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

To: Committee Appointees  
From: Chief Justice Ruth McGregor  
Date: October 8, 2007  

The 2007 Report of the Accreditation Policy Task Force made a number of excellent recommendations, some of which require additional review and study. When the Task Force was appointed, the Council understood that the goals of this important project could not be completed in one year. Because Section leadership is committed to continuing the work on this project, I have decided, with the concurrence of outgoing Chair William Rakes and Chair-elect Randy Hertz, to create three Special Committees to follow up on recommendations of the Task Force.

The Special Committees should begin work as soon as possible and should submit an interim report to the Council by May 2008.

Special Committee on Outcome Measures  
Chair: Randy Hertz  
Staff: Dan Freehling  

This Committee will determine whether and how we can use outcome measures, other than bar passage and job placement, in the accreditation process. The Committee may consider approaches taken by other accrediting agencies, evaluate criticism of existing measures, and analyze relevant information and studies. The Committee also should consider methods to measure whether a program is accomplishing its stated mission and goals. The Committee should define appropriate outcome measures and make specific recommendations as to whether the Section should adopt those measures as part of the Standards.

Special Committee on Transparency in the Accreditation Process  
Chair: Peter Winograd  
Staff: Becky Stretch  

This Committee will study the accreditation process to determine how it can be structured and administered to assure more transparency, and identify steps that can be taken to obtain more comments and feedback about the process. The Committee also will consider how schools can best prepare for increased transparency. The Committee
should recommend procedures that further the default position of openness of and accessibility to the process.

**Special Committee on Security of Position**
Chair: Mary Kay Kane
Staff: Camille DeJorna

This Committee should follow-up on Part IX of the Report of the Accreditation Policy Task Force by considering the following issues:

1) Assuming arguendo that the Council were to eliminate the current Standards and Interpretations on “security of position” and adopt other Standards and Interpretations to protect the interests that the current “security of position” provisions are designed to protect – which are identified in Part IX of the Task Force Report as including academic freedom, attraction and retention of well-qualified faculty, and “ensuring that law school governance decisions that can affect curriculum will have the benefit of the comments of sectors of the law school faculty whose knowledge and perspective otherwise might be unrepresented” – what specific wording could be employed (in Standards or Interpretations or both) to protect these interests adequately?

2) Will the new provisions proposed by the Special Committee serve the interests underlying the existing “security of position” provisions as effectively, more effectively, or less effectively than the existing provisions?