Report of the Committee on Diversity in Legal Education

by Herma Hill Kay

Chairperson Rudy Hasl appointed our Committee in 1996 and asked us to expand our charge to include a focus on the situation of women as well as minorities in legal education. In particular, he asked the Committee to consider two matters: (1) law school admission policies in the wake of the Fifth Circuit decision in the Hopwood case and the U.C. Regents’ resolution and Proposition 209 in California; and (2) the treatment of women students, faculty, staff and administrators in legal education, building on reports such as that of the ABA Task Force on Women in the Profession, “Elusive Equality.”

During 1996-97 the Committee held three meetings in conjunction with meetings of the AALS, the ABA, and the ALI, and made a final report to the Council on August 1, 1997, at its meeting in San Francisco. The report described the Committee’s work during the year, and proposed a resolution for the Council’s consideration. The final part of that resolution proposed a study to be undertaken by the Law School Admissions Council and the law schools, described as follows:

5) that the Section propose to LSAC and the law schools a pilot project to study the effect on minority admissions if the LSAT score were to be used as setting a minimum threshold below which, in the absence of compelling factors, schools would not consider applicants, rather than using the LSAT score in combination with UGPA to produce an index number to be used in the admissions process. The remaining applicant pool would then be chosen using UGPA and other school-determined relevant factors as the basis for the admissions decision. The Section requests that LSAC and the law schools report back the results of this study as soon as may be feasible.

In addition, the Committee asked that the Standards Review Committee consider expanding Standard 211 on Equal Opportunity Effort to include women of all colors as one of the identified groups and that Interpretation 211-1(h) be expanded.

Continued on page 14

Harold Reuschlein, Former Section Chairperson, Dies

The Section was saddened to hear of the death on August 18 of former Council Chairperson Harold Gill Reuschlein. Dean Reuschlein was 93.

Dean Reuschlein, the founding dean of Villanova Law School in 1953, was long active in the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, serving as a member of the Council from 1962-1971 and as Chairperson of the Section in 1969-1970. He was a member of the Accreditation Committee from 1972 until 1978, serving as Committee Chairperson from 1973 to 1977. In 1992 he received the Section’s Robert J. Kutak Award given each year to an individual who meets the highest standard of professional responsibility and demonstrates substantial achievement toward increased understanding between legal education and the active practice of law. In presenting the award, the chair of the Kutak Award Committee observed that “no individual has given more to the cause of American legal educators than Harold G. Reuschlein.”

During Dean Reuschlein’s tenure as Chairperson of the Section new Standards for the approval of law schools were drafted and adopted and new publications were produced. Also, Dean Reuschlein endeavored to bring more judges and practitioners as active participants in the activities of the Section.

Harold Reuschlein was a significant contributor to the work of the Section and American legal education. He will be remembered for his many endeavors for the improvement of legal education as well as his love of good companionship and his many thespian endeavors.

He is survived by his wife of 69 years, Marcella. The family asked that any memorials be made to the Villanova University School of Law for the Harold G. Reuschlein Scholarship Fund.

Harold G. Reuschlein

Continued on page 14
In fall 1995, A.P. Omar, Minister of Justice of South Africa wrote me stating:

As we work to transform our system of legal education to make it more relevant to our new realities, it will be very helpful for us to have international input into this process. Legal education is one of my top priorities since it is the foundation for the entire legal system, and key to making the legal system strong and sustainable.

Many areas of our present legal education need to be changed or strengthened, and we are working to do this. Many of the issues we are dealing with (including curriculum content, teaching pedagogy, law school accreditation, integration of skills in legal training, law school bridging programs for historically disadvantaged groups, the use of law school clinics, and provision of legal assistance to name a few) have been faced by legal educators in other countries including the United States. We know we can benefit from their experiences. They in turn have much to learn from our unique situation.

Minister Omar stated that he would like the assistance and advice of the Consultant's Office and the Section as South Africa "embarks on the difficult task of reforming legal education..."

During the next several months representatives of the Section's African Law Initiative began a dialogue with representatives of the South African Ministry of Justice. We met with South African Ambassador to the United States Sonn to discuss how the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar might be of assistance.

