process is uninviting and the practical criteria for membership go unstated. Recently, the Section’s managing director shared a helpful hint with a journalist. He told the ABA Journal that he “encourage[s] the young lawyers, and all of us on staff, to try to figure out ways to get more folks who are closer to the beginning of their careers involved on site visit teams. That’s a primary credential for service on the council.”\(^{49}\)

One way to encourage young lawyers would be to designate two spots on the Council that indicate that there is, in fact, a place for young lawyers in a space dominated by older lawyers and those whose primary professional employer is a law school. This would provide fresh perspectives to the Council. Currently, the Council consists of a single law student, who serves for one year, 15 at-large positions, and five executive officers.\(^{50}\) While the ABA Young Lawyers Division has a liaison to the Council, that member does not have voting power and is not permitted in closed sessions.

The Council is currently comprised of members who, on average, graduated from law school 38 years ago. The greenest members graduated in 1990. Age and experience are not the problem, however. The problem is that tuition averaged $3,236 at public schools and $11,728 at private
schools in 1990, and substantially less in prior years.\textsuperscript{51} The deans and faculty on the Council know the cost of today’s tuition only in the sense that they can recite the price. They do not understand the life impact of tuition prices of $40,000, $50,000, or even more than $60,000 \textit{per year} have on decision-making. A student working for 15 weeks at an annualized salary of $180,000—New York City market rate for entry-level associates at large law firms—would not cover annual tuition at the average private school today, let alone books and living expenses. Not only is that job unavailable to the vast majority of students, but its term is three to five weeks longer than a typical summer associate works.

The continued increase of law school tuition compared to the relatively stagnant value of that education is an important consequence of a broken legal education system that proliferated under the Section’s leadership. We can begin to understand the current, unfair state when we examine how schools and the ABA govern; how schools recruit new students and set prices; and how policymakers and their influencers fundamentally misunderstand what it means to provide “access to education.” These factors enable and cause our broken system to endure.

Achieving a higher education should not hurt students—economically, socially, or personally. But our legal education system has hurt many. Countless well-meaning people defend the status quo reflexively, choosing to focus on theories of long-term return on investment or the J.D.’s intrinsic value to justify the current state of legal education. Enchanting as these arguments may sound, they are presently and justly overshadowed by crippling debt. Simply put, if you are a young college graduate or mid-career applicant right now, then you aren’t buying the idea of a long-term return when the most certain thing about your future is your monthly loan obligation.

While the Council considers restructuring,\textsuperscript{52} there is no guarantee or even indication that it would result in the addition of young attorneys to the Council. There are qualified young attorneys, with good ideas and great intentions, who feel that their voice has not been heard because of the assumption that the Council’s interests are captured by law schools. While we appreciate the individual Council members’ contribution to the advancement of the law and education as a whole, we also believe that young lawyers would offer keen and unique insight into recent changes in legal education and prospective changes in accreditation. Importantly, we are confident that these prospective members would join the Council with a goal of collaboration and with newly formed views that are not entwined with the entities the Council regulates. The renewed vigor and unique perspectives will propel legal education and the profession forward.


\textsuperscript{52} Memo on the Reorganization of the Structure of the Accreditation Project, https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/legal_education_and_admissions_to_the_bar/council_reports_and_resolutions/November2017CouncilOpenSession/17_nov_restructuring_project_cover_memo.authcheckdam.pdf.
2. Increased Data Transparency

The ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, using authority it already has under the ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools, should require schools to report as part of the Section’s annual questionnaire, and for the Section and schools to provide on their websites, (1) disaggregated borrowing data, including subcategories by race/ethnicity and gender; (2) disaggregated data on the amount of tuition paid by class year (1L or upper-level), race, and gender; (3) data on applicants and scholarships by gender and, to the extent the Section does not do so already, by race/ethnicity; (4) data on J.D. program completion and bar passage success.

For the better part of a decade, law schools have faced pressure to be more transparent, affordable, and fair. Concerned people inside and outside of the legal profession alike have objected to deceptive marketing, over-enrollment, and runaway tuition. In many ways, the Section of Legal Education has acknowledged and responded to the criticism. The ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools (“Standards”) now expressly prohibit schools from providing false, incomplete, or misleading consumer information. The Standards also require law schools to publish detailed employment data on their websites. More recently, the Section convened a roundtable of legal education stakeholders to discuss how to modify the Standards to encourage innovation and address challenges related to cost, declining job opportunities, and declining bar passage rates. One theme that emerged from the roundtable is the necessity of more transparency.

We propose several recommendations for the Section that, if enacted, will shed light on law student debt, inequitable pricing practices, exploitative admissions and retention choices, and lasting inequality. The Council already has the authority to collect and require schools to publish all of the data described below. Standard 104 permits the Council to collect these data “in the form, manner, and time frame” it specifies each year. Rule 54(b) permits the Council to publish these data when “authorized under Standard 509 or [when] … made public by the law school.” Standard 509 allows the Council to require schools to publish these data “in the form and manner and for the time frame designated by the Council.”

Transparency forces the public and school leaders to confront difficult realities, whether it’s high prices, burdensome debt, low bar passage rates, or unfulfilled diversity promises. These recommendations will expand access to valuable data, helping consumers to make informed decisions, schools to change to meet evolving demands, and the Section to create and maintain an environment of accountability.

