Internal Operating Practices

Accreditation Project: Internal Operating Practices

The Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar is the governing body of a section of the American Bar Association, the recognized national agency for the accreditation of legal education programs that lead to the first professional degree in law at United States law schools, and the generally accepted approver of law schools by bar admitting jurisdictions in the United States. The work of the Council and the staff of the Managing Director’s Office related to the accreditation and approval of law schools is sometimes referred to as the “Accreditation Project.” These Internal Operating Practices apply to that Accreditation Project.

1. Separate and Independent

As required by the United States Department of Education criteria for the approval of accrediting agencies, the Council and the Managing Director’s Office act separately and independently of the larger American Bar Association with respect to the work of the Accreditation Project. The American Bar Association understands and accepts this requirement.

2. Accreditation Entities; Confidentiality of Materials and Proceedings

The following entities are part of the Accreditation Project: the Council, the Appeals Panel, and the staff of the Managing Director’s Office. The Council, from time to time, may appoint ad hoc committees, task forces, or working groups on accreditation-related matters. These groups, which work under the umbrella of the Council, are also part of the Accreditation Project.

As stated in Rule 44 of the Rules of Procedure, all matters and materials relating to the accreditation of a law school are confidential. All proceedings of the Council when considering matters relating to the accreditation of a law school are confidential. All work, materials, and proceedings of the Appeals Panel are confidential.

Meetings of the Council when not considering matters relating to the accreditation of a law school are generally open and shall be open whenever any final action is taken on the Standards or Rules of Procedure. Absent the approval of the Managing Director after consultation with the Chair of the Council that the business of an ad hoc committee, task force, or working group requires the group to meet in closed session,
the meetings of such groups shall be open and the date, location, and agenda for the meeting shall be published in advance of the meeting.

3. **Site Team Evaluators**

(a) Qualifications – The Council seeks to appoint site evaluators who are competent and knowledgeable concerning legal education and the legal system. Site evaluation teams shall include, as appropriate, educators, practitioners, administrative personnel, and judges. Site evaluation teams must be of sufficient size to accomplish the purposes of the site evaluation and should not be larger than needed to accomplish the purposes of the visit. The determination of the size and composition of site visit teams shall be made by the Managing Director’s Office.

(b) Evaluation – The Managing Director’s Office should seek to evaluate the quality of work done by individual site evaluators. This may be accomplished by corresponding with the chair of the team and the dean of the school visited. The objective of this process should be the development of a pool of competent and experienced site evaluators.

(c) Training – The Managing Director’s Office shall conduct, each year, workshops to train evaluators (particularly new or relatively new ones), and chairpersons of site evaluation teams. These workshops should cover the Standards, Interpretations, and Rules of Procedure; current matters of accreditation policy; process considerations for the conduct of an on-site inspection; and the drafting of the site team report. Current instructions concerning the conduct of a site evaluation visit and the content of a site evaluation report should be supplied to each site evaluator.

4. **Notice of Schools and Programs to be Accredited, and Preparation of Schools for Site Evaluation Visits**

The Managing Director’s Office shall:

(a) Publish on the Section website a list of law schools that are scheduled to be visited during the upcoming academic year for sabbatical, provisional, or full approval site evaluation visits or a visit in connection with an application for acquiescence in a substantive change of organizational structure. The notice should also state that interested persons may submit written comments regarding the school by a date certain determined by the Managing Director’s Office.

(b) Conduct, each year, one or more workshops, webinars, or similar programs to prepare schools for undergoing site evaluation visits. Such workshops may be, but need not be, held in conjunction with the workshops for training new site evaluators. These workshops should cover the Standards, Interpretations, and Rules of Procedure; current matters of accreditation policy; preparation for a site evaluation visit; the conduct of a site evaluation visit; and the expected content of a site evaluation report. Current instructions concerning the conduct of a site evaluation visit and the expected content of a site evaluation report should be provided to each school well in advance of the scheduled site evaluation visit.

5. **Notification of Council Decisions**

The Managing Director’s Office shall:
(a) Provide written notification to the Secretary of the Department of Education, the appropriate state licensing agency, and other appropriate accrediting agencies, at the same time the Managing Director’s Office notifies the Law school in writing of any decision to deny, withdraw, suspend, or remove the approval or provisional approval of the law school or to place a law school on probation, to direct specific remedial action, or to find significant non-compliance with one or more Standards under Rule 11(a)(4), but no later than thirty (30) days after the Council reaches the decision.

(b) Provide written notification to the Secretary of the Department of Education, the appropriate state licensing agency, other appropriate accrediting agencies, and the public within thirty (30) days of:
   
   (i) a decision to grant provisional approval or full approval to a law school;
   
   (ii) a decision by an approved or provisionally approved law school to withdraw from approved or provisionally approved status; and

   (iii) a decision by a law school to allow its approval or provisional approval to lapse.