A small working party was formed consisting of former Council Chairperson Judge Henry Ramsey, Jr.; Michael Wolf, director of the Section's African Law Initiative; Nnamdi Ezera of the ABA's Washington staff; Professor Ziyad Motale of Howard University; and myself. Michael Wolf coordinated plans for this small working party to visit South Africa at Minister Omar's request and to meet with a variety of persons representing legal education and the bar of South Africa.

During August 17-22, 1998 this working party visited South Africa to begin a dialogue leading to linkages and assistance on areas where American legal education could be of the greatest assistance to the South African government, legal community, and law schools. Our purpose was to assess the most critical legal education and training needs in the context of the transformation of the legal profession and legal education in South Africa. The long-term goal of the visit is to assist in the formation of productive partnerships between South African and American legal education and law schools. During the visit the team met with many practitioners, law deans and professors, leaders of the major lawyers' associations, United States Ambassador James Joseph and Ministry of Justice officials.

A comprehensive report is being completed that will be presented to Minister Omar in October. We know that there are many American law schools that will be eager to participate in this initiative, some schools that already have connections in South Africa. The Section looks forward to assisting Minister Omar and law schools in both countries as relationships come into being that will be a mutual benefit to the South African and American legal profession and legal education.
NALP Report

Advising Today's Law Student on Careers

Law faculty receive countless requests for career advice from students even though these future lawyers have access to excellent career services offices. Students naturally look to the experiences and expertise of law faculty for supplemental advice.

Hopefully, you are encouraged, and not overwhelmed, by the prospect of sharing career advice with today's law student. Staying current on employment trends is not difficult or time-consuming as this brief overview of the current employment market suggests.

Market Trends

The rate of entry-level hiring has increased during each of the past four years. For the Class of 1997, the overall employment rate rose to 80.2% six months after graduation, up about 2% over the year prior. An increase in full-time legal employment can be credited for virtually all of the increase, even though a strong lateral hiring market is constraining entry-level legal hiring.

The largest percentage of employed 1997 graduates acquired jobs in private practice (55.6%). Many joined smaller organizations, as demonstrated by the 17.6% of law graduates who joined firms with 2-10 attorneys. Indeed, nearly one-quarter of the class went to firms with 25 or fewer attorneys.

Employment in business, at 14%, was down slightly from the year prior and provided mostly nonlegal employment for graduates since less than 40% of these jobs were reported as legal in nature. Government and public interest employment attracted a little over 15% of the class, with judicial clerkships absorbing the final 11.1%.

Given the large percentage of students entering smaller law firms, government agencies and the courts, it is not surprising that the national median salary ($41,000) has remained relatively unchanged over the past few years. While the press has given substantial attention to recent jumps in entry-level pay at the nation's largest firms (touting base salaries of $90,000 and announcing bonuses of $5,000-10,000) such compensation levels are not the reality for the vast majority of students. Of the nearly 40,000 graduates in the Class of 1997, only 10% of them acquired salaries of $80,000 or more. In actuality, over one-third of the employed graduates acquired jobs that paid $40,000 or less.

Despite the visibility of OCI, the vast majority of employers hire students who come to them through self-initiated contact—the number one job source for law graduates. In comparison it may be surprising to note that nationally, OCI accounts for only 17.1% of employment. Hence, the faculty role in encouraging and motivating students in their self-initiated job search is extremely important.

Staying Current

More information about the current legal employment market, such as hot practice areas or regional/city trends, is readily available:

- Meet with a member of your career staff. Ask them to share their knowledge of the market vis-à-vis your students. Ask for two sets of employment data: 1) a copy of NALP's national employment and salary figures for the Class of 1997; and 2) the same figures for your school. The data contain helpful employment and salary breakdowns, such as the percentage of students becoming prosecutors or the salary range for employers in your state.
- Review a copy of the National Law Journal's annual "Careers Supplement," typically published in August. The supplement provides a quick overview of hot, warm and cold practice areas based on interviews with leading recruiters throughout the country. Your career services office most likely has a copy.
- Stay abreast of current career office services, activities, and job listings by reading the career office's student newsletter. One of the greatest roles faculty can play is to help direct students into the school's career office. Encouraging and motivating students to attend a particular career panel or to meet with a career counselor goes a long way in reenergizing a job-searching student.

Kelly Townes, current NALP President, is the Associate Dean for Administration & Career Services at the Indiana University School of Law—Bloomington.