54 Id.
55 Id.
56 Id.
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Student Debt

In 2016, the average private law school graduate received $134,497 in student loan disbursements during law school. The average public law school graduate received $96,054. Notably, these figures do not reflect the amount of debt owed when repayment begins six months after graduation because they do not factor in interest, which the government does not subsidize for law students. This year, interest immediately began to accrue at 6% for Stafford Loans (up to $20,500 per year) or 7% for Graduate PLUS loans (up to the full cost of attendance) for students.

These eye-popping numbers come from school-level borrowing averages. Each school’s average includes any graduate who borrowed at least $1 during law school, whether they borrowed for just one semester—perhaps $5,000 to pay for a trip—or they borrowed the full cost of attendance. So while the average can tell us about the entire population, it tells us little about individual students. With cost of attendance in 2017-18 as high as $95,883 at Stanford Law School, student borrowing can vary wildly based on scholarships and ability to pay. The latest available data show that 55% of Stanford Law students pay full price. After accounting for interest that accumulates during law school, a Stanford graduate may owe over $300,000 when the first payment is due, even factoring in a 2L summer associate salary.

The public does not know how many (if any) graduates actually borrow the full amount, just that 75% of Stanford Law graduates in 2016 borrowed at least $1 and that the average amount borrowed was $137,625. Perhaps borrowing several hundred thousand dollars from one of the nation’s elite law schools is not a matter of public interest or concern. But the debt loads at lesser-performing schools can reach this astronomical amount too—and it is at those schools that underlying borrowing data will serve the most important purpose.

Take, for example, Southwestern Law School. Its annual cost of attendance is $82,600. Half of its students paid full price in 2016-17. In 2016, only 38.9% of its 2016 graduates obtained a long-

59 Id.
62 Id. With 55% of students paying full price and 25% of the class not borrowing, at least 30% of those who paid full price borrowed at least $1—but probably much more.
65 Id.
term, full-time job that requires bar passage within ten months of graduation. Only 38% of 2016 graduates passed the California bar exam on the first try. The public does not know how many (if any) graduates actually borrower nearly a quarter of a million dollars at this school. But unlike Stanford, the public does not know the average amount borrowed because Southwestern Law School has not disclosed graduate borrowing data since 2012, when the average amount borrowed for the 78.9% of graduates who borrowed was $147,976. Since that time, tuition is up 23%; net tuition is up 8%; cost of living is up 12%; the median and 75th percentile scholarship has not changed; and the 25th percentile scholarship has declined by a third.

The Section of Legal Education does not publish any school-level borrowing data, although the Section does collect the average amount borrowed and the percentage borrowing on its annual questionnaire. Rather, borrowing data come from voluntary disclosures by law schools to U.S. News & World Report. Every year, more than a handful of schools make erroneous disclosures to U.S. News, which only occasionally get corrected. Every year, a dozen or so other schools decline to publish the average amount borrowed by graduates.

Consumers, schools, and researchers lose out because the only source for information that the Section possesses is a news magazine that muddies the decision-making process for consumers and schools alike. As the best source for borrowing data, the Section encourages people to visit the U.S. News website through its decision not to publish the borrowing data it possesses. That said, the average amount borrowed by graduates and the percentage borrowing are limited in utility, although there is value in confronting consumers with figures that account for several years of schooling instead of annual cost of attendance. The Section would do a great service to legal education if it enabled consumers and researchers to peer underneath the surface figures (average borrowed) to see the borrower makeup by amount borrowed. Shedding light on underlying borrowing data may stir policymakers, faculty, and administrators to think more clearly and realistically about the problem of student debt. One way to do this is through a frequency distribution, which “displays the frequency of various outcomes in a sample.”

In legal education, the most famous application of a frequency distribution is NALP’s bi-modal salary distribution curve (shown below, Figure A). This curve continues to shape how

66 Id. at ABA Report, https://www.lstreports.com/schools/southwestern/aba/.
70 In the past, the Section collected graduate borrowing data, but currently only collects annual loan disbursements.
policymakers, researchers, consumers, and the public understand entry-level salaries. The mean salary may have been $82,292 for 2014 graduates, but very few graduates made at or near that amount. Instead graduates fell into one of two “humps”—$160,000 on the one side and between $40,000 and $65,000 on the other.\textsuperscript{72}

Figure A

In an ideal world, the public would know how much graduates owe when the first payment is due including interest, but this is not possible without federal legislation and, in our estimation, not worth the effort. Instead, we ask the Section to collect data on student loan borrowing outcomes for graduates and to publish those outcomes using a frequency distribution table, including non-borrowers, using its authority under Standard 104 and Rule 54(b), as well as to require schools to publish these data on their websites using its authority under Standard 104 and Standard 509(b)(2).

\textbf{Tuition Prices and Discounts}

Since 1985, inflation has been a factor in rising law school prices, but legal education inflation far exceeds the inflation rate. In 1985, the average private school tuition was $7,526 (1985 dollars), which would now cost a student $17,118 (2017 dollars).\textsuperscript{73} Instead the average tuition is $46,329

\textsuperscript{72} NALP Salary Distribution Curves, \url{http://www.nalp.org/salarydistrib} (last visited Sept. 22, 2017).
\textsuperscript{73} Supra LST Data Dashboard, note 2, \url{https://www.data.lawschooltransparency.com/costs/tuition/?y1=1985&y2=2017}.  
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(2017 dollars). In other words, private law school is now 2.7 times as expensive as it was in 1985 after adjusting for inflation. Public school (for residents) is now about 5.8 times as expensive.