(c) Provide written notification to the public within 24 hours of the time the Managing Director’s Office notifies the law school in writing of any decision to deny, withdraw, suspend, or remove the approval or provisional approval of the law school or to place a law school on probation, to direct specific remedial action, or to find significant non-compliance with one or more Standards under Rule 11(a)(4).

(d) Make available to the Secretary of the Department of Education, the appropriate state licensing agency, the appropriate accrediting agency, and the public within 60 days after final decision, a brief statement summarizing the reasons for the decision to deny, withdraw, suspend, or remove the approval or provisional approval of a law school, and the comments, if any, which the affected law school may wish to make with regard to that decision or evidence that the law school was offered but declined to provide any comments.

6. Submission of Information to Secretary of Education

The Council shall submit to the Department of Education:

(a) the Section’s Annual Report;

(b) the name of any school for which the Council serves as an institutional accreditor that the Council has reason to believe is failing to meet its Title IV program responsibilities or is engaged in fraud or abuse, and the reason(s) for the Council’s concern;

(c) annually, revisions to the Standards, Interpretations, or Rules of Procedure;

(d) annually, a list of approved law schools;

(e) upon request by the Department of Education, or an office within the Department of Education under the Secretary’s control, information regarding an approved law school’s compliance with the Standards or its Title IV or HEA responsibilities, including requests for decision letters, site reports, transcripts, or related correspondence; and

(f) upon request by the Secretary of Education, a summary of the Council’s major accrediting activities during the previous year.
7. **Maintenance of Records**

The Managing Director’s Office shall maintain a complete set of records for a sufficient period to cover at least the last two reviews of a law school or a law school’s programs. The records shall include site evaluation and fact finder reports, law school responses to site evaluation and fact finder reports, the law school’s most recent self study, and any other reports and responses related to the review of a law school. Periodic review reports, including the law school’s completed annual questionnaire, shall be retained for a period of one accreditation review.

The Managing Director’s Office shall maintain the following records indefinitely: Council decision letters, Appeals Panel decision letters, the former Accreditation Committee decision letters, the law school’s responses to such decision letters, and all other correspondence significantly related to those decisions.

8. **Response to Department of Education Information Regarding Law School Compliance with Standards**

In the event that the Managing Director should receive information from the Department of Education that raises issues about a law school’s ability to comply with the Standards for the Approval of Law Schools and Interpretations, the Managing Director will submit such information to the Council for consideration under the Rules of Procedure, and for any subsequent action by the Council as it may deem appropriate.


The Council shall engage in an ongoing review of the Standards, Interpretations, and Rules. At the beginning of each academic year, the Managing Director’s Office shall give public notice of specific Standards, Interpretations, or Rules of Procedure that will be considered for revision during the coming academic year and shall invite suggestions for other changes that should be considered.

In addition to the regular and ongoing review of the Standards and Rules of Procedure, the Council may engage in a comprehensive review of the Standards and Rules of Procedure or specific segments of them whenever the Council determines that a more comprehensive review would serve the interests of legal education. Generally, the Council would create an ad hoc committee to assist the Council in this work.

If, during the review process the Council determines that it needs to make changes to the Standards, Interpretations, or Rules, action to make those changes must be initiated within 12 months of the determination and shall be completed within a reasonable period of time.

During the review of any Standard or Rule, the Council shall seek public comment, as appropriate. Before final adoption of any changes or amendments to the Standards or Rules, the Council shall post proposed provisions and seek public comment. Written comments shall be solicited, and the Council may also conduct a public hearing to receive oral comment. If a public hearing is held, a transcript shall be made and posted on the Section website.

The Council shall hold public hearings to solicit testimony from interested parties. Notice shall be given at least 15 days prior to any scheduled hearing on the proposed revisions. The Council shall consider oral and written comments and any testimony received, and, if necessary, make changes to the proposed revisions. The Council shall act on the final revisions and shall make available to the public a written report discussing the results of the review. A Council decision to adopt, revise, amend, or repeal the Standards, Interpretations, or Rules shall be reviewed by the House in accordance with Part X of the Rules of Procedure and House Rule 45.9.
10. Approval of Questionnaires

The Managing Director’s Office shall recommend, annually, the set of questionnaires that law schools must complete and forms and questionnaires that law schools may use in the process of requesting substantive changes and variances. The Council shall review those questionnaires and approve them. While not requiring a formal notice and comment process, the Managing Director’s Office shall seek input from law schools that may be helpful in developing the questionnaires.

11. Publication of Site Team Members

At the end of each year, the Managing Director’s Office shall publish the date and place of each site evaluation (including limited site evaluations and visits to foreign programs) that occurred during the past Association year, together with the names and institutional affiliations of each site evaluator or fact finder.