SAVE THE DATE

Presidents', Provosts', & Deans' Conference

Chicago, Illinois
February 25-27, 1999

For more information:
http://www.abanet.org/legaled
The Access Group Report

On Human Nature: The Fairy Tale Fallacy

Once upon a time, there was a beautiful maiden, who felt trapped. In a wild moment, her father had told her that she could spin straw into gold, but she couldn’t, of course, even on pain of death. So when a funny little creature offered to accomplish the task for her and save her life, she jumped at the chance. The catch was that in return, she had to promise him her first-born child. She agreed readily, assuming that by the time she had to make good on her promise, something would surely turn up.

In the fairy tale, of course, something does turn up, and the maiden gets to have her cake and eat it too. So why are we asking the legal education community to consider the case of Rumpelstiltskin? Because the beleaguered maiden personifies the universal human genius for denial. As in this example, we seize the present opportunity to make our wishes come true, and avoid thinking about the cost as long as we can.

It seems to us that this is what too many law students are doing today. Their financial aid advisers (and even some of their loan providers) have explained over and over that they should figure out their costs to the penny, then borrow only what they need and can afford to repay. And most students do attend the financial aid counseling sessions that are required when they enter school, but many don’t seem to hear what is being said. It’s not salient information for them; their minds are on their course work and the start of a new academic odyssey. And because they are not listening, they wind up borrowing too heedlessly and spending too freely, using more money than they actually need to live on.

Logical Fatalism

“It’s very hard for many students to grasp the reality of debt,” says Dr. Jeff Hanson, Director of Debt Management Services for the Access Group. He believes that many students start school with three unarticulated beliefs, and usually manage to hold onto them, despite evidence to the contrary, all the way through school. Those three beliefs are a combination of logic and fatalism:

1. “The only way I’m going to go to law school is if I borrow the money. I have no other option.” (In many cases, perfectly true.)
2. “My school would never do anything harmful to me. Therefore, if they approve my borrowing tens of thousands of dollars each year, it must be all right.” (Perfectly logical.)
3. “I’ll be able to pay it all back, because I’m going to get a good, well-paying job.” They believe this obdurately, whether the current job market is good or bad. They believe it even if their year-one class rank is low, even knowing that the odds are against their being able to improve their rank in coming years, and even knowing that most law firms interview based on class ranking. They cling tenaciously to a secret faith that they will be the exception to the rule. The alternative—that they might not get a good job, or any job, after borrowing tens of thousands of dollars—is unthinkable. Deep down, they must know they’re going to have to repay the money no matter what, even if they’re unemployed or underemployed. But that’s too scary to think about, so they focus on their “great expectations.”

In addition, students often do not grasp what economists call “the marginal cost” of borrowing money. They think, “Well, if I’m already going to owe $50,000, what’s another 5,000?” They don’t seem to realize that $55,000 is a lot more to owe than $50,000—and that the actual figure will be even higher as interest accrues, on every dime, every day.

And finally, since they know they’ll have at least a six-month grace period after they graduate, and won’t really have to think about repaying their education loans until then, they simply put the whole subject out of their minds.

Unhappily, for many graduates, their actual opportunities will not match their ill-conceived expectations—but they’ll still have to pay the piper anyway.

As hard as it is to get their attention, schools owe it to their students (who after all, they hope will be satisfied, generous alumni someday) to do everything possible to help them limit how much they owe when the time comes to repay. That’s why the Access Group has developed the Student Financial Planning Program, through which we are working with law schools and other professional schools around the country to develop effective educational programs in money management, personal finance, and debt management. This curriculum will include lessons on budgeting, investing, using credit wisely, managing debt, and other aspects of personal finance that students need to know before, as well as after, they graduate.

The main thing students have to grasp is that they can’t have their pizza and eat it too. It is incumbent upon them to figure out a budget based on minimal expenses while they’re in school, and stick to it—even though it requires temporarily accepting a minimal lifestyle. Their mantra should be, “If I live like a lawyer while I’m a student, I’ll have to live like a student once I’m a lawyer.”