Since then, law schools have engaged in more tuition discounting through grants and scholarships. So although the nominal tuition price has increased, it does not tell the whole story. About 30% of students pay full price. For the 70% receiving a discount, the discounts have shifted away from need-based discounts based on ability to pay towards merit-based discounts based on LSAT and undergraduate GPA. Those with the highest LSATs and GPAs receive the discounts. As such, the students who are least likely to complete school, pass the bar, and get a job subsidize the students who are more likely to succeed. These also tend to be the students the most disadvantaged.

Currently, the Section requires schools to report and publish cost of attendance data and scholarship data about the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles for full-time and part-time students. It also requires schools to report and publish scholarship data by the percentage of tuition covered, e.g. what percentage of all students have a scholarship that covers up to 50% of tuition. Moreover, the Section requires schools to report and publish whether and how often they reduce or eliminate scholarships after poor academic performance.

The Section already recognizes the value of publicly available price information for consumers, researchers, and the public. But with increased discounting and the shift away from need-based aid, additional clarity would add additional value much in the way that more graduate borrowing data would. The Section should therefore further its efforts of helping people understand the cost of legal education. As such, we ask the Section to collect data on tuition paid for each enrolled individual and to publish up to four frequency distributions tables per law school—one for 1L tuition paid, one for upper-level tuition paid, and a distinction for part-time and full-time as necessary—using its authority under Standard 104 and Rule 54(b), as well as to require schools to publish these data on their websites using its authority under Standard 104 and Standard 509(b)(2).

Gender Diversity

In 1965, just 1 in 25 law students was a woman. That number steadily climbed to 1 in 4 in 1975; 1 in 3 in 1980; and since 2000, the proportions have been roughly equal—though slightly more men than women every year except last year. Parity in law school enrollment was an enormous milestone, but new research demonstrates that national parity masks lurking gender inequality.

---

74 Id.
75 Id.
76 Id. at https://data.lawschooltransparency.com/costs/net-tuition/.
The research shows three significant “leaks” in the law school pipeline for women.\(^78\) The first of these leaks involve women applying to law school. Even though women are 57% of college graduates, they account for only about 51% of the law school applicants. If women applied at the same rate as men to law school, applications would increase 16%. The second leak is that women who apply to law school are less likely than men to be admitted. For the class entering in 2015, law schools admitted about 80% of the men who applied, but just 76% of the women who applied. The third leak is that, even when women are admitted, they are not spread evenly across law schools. They instead cluster disproportionally in schools with the weakest employment outcomes and worst reputations.

The first and second leaks go back several decades. The third leak, however, is new and worsening. In 2001, when schools had just gotten to roughly 50/50 nationwide, women were evenly distributed amongst schools. But by 2006 the story had started to change. Although the pattern was not yet statistically significant, it had started to emerge. By 2015 the pattern was statistically significant and quite stark. Today the top 50 schools are the mirror opposite of the bottom 50 schools.

The emerging explanations mostly relate to the *U.S. News* law school rankings, with the most compelling relating to schools jockeying for higher LSAT scores to increase the median score, which is a considerable driver of ranking. Over the past 15 years, in their quest to secure or improve their *U.S. News* ranking, law schools have decided to emphasize LSAT scores more. Women actually do two points worse on average than men on the LSAT, and there are fewer higher scorers as well.\(^79\) This is typical of standardized tests with predominantly multiple choice questions, unlike writing examinations that tend to favor women.\(^80\) Additional explanations may include an uneven distribution of applicants (perhaps increased median LSATs drive applicants away), uneven distribution of scholarship money (perhaps because schools overvalue the extra two points they get from men), and scholarship negotiation tendencies (perhaps because women are less likely to ask for more or any money). At this point, further research is not possible because school-level applicant and scholarship data are not available by gender.

Data on applicants and scholarships would also help consumers make informed choices. As outlined in the previous sections on tuition and debt, law school is expensive. Reducing the information asymmetry—allowing students to more clearly understand their bargaining position—will help them to pay less, which would reduce debt and/or enhance the school options.


\(^79\) *LSAT Technical Report October 2012*, Law School Admissions Council, [https://www.lsac.org/docs/default-source/research-(lsac-resources)/tr-12-03.pdf?sfvrsn=4](https://www.lsac.org/docs/default-source/research-(lsac-resources)/tr-12-03.pdf?sfvrsn=4) (Figure 10).

Additionally, these data will help the Section analyze compliance with Standard 206(a). Standard 206(a) provides that “a law school shall demonstrate by concrete action a commitment to diversity and inclusion by providing full opportunities for the study of law and entry into the profession by members of underrepresented groups, particularly racial and ethnic minorities, and a commitment to having a student body that is diverse with respect to gender, race, and ethnicity.” If a school, even inadvertently, is biasing enrollment towards men because it’s too concerned with chasing a higher ranking, then the school may be out of compliance with the ABA Standards.

As such, we ask the Section to collect and to publish data on applicants and scholarships by gender using its authority under Standard 104 and Rule 54(b), as well as to require schools to publish these data on their websites using its authority under Standard 509(b)(1) and Standard 509(b)(2).