12. Training and Orientation for Council Members

At the beginning of each year, the Managing Director’s Office shall provide training for members of the Council concerning the Standards for Approval of Law Schools and the policies and procedures that govern the accreditation process. Additional training in the Standards, policies, and procedures will be provided at the beginning of each academic year to any new members of the Council.

13. Conflicts of Interest

(a) It is the Council’s policy to avoid any conflict of interest or perceived conflict of interest arising because a person involved in the accreditation process has an interest in the law school or law school program under review by the Council or the Appeals Panel.

(b) Council members, Managing Director’s Office staff, members of the Appeals Panel, site team members, and fact finders (in each case when used in this IOP, a “Member”) should avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest by recusing himself or herself from participating in any matter in the accreditation process related to a law school under review without the necessity of stating a reason for recusal.

(c) If any of the following conditions are met, a Member is required to recuse himself or herself from participating in such a matter:

(1) The Member:

(i) is currently the dean, a faculty member, other employee, or a student of a law school under review (or its parent institution); a former dean of a law school under review; a former full-time faculty member of the law school under review, for a period of ten years following the termination of faculty status with that law school; a former employee of the law school under review other than as a full-time faculty member, for a period of two years following termination of such employment; or a graduate of the law school under review;

(ii) is currently a member of any board of the law school or its parent institution or has been within the last two years; or
(iii) has a current business or professional relationship (including consulting with or without compensation) with the law school (or its parent institution) or has had such a relationship within the last two years.

(2) The Member’s spouse, child, parent, domestic partner, or sibling:

(i) is an employee or student of the law school under review (or its parent institution) or has been within the last two years;

(ii) is currently a member of any board of the law school or its parent institution or has been within the last two years; or

(iii) has a current material business or professional relationship with the law school (or its parent institution) or has had such a relationship within the last two years.

(d) A Member of the Appeals Panel shall recuse himself or herself from participating in the review of a matter before the Appeals Panel in any case where the Member of the Appeals Panel participated in making the decision on such matter as a member of the Council or served on the site team which visited the law school.

(e) In addition to the conditions set forth in subparts (b), (c), and (d) above, if, in a matter before the Council or the Appeals Panel related to a law school under review, a meaningful conflict exists or could be reasonably perceived to exist in view of the Member’s office or other position, previous or current relationship with the law school, or other circumstances (including geographic distance between the Member’s residence or place of employment and the law school under review or circumstances involving the Member’s spouse, child, parent, domestic partner, or sibling), then the Member shall disclose the relationship to the Chair of the Council or the Chair of the Appeals Panel, as applicable, and the relevant Chair shall determine whether the Member shall be recused from participating in the matter under consideration. For purposes of this subpart, a relationship with a law school includes, but is not limited to, a relationship with the members of the law school’s faculty, staff, students, graduates, or its parent institution.

(f) A Member who is recused with regard to a matter related to a law school under review:

(1) may not be present in the room (nor participate in the meeting by means of telecommunications) when the law school appears before the Council or the Appeals Panel or when the Council or the Appeals Panel is discussing the matter related to the law school;

(2) shall refrain from participating in any discussions, formal or informal, with other Members regarding the matter related to the law school; and

(3) shall not read but instead shall destroy or delete any materials received from the Managing Director or Managing Director’s staff concerning the law school.

(g) A current dean, faculty member, other employee, or student of the law school under review (or its parent institution); a former dean of the law school under review; a former full-time faculty member of the law school under review, for a period of ten years following the termination of faculty status with the law school; a former employee of the law school under review other than as a full-time faculty member, for a period of two years following termination of such employment; or a graduate of the law school under review may not serve on a site evaluation team or as a fact finder visiting that law school or law school program.
For good cause stated, the dean of a law school (or law school program) under review may request that a member of a site evaluation team, or a Member of the Council, or the Appeals Panel, recuse himself or herself from acting in such capacity with respect to the dean’s law school. With regard to a member of a site evaluation team, the Managing Director shall grant or deny such request based on the merits of the claim. With regard to a Member of the Council or the Appeals Panel, the Chair of the Council, or the Appeals Panel, as the case may be, shall grant or deny such request based on the merits of such claim.

14. Grievance Committee

The Grievance Committee shall consist of the Chair-Elect and Vice Chair who shall serve one-year terms. The Chair-Elect will serve as the Chairperson of the Grievance Committee. Members will be subject to the same conflict of interest rules that apply to members of the Council.

Complaints received pursuant to IOP 15 Grievance Procedure shall be heard by the Grievance Committee.