We don’t want to discourage students from making the commitment to a professional education; from, ultimately, pursuing what they have decided they want for their lives. We do want them to understand that their dream will come true only at a price, and that they should try to keep the price as low as possible, since they’ll have to pay it to the last penny. An insolvent ending is not a happy ending, as we all learn eventually. We simply want students to learn it early—long before they have to give up that first-born child to pay the piper.
Building planners now have an additional source of information for assistance in law school construction projects. A Law Library Journal article, “Planning and Constructing Law School Buildings: Ten Basic Guidelines,” highlights key issues that administrators, architects and contractors should consider to avoid common pitfalls. Discussion of the ten steps includes input from law school administrators across the country on specific features and practices to emulate or avoid in building planning. Professor John Edwards of Drake University Law School wrote the article to help those involved in law school building projects avoid problems that others have experienced. Utilization of the points discussed in the article made it possible to complete a 70,000-square-foot building that has earned five design awards (see adjacent photo). Footnote references provide additional sources to assist in the process. The following guidelines and brief explanations should give a general overview of the scope of the article.

Top Ten List of Construction Project Guidelines

1. Hire a consultant.
   Having an expert available early in the process can facilitate the project's development and help identify areas needing attention.

2. Acquire the necessary background materials and information.
   All of the necessary "tools" to understand the process should be assembled and studied, including building guidebooks and a construction dictionary.

3. Seek input from various constituencies, including students, faculty, staff and other patrons.
   A survey of user needs will help identify the priorities that should be met by the project.

4. Reiterate the need for incorporating functional concerns with architectural goals, including maximum flexibility for future growth and technology.

5. Review the budget frequently to ensure that essential items remain part of the project.
   Staying within the budget as changes are needed requires careful attention to project priorities so they are not deleted or significantly diminished as the contingency fund declines and adjustments become necessary.

6. Attend key meetings with design and construction personnel and promptly review the written minutes of those meetings.
   A law school administrator should be present at all construction meetings in which significant decisions will be made or the project will progress without that input.

7. Develop a good working relationship with project personnel, including architects, key construction supervisors, and campus advisors.
   Operating as a team facilitates the process and makes it much easier to incorporate changes as they are needed.

8. Conduct frequent walk-throughs during the construction process.
   Periodic visits at critical construction phases can help identify problems when it is cost-effective to remedy them.

9. Plan the move carefully, giving special attention to the personnel who will be moving library materials.
   Hiring a competent mover whose experience and insurance assure the safe and timely delivery of materials will facilitate the transition in the new building, especially for the library. (The article includes several moving horror stories.)

10. Maintain records of all warranty items and provide prompt notification of concerns.
    During the initial year after dedication every problem should be noted and given to the contractor so that it can be addressed. Furnishings should also be monitored for defects so that they can be corrected while under warranty.

Reprints are available from the author, John.Edwards@drake.edu or 515-271-2141. The article can be found in the summer 1998 issue of the Law Library Journal, volume 90 #3, pages 423-45. An electronic version is accessible from Westlaw's LLIBJ database or from the Website of the ABA Consultant on Legal Education at http://www.abanet.org/legaled. Additional materials on planning and designing law school buildings developed for the most recent Bricks & Bytes Conference are available from the ABA Service Center at 1-800-285-2221 by requesting publication 5290090, Law School Facilities Reference Book.

Opperman Hall and Law Library at Drake Law School.
ABA President Anderson Responds to Newspapers’ Editorials

On October 1, 1998, the ABA sent the following letter drafted by President Anderson to 163 newspapers around the country in response to recent editorials published about the ABA and its role in the accreditation of law schools.

To the Editor:

One of the reasons the American Bar Association was formed was to create and maintain standards for legal education to ensure that people who offered themselves to the public as lawyers were knowledgeable enough to be trusted with the serious legal affairs of their clients. Thomas Sowell’s recent column, in which he criticized the ABA and its law school accreditation program, was so completely off target that it must have been based on a total misunderstanding of how ABA accreditation works.

The ABA standards for approval are about quality legal education, not costly legal education. Of the 182 law schools approved by the ABA, 84 public and private institutions charge lower tuition than does the Massachusetts School of Law. Those schools were able to satisfy our standards and still offer a more reasonably priced legal education than MSL. And the fact that ABA approved law schools graduate approximately 40,000 new lawyers each year, 43 percent of them women and 21 percent of them persons of color, hardly suggests that