Racial and Ethnic Diversity

Whereas tremendous progress has been made towards gender parity, even with the emerging trend of gender clustering at the most and least reputable schools, significant progress remains for enrollment by race and ethnicity.81

Table B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>2+ Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 1Ls</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Population</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aaron Taylor, the executive director of AccessLex’s Center for Legal Education Excellence, observed similar trends with race and ethnicity as the previous section outlined about gender. Taylor found that Black and Hispanic students were more likely to attend schools with lower median LSAT scores, which tend to be less prestigious.82 Whereas white and Asian students were more likely to attend more prestigious schools with higher LSAT median scores.83 Taylor told the National Jurist that “[t]his affects long-term outcomes, career trajectories and payoffs from law school investments. There are many implications tied in large part to race and ethnicity.”84

Even on the tuition and debt front, the implications are huge. According to the Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE), then-directed by Taylor, “[i]t seems apparent that increased costs

---

83 Id.
of attending law school have placed undue pressures on students from less affluent backgrounds to rely on student loans to finance their education. This burden falls disproportionately on Black and Hispanic students, who are more likely to come from low-wealth backgrounds. The proportion of Black students expecting no debt was less than 5% in 2015 and less than 10% for Hispanic students. For white students, it was about 20% and for Asian students about 25%. On the high end, about 25% of white students expected debt in excess of $120,000, compared to almost 45% of Black students and about 40% of Hispanic students.

Of course, these disparities relate to the “large racial and ethnic wealth disparities in the U.S.” But they also appear to relate to law school scholarship policies, because wealth explains part of the divergence in LSAT scores, which play an outsized role in determining the price a student pays to attend law school. According to LSSSE’s 2016 report, 2 in 3 white students receive a merit scholarship, while just 1 in 2 Black and Hispanic students do.

For the same reasons outlined above for gender, including adherence to and enforcement of Standard 206(a), we ask the Section to collect and to publish data on applicants and scholarships by race/ethnicity using its authority under Standard 104 and Rule 54(b), as well as to require schools to publish these data on their websites using its authority under Standard 509(b)(1) and Standard 509(b)(2).

Additional Diversity Data

For the foregoing reasons outlined in the sections on race/ethnicity and gender data, the public would also benefit if the data requested in the sections on tuition prices and student borrowing outcomes were publicly accessible by race/ethnicity and gender. The Section may do so under its current authority under Standard 104, Standard 509, and Rule 54(b).

Completion and Bar Success

Many law schools have enrolled students that face a significant risk of not completing school or passing the bar exam. Despite a decrease in completion rates, bar passages rates have also

---
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decreased. After years of steady bar passage rates, overall passage rates have fallen 10 points and first-time rates have fallen 9 points between 2013 and 2016, although the declines have not been uniform across the country.92 For example, first-time rates fell 36 points in South Dakota, 19 points in Iowa, 18 points in New Mexico, 16 points in Oregon, and 15 points in Arizona.93 On the other hand, first-time rates increased in Nebraska, Louisiana, and Michigan.94 Similarly, declines have not been uniform across all law schools. Some schools have increased their bar passage rates, such as Florida International University College of Law.95 Many others have seen dramatic declines.96

The declines were predictable based on lower Law School Admissions Test (“LSAT”) scores and insufficient mitigation through, for example, higher grade point averages (“GPA”) and more forced attrition.97 Highlighting which schools, through their educational programs, help or do not help students outperform their predictors would help consumers make more informed choices about where to attend law school, while helping law schools compete on metrics other than the U.S. News law school rankings. Further, it would help the legal education community develop best practices for maximizing the success of students at higher risk of failure—an essential goal that will not only help legal educators get the most out of students, but also increase diversity in the profession by fortifying our leaky pipeline.

The Section has determined that completion rates based on available predictors are valuable in assessing compliance with the Standards, as well as the progress non-compliant schools are making towards coming back into compliance. Since August 2016, the Council for the Section has publicly sanctioned five law schools in relation to its admissions and retention choices.98 Each sanction included remedial actions, including a requirement that each school provide current students bar passage rates for previous, similarly-situated students. While similarity was determined based on law school GPA, information fashioned for prospective law students would be valuable too. Prior to enrollment, there is not yet a better predictor of school completion and bar exam success than the LSAT. In fact, the Section’s accreditation committee requested that at least one of the schools—Charlotte School of Law—report completion and bar passage rate information for students with LSATs at or below the median in order to assess compliance with

93  Id.
94  Id.
96  Id.
97  For example, law schools have not increased incoming undergraduate GPAs enough to outweigh lower LSAT scores. In fact, GPAs were down almost uniformly across the schools studied. 2015 State of Legal Education, Law School Transparency, https://www.lawschooltransparency.com/reform/projects/investigations/2015/data/other-stats/?show=mb.
98  ABA Section of Legal Education Announcements, https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education.html (Arizona Summit Law School, Charlotte School of Law, Ave Maria School of Law, Texas Southern University Thurgood Marshall School of Law, Valparaiso University School of Law)
the ABA Standards. As such, we ask the Section to collect and publish data on program completion and bar passage success by LSAT score using its authority under Standard 104 and Rule 54(b), as well as to require schools to publish these data on their websites using its authority under Standard 509(b)(4), and Standard 509(b)(8). We decline, at this time, to recommend a specific format for publishing these data. Instead, we recommend that the Section implement a tracking system, including admissions indicators and demographic status, for all new students that can track progress through bar passage and entry-level employment.

3. User-Friendly Data Presentation

The ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, using authority it already has under the ABA Standards, should simplify the Employment Summary Report, which includes graduate employment data.

The ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, using authority it already has under the ABA Standards, should simplify and reorganize the Standard 509 Information Report, which includes data related to admissions, attrition, bar passage, price, curricular offerings, diversity, faculty, refunds, and scholarships.

The recommendations in the previous section work without changes to the ABA Standards. Not only can the Council collect and publish a variety of data in the manner and form that the Council sees fit, it may require schools to make any of this information available to students and the public on their websites or via other means of communication. At the school level, the Section—at the direction of the Council—presents two sets of data available to the public directly: the Employment Summary Report and the Standard 509 Information Report. The Council also requires law schools to publish these reports prominently on their websites.

Employment Summary Report

The Employment Summary Report details post-graduation employment outcomes for a graduating class, measured as of March 15th the following year for the class of 2014 and later—about ten months after graduation. The report allows people to calculate important data points, such as unemployment rate, percentage in law firms (and by size), percentage in public sector jobs, and percentage in jobs that require bar passage. It also includes information about where the jobs are located, whether jobs are funded by the law school, and whether jobs are short or long term and part or full time. These disclosures have already reshaped legal education, but students and the public would nevertheless be served by simplifying the Employment Summary Report.

---

We ask the Council to adopt the Proposed Employment Summary Report (Appendix A). It includes a complete changelog between forms and addresses the concerns expressed by Council members at the June 2017 Council meeting, as well as the concerns of many stakeholders. Specifically, the Proposed Report reduces the number of cells by 56% without altering data collection. It maintains the status quo on school-funded jobs above the line, which provides an equal playing field for law schools. It does not unnecessarily collapse categories that demonstrate significant differentiation. It provides clearer, and more consistent naming conventions. It maximizes visual cues that enhance consumer comprehension, including spacing, punctuation, and color. Altogether, it will help consumers make informed choices about whether and where to attend law school.

**Standard 509 Information Report**

The Standard 509 Information Report details a variety of statistics that help students figure out when to apply, whether they can get in, how much it costs, how diverse the student body is, and at what rate students complete school and pass the bar exam. This report is already a dense, though enormously helpful document. However, if the Council advances some or all of our data recommendations involving additional disclosure requirements and if the Council finds some or all of the new data important enough to earn a spot on the report, it will require simplification to ensure students and the public continue to make ample use of its contents. But even if the Council adopts none of the aforementioned data recommendations, there remains the opportunity to simplify the report and design it for maximum consumer comprehension. After all, the current report was originally designed two decades ago for print in the LSAC Official Guide. Today’s Standard 509 Information Report is viewed online as a PDF.

Data presentation involves choices about how to organize and summarize datasets, translating data from its raw form into meaningful information. With any dataset, the data can be presented in various forms, including charts, graphs, and tables. The best method depends on the audience(s). Presentation choices must balance what the audience wants to know and what they should want to know, along with consideration to information overload, complexity, and utility. Importantly, these choices set the benchmark for what matters to the audience.

We do not ask the Council to adopt a specific, new format for the Standard 509 Information Report. The ideal format will depend on what data recommendations the Council adopts. In principle, the most serious flaw is that parts of the report amount to a data dump. While the Section should continue to make all data available on spreadsheets—an important practice of the Section that benefits students, schools, researchers, policymakers, and journalists—the Standard 509 Information Report targets people who seek a valuable summary of individual law school offerings. The report should reflect this objective.
Consider the J.D. enrollment and ethnicity table (Table C, below) from the 2016 Standard 509 Information Report.

Table C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J.D. Enrollment and Ethnicity (academic year*)</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>First-Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>J.D. Deg Awd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics of any race</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some rows (Total Minority and Total) reflect the sum of other rows, but there is no visual cue to distinguish rows with sums and other rows. The columns and data time period are also not clearly indicated. Most importantly, however, the raw data do not add value to the table commensurate with the costs to consumer experience. The columns labeled # add to information overload, which reduces comprehension and therefore decision quality.

Consider an alternative table (Table D, below) that conveys the same information.

Table D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Enrollment: 749</th>
<th>J.D. Enrollment and Ethnicity, 2016-17 Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total First-Years: 242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduates: 258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority</td>
<td>Men: 13.9%  Women: 15.0%  Other: 0%  Full-Time: 28.8%  Part-Time: 0%  Total: 28.8%  Graduates: 26.7%  First-Year: 30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics of any race</td>
<td>Men: 3.1%   Women: 3.0%   Other: 0%   Full-Time: 6.1%   Part-Time: 0%   Total: 6.1%   Graduates: 8.9%   First-Year: 7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>Men: 0.3%   Women: 0.0%   Other: 0%   Full-Time: 0%   Part-Time: 0%   Total: 0%   Graduates: 0%   First-Year: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Men: 5.6%   Women: 7.1%   Other: 0%   Full-Time: 12.7%  Part-Time: 0%   Total: 12.7%  Graduates: 12.8%  First-Year: 11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Men: 3.3%   Women: 3.5%   Other: 0%   Full-Time: 6.8%   Part-Time: 0%   Total: 6.8%   Graduates: 6.6%   First-Year: 7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Men: 0%     Women: 0%     Other: 0%   Full-Time: 0%   Part-Time: 0%   Total: 0%   Graduates: 0%   First-Year: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>Men: 1.6%   Women: 1.3%   Other: 0%   Full-Time: 2.9%   Part-Time: 0%   Total: 2.9%   Graduates: 2.3%   First-Year: 4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Men: 30.7%  Women: 24.9%  Other: 0%   Full-Time: 55.7%  Part-Time: 0%   Total: 55.7%  Graduates: 61.6%  First-Year: 59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>Men: 2.5%   Women: 3.0%   Other: 0%   Full-Time: 5.6%   Part-Time: 0%   Total: 5.6%   Graduates: 3.1%   First-Year: 3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>Men: 6.7%   Women: 3.2%   Other: 0%   Full-Time: 9.9%   Part-Time: 0%   Total: 9.9%   Graduates: 8.5%   First-Year: 7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men: 53.8%  Women: 46.2%  Other: 0%   Full-Time: 100%   Part-Time: 0%   Total: 100%   Graduates: 61.6%  First-Year: 59.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It shades rows that total other rows, indents the sub-totaled rows, bolds the overall total, and labels the academic year. It eliminates the raw data except for total enrollment, total first-year enrollment, and total graduates, which the layout emphasizes at the top. The layout also emphasizes two critically important figures: overall minority and gender percentages. The table also uses the percentage of the entire class for each row that shows the intersection of race and gender, rather than percentage of gender.