15. Procedures for Processing Grievances Filed Against Council Members, Appeals Panel Members, Managing Director’s Office Staff, Site Team Evaluators, or Entities of the Section

(a) Any person may file with the Managing Director a written and signed grievance against a member of the Council, a staff member of the Managing Director’s Office, or a site team evaluator for failure to comply with rules, procedures, or policies of the accreditation process or for other misconduct in that process. Any such grievance against the Managing Director may be filed with the Chair of the Grievance Committee, and the Chair of the Grievance Committee shall act in the place of the Managing Director. The grievance must contain a statement of facts and circumstances showing with reasonable particularity the basis for the allegation of non-compliance or misconduct. The grievance must be filed within 6 months of the occurrence that is the basis for the allegation of non-compliance or misconduct. Pursuit of other remedies does not toll the 6-month limit. Under no circumstance shall this grievance procedure be a substitute for, or alternative to, the appeal procedures with respect to decisions affecting accreditation, in which instances the appeal procedures shall be exclusive.

(b) The Managing Director shall dismiss the grievance if the Managing Director determines that it does not allege facts sufficient to establish a violation of the rules, procedures, or policies of the accreditation process. If the Managing Director does not dismiss the grievance, the Managing Director shall forward it to the Chair of the Grievance Committee within 30 days after it was received. If the grievance is against a member of the Grievance Committee, the Chair of the Council shall appoint another person from the Council to review it. The Managing Director shall simultaneously forward a copy of the grievance to the person or persons against whom the grievance was asserted. Such persons or entities shall hereinafter be referred to as “respondents.”

(c) Respondents shall respond to the grievance by sending a written response to the Chair of the Grievance Committee. Said response shall be delivered to the Chair of the Grievance Committee within 30 days after the date on which the Managing Director sent the grievance to the respondents.

(d) Upon review of the grievance and the response required by (c), the Grievance Committee may request that the complainant or respondents provide additional information. Complainant and/or respondents shall submit the additional information requested within 30 days after receipt of the Committee’s request.
(e) The Complainant bears the burden by a preponderance of the evidence of establishing that there has been a violation of the rules, procedures, or policies of the Section, or other misconduct related to the accreditation process.

(f) Within 45 days, after receipt of the information required in (c) and (d), the Grievance Committee shall render its decision. If the Grievance Committee determines that there has been such a violation or misconduct, the Grievance Committee shall refer the matter to the Council for further action.

(g) The Managing Director shall, in writing, inform the complainants and any respondents of the Grievance Committee’s decision.

(h) All matters under this section shall be confidential.

16. Impartiality and Propriety

(a) Those who have significant responsibility in the process leading to accreditation of law schools serve a vital function in the legal system of the United States. It is important to the fair and effective functioning of the system of law school accreditation and to the maintenance of public and professional respect for that system that those who act in it act impartially and avoid even the appearance of impropriety.

(b) One who has significant responsibility in this system or who has had significant responsibility in this system within a period of two years past, as enumerated in paragraph (d) below, should not serve as a consultant to a law school in any matter relating to initial accreditation by the Council or the re-evaluation and continuation of accreditation by the Council.

(c) This statement applies to service as a consultant whether or not that service is for compensation. It does not apply to informal advice which an advisor renders without fee, informally, and which is disclosed to the Council and to the Managing Director’s Office. It does not apply to the routine or official advice and assistance which is rendered by members of a site evaluation team, by the Managing Director, or by members of the staff of the Managing Director’s Office, or by a person acting in the normal course of his or her employment.

(d) This IOP applies to:
   (1) members of the Council;
   (2) members of the Appeals Panel;
   (3) former members of the Accreditation Committee;
   (4) Managing Director’s Office staff, except as provided in subsection (c) above; and
   (5) a member of a site evaluation team accepting appointment as a consultant to a law school that he or she has evaluated, within two years after the site evaluation or while the Council still has under consideration matters developed by the site evaluation, whichever is longer.

(e) Service as a consultant for a law school does not disqualify a person from any of the offices or committees in paragraph (d). However, the officer or committee member should excuse himself or herself from participation in discussion, formal or informal, of the affairs of a school which he or she has served as consultant or employee and from taking part in any vote with respect to its status.
(f) A person who has served as a consultant or employee of a law school within two years prior to assuming a significant responsibility in the accreditation process should decline to participate in the determination of the accreditation status of the school with which he or she previously served.

(g) The Managing Director shall bring this provision to the attention of persons who are nominated for or appointed to any of the positions enumerated in paragraph (d) above.

17. **Guidelines for Reimbursement of Site Evaluators and Fact Finders**

(a) All reasonable and necessary expenses of members of site evaluation teams and fact finders shall be reimbursed by the visited institution.

(b) Reasonable transportation expenses shall be coach-class airfare, reasonable ground transportation expenses to and from the site evaluation, and meals/lodging/gratuities at a reasonable cost.

(c) Law schools are expected to promptly process and remit reimbursable expenses to site evaluation team members.