Again, the raw data must remain publicly available. But on a summary report such as the Standard 509 Information Report, the main takeaways of the table should not be dwarfed by a volume of data, as is the case with Table C.

For the 2017 Standard 509 Information Report, released on December 15, 2017, the Section made several changes to Table C. The table (Table E) now includes gender and race subcategories for each class cohort. While the table does remove redundant cells, the Section chose raw data over percentages, so the tables remains a data dump that undercuts its purpose of informing consumers.

Table E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J.D Enrollment as of October 5th 2017</th>
<th>1L</th>
<th>2L</th>
<th>3L</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics of any race</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost of attendance and scholarship information on the Standard 509 Information Report (collectively Table F, below) could also use improvement.
The report devotes an entire section for living expenses. Only 12 schools differentiated between living on or off campus for the 2016-17 academic year.\textsuperscript{100} At more than half of those schools, the difference was less than $1200.\textsuperscript{101} The report also includes a column on the “Grants and Scholarships” table for full- and part-time students combined. In that section, as well as the Conditional Scholarships section, consumers would benefit from percentages without raw data.

The table to the left (Table G) addresses these problems.

A new Standard 509 Information Report should also consider data about transfers \textit{out} instead of \textit{in}. Comparing law school GPAs of transfers in is like comparing apples to oranges. Information about the law school GPAs of transfers out, on the other hand, actually provides actionable information for students.

The current Standard 509 Information Report needs additional changes that follow similar themes described in this section, regardless of whether the Council includes additional data on the summary. The choices made will balance various

\textsuperscript{100} Supra ABA Required Disclosures, note 69.

\textsuperscript{101} Id.
competing interests, but should ultimately advance the intended audience’s comprehension of valuable information.

Additional Disclosures

Standard 509 also requires law schools to publish data on their websites beyond the Employment Summary Report and Standard 509 Information Report: tuition refund policies, articulation agreements, curricular offerings, faculty and staff information, and more. To the extent that the Council wants students to still have certain raw data, the mandated ABA Required Disclosures page, which is a clearinghouse for all Standard 509 disclosures, can be expanded. The same principles of useful organization apply to these pages, but there is more flexibility because everything disclosed does not need to appear on a relatively short PDF.

4. Disclosures at Time of Admission

The ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar should require law schools to provide every admitted law student a copy of the Standard 509 Information Report and Employment Summary Report as part of each student’s admissions offer.

Standard 509 requires that law schools publish a variety of information on their websites, but permits schools to publish information elsewhere as long as it is not false, incomplete, or misleading. Standard 509(d), however, requires law schools to distribute conditional scholarship data to all recipients of conditional scholarship offers as part of their offer letter—whether by email or post. A conditional scholarship is one where retention of the full amount depends on academic performance in law school. Data on conditional scholarships helps consumers assess their chances of keeping the scholarship so that they can make an informed decision about accepting it and attending the institution. Without it, the consumer may be misled about the true likely cost of the legal education.

Similar logic underlies the requirement that information be made available to the public on the school website via Standard 509, including the Standard 509 Information Report and Employment Summary Report. The information contained in those two reports in particular is essential to consumers making informed decisions. However, the Council determined that the conditional scholarship information is important enough to also be sent to every conditional scholarship offeree. We recommend extending this logic to the two reports. The Council should require schools to include the reports as part of every offer of admission.
Standard 509(a) already permits the Council to do this. The standard provides that any information a school distributes must be “complete, accurate and not misleading.” The Section’s managing director has this to say in the Section’s Standard 509 Guidance Memo:

The following guidance is offered regarding how the Council and the Accreditation Committee view this overriding requirement of publishing information that is complete, accurate, and not misleading. Wherever a school offers any analysis or elaboration of the information covered by Standard 509, the required disclosures must be repeated or there must be a link to those required disclosures that is sufficiently proximate and prominent to draw the reader’s attention to the link. The disclosures or link to them must precede the analysis or explanation. Finally, the display of the analysis and elaboration of the data may not be more conspicuous or prominent than the display of the mandated disclosures or the link to them.102

The memo’s prescriptions apply to any analysis or elaboration of data specified in Standard 509(b) or Standard 509(c), such as information related to costs, scholarship, bar passage, and employment data, e.g. employment rate computations from employment data. The prescription means that anytime that information is relayed to a person or to the public, through the website or otherwise, the relevant required disclosures in Standard 509(b) or Standard 509(c) “must be repeated or there must be a link … that is sufficiently proximate and prominent.” In other words, when a law school advertises its employment rate, the Council may prescribe how and what the school must provide in order to not provide incomplete, false, or misleading information.

Given the analyses schools include in their offer letters and accompanying materials such as viewbooks or marketing flyers, the Council can choose to require schools to attach the Standard 509 Information Report and the Employment Summary Report as the means for a school to satisfy Standard 509(a). At minimum this prescription would guarantee receipt of the relevant information to anyone who would actually have the opportunity to attend, even if no marketing materials are sent at the time. A school that never sends marketing materials to an admitted student with information covered by Standard 509 would be the first.

If the Section does not agree with the preceding analysis, Standard 509(d) allows the Council to mandate disclosure of at least the Standard 509 Information Report. Here’s the relevant portion of the Standard 509 Guidance Memo:

Law Schools that offer conditional scholarships must include the conditional scholarship information from the Standard 509 Information Report at the time that a conditional scholarship offer is communicated.

scholarship offer is extended. It is not sufficient to provide a link to the page on the ABA’s website where the law school’s 509 Information Report can be generated. The data itself must be posted.\textsuperscript{103}

Instead the Council can choose to require the school to provide the Standard 509 Information Report instead of the above prescription. Indeed, this would help the recipient of the conditional scholarship offer put the scholarship offer in context because the report includes data about tuition, cost of living, and scholarship amounts. This method, unfortunately, only helps reach a subgroup of accepted students (those receiving conditional scholarships) at a subgroup of schools (those offering conditional scholarships).\textsuperscript{104} But that subgroup includes about half of all schools and about half of those schools’ students. That’s worth doing.

To reach the remaining students (about 75\% of accepted 1Ls), the Council would need to amend Standard 509 or find other justification under the ABA Standards. A change would also be necessary in the event that the Council believes it does not have \textit{any} present authority to mandate the inclusion of the Standard 509 Information Report and the Employment Summary Report with the offer of admission. Here, the ABA Law Students Division’s recent letter to the Council is relevant:

\begin{quote}
We call upon the Council to require all Standard 509 reports be provided with every admission letter. We affirm that Standard 509 reports are not readily known by potential law students and should be presented in an effort to increase consumer protection.\textsuperscript{105}
\end{quote}

Indeed, the information contained in the two reports is important enough that schools should send it as part of the admissions package.

\section*{5. Voluntary Disclosures by Law School}

\textbf{Every ABA-approved law school should voluntarily publish its school-specific NALP Report each year.}

Since 1974, the National Association of Law Placement (“NALP”) has processed annual graduate employment and salary data collected by individual law schools. All ABA-accredited law schools are surveyed by NALP, and the schools use NALP graduate survey forms or something similar to collect data from their graduates and then pass the data on to NALP. NALP checks the data for discrepancies or obvious questions, and returns analyses back to law schools in the form of a 25+ page report. NALP does not make individual school reports public, but individual law schools may voluntarily make their respective NALP reports public.

\textsuperscript{103} \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{104} \textit{Supra} LST Data Dashboard, note 2, \url{https://data.lawschooltransparency.com/costs/conditional-scholarships/}.
\textsuperscript{105} Unpublished Letter.
The NALP report is valuable to prospective law students because of information it contains. An individual school report has employment information that goes well beyond ABA-mandated disclosures and includes salary data (aggregated in categories, not individual salaries) and employment outcomes data about job source (e.g., OCI, networking, or direct mailings), job offer timing (before graduation, before bar results, after bar results), employed graduate search status (employed graduates who are either still seeking or not seeking), job region and job states, and job type breakdowns by employer type (e.g., Government–J.D. Advantage). When a school chooses to publish its NALP report and make it easily accessible, the school makes it easy to compare its graduates’ outcomes with those from other schools that also choose to make the report public.

Starting with the class of 2010, LST requested that schools make these reports available to the public. At the time, no school made its report public even though the only costs associated with making it available were scanning the document and uploading it to their website. Today, about 60% of schools make the report public. Table G (below) shows the status of NALP report disclosure as of January 10, 2018—and we expect reports to continue to trickle in.

Table H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Reports (%)</th>
<th>Full Reports</th>
<th>Partial Reports</th>
<th>Withheld Reports</th>
<th>No Reports Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>117 (58.5%)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>118 (59%)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>125 (62.8%)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>115 (58.7%)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>112 (57.1%)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>97 (49.7%)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>63 (32.8%)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of January 24, 2018

While some schools have instituted a culture of transparency and go beyond the ABA standards without publishing the NALP report, it can still be difficult for prospective students to compare schools due to differences in terminology and presentation on school websites. NALP reports give students data in a uniform manner, helping them to compare schools based on the job metrics most important to them.

Next Steps

This report is the product of discussions with young lawyers, law students, legal academics, and leadership in various sections and divisions in the ABA. The process started immediately after the Standards Review Committee convened its roundtable in July 2017 to discuss how to encourage innovation and address challenges related to cost, declining job opportunities, and declining bar passage rates. Transparency emerged as an essential, immediate step.

The transparency measures outlined in this report have been designed to address the most pressing issues in legal education. Every suggestion from this report can be accomplished by the Section of Legal Education without additional authority from the ABA Standards. In many cases, the suggestions can be accomplished without additional reporting burdens for law schools. In other cases, schools already possess the data but are not required to report it as part of the annual questionnaire. On balance, the value of public data will outweigh the costs of reporting in these cases.

We do recognize that there are important, formal processes in place to add items to the Standard Review Committee’s annual agenda. We nevertheless hope that when the Council for the Section of Legal Education next meets—in San Antonio on February 8-10, 2018—the Council will choose to encourage its Standards Review Committee and the Section staff to review this report’s proposals related to data collection and data presentation and, as appropriate, add items to the agenda for the coming year.

In further pursuit of a better, more responsive legal education, we also hope the Council will consider adding two young lawyers to the Council in 2018 and guarantee two spots in the future. At minimum, we hope the Council will more broadly circulate notice of Council nominations to generate a more diverse slate of nominees.

Finally, every faculty member and administrator at a law school that does not annually publish its NALP Report should assess why this choice has been made. We hope the state bar associations, especially the young lawyer divisions and committees focused on professionalism, will impress upon schools within their jurisdictions the importance of taking a very basic step to improve transparency. Appendix B has a list of the latest non-participating schools by state. Schools of all types fall in either group.

Strengthening the pipeline from prelaw students to law students to young lawyers begins with addressing the price of legal education. Enacting the proposals from this report will help consumers make more informed decisions, exert downward pressure on law school tuition prices, advance legal education research of cost and diversity, and increase accountability. All together, these proposals help secure the legal profession’s continued, important place in society.
## EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY FOR 2017 GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Type</th>
<th>Full Time Long Term</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bar Passage Required</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.D. Advantage</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Funded</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Total</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-Employed

- Pursuing Graduate Degree Full Time: 10
- Unemployed: Deferred Start Date: 0
- Unemployed: Not Seeking: 6
- Unemployed: Seeking: 37
- Status Unknown: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Employed Total</th>
<th>56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduates</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer Type</th>
<th>Full Time Long Term</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Firm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-10 Attorneys</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25 Attorneys</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50 Attorneys</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100 Attorneys</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-250 Attorneys</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-500 Attorneys</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501+ Attorneys</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Industry</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Clerkship</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Local, &amp; Other Clerkship</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Funded</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Type Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Total</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Employed Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduates</td>
<td>555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Location</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Common Employment Destination</td>
<td>Washington D.C.</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Common Employment Destination</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Most Common Employment Destination</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHANGE LOG

* Simplified form header to remove extraneous information that is easy to find in many places
* Collapsed 3 columns involving short-term or part-time jobs into 1 "other" column
* Changed last column from "Number" to "Total"
* Altered headings: "Employment Status" became "Employment Type" (bar passage required is not a status but a type of employment) and "Employment Type" became "Employer Type" (law firm is an employer, regardless of what someone does for the firm; also makes for consistency with the "employer type unknown" subcategory of "employer type")
* Introduced new heading "Non-Employed" to reflect any category that does not reflect employed graduates. Purpose is to show context for employer type and employment status traunches, without repeating rows of data unnecessarily
* Separated Employed and Non-Employed tables
* Introduced sum rows for "Non-Employed" so "Employer Type" has clearer context
* Changed coloring (white to light yellow) on any row that is the sum of other rows
* Added "attorneys" to each row title under the "law firm" employer type category; switched "Unknown Size" to "Size Unknown" for consistency with other unknown subcategories; made "Law Firms" singular to be consistent with sibling categories, e.g. government.
* Changed "Pub. Int." to "Public Interest"
* Combined state & local clerkship row with other clerkships row into 1 row
* Added new row under employer type for school-funded jobs, which resulted in school-funded jobs (as defined above the line) in other categories, e.g. education or public interest, being removed from those categories
* Removed school-funded jobs table (BPR, JDA, etc), but this would still be available via spreadsheet
* Changed row titles for employment location for clearer statement of what's reflected
* Removed foreign employment row

KEY POINTS

* Accomplished without changing data collection process at all
* Maintains status quo on school-funded jobs, e.g. these jobs remain above the line, excluded from BPR, JDA, Pro, and NP categories
* Reduced cells from 155 to 87, 56% reduction
* Does not unnecessarily collapse categories that demonstrate significant differentiation
* Clearer and more consistent naming conventions
* Maximizes visual cues that enhance consumer comprehension, including spacing, punctuation, and color
Appendix B: Schools That Did Not Publish Their 2016 NALP Report, by State

Alabama
Faulkner University
Samford University
University of Alabama

Arizona
Arizona State University
Arizona Summit Law School

Arkansas
University of Arkansas - Fayetteville

California
Chapman University
Southwestern Law School
Stanford University
University of California - Davis
University of La Verne
Western State University

Connecticut
Quinnipiac University
University of Connecticut
Yale University

Delaware
Widener University - Delaware

Florida
Ave Maria School of Law
Barry University
Florida A&M University
Florida Coastal School of Law
Florida International University

Georgia
Emory University
Mercer University
John Marshall Law School - Atlanta

Hawaii
University of Hawaii

Idaho
Concordia University School of Law
University of Idaho

Illinois
University of Chicago

Indiana
Indiana University - Indianapolis
University of Notre Dame
Valparaiso University

Iowa
Drake University

Kentucky
University of Kentucky
University of Louisville

Louisiana
Southern University Law Center
Tulane University

Massachusetts
Boston University
Harvard University
New England School of Law
Northeastern University
Suffolk University

Michigan
Thomas M Cooley Law School

Minnesota
Mitchell Hamline School of Law

Missouri
St. Louis University
Washington University in St Louis

Nebraska
Creighton University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Law Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Brooklyn Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hofstra University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Touro College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Campbell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charlotte School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duke University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elon Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina Central University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio Northern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Willamette University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Duquesne University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University - Dickinson Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Villanova University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widener University - Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Roger Williams University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Charleston School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>University of South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Belmont University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln Memorial University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>South Texas College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas Southern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Vermont Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Appalachian School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberty University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regent University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Gonzaga University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Catholic University of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Washington University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>University of Wyoming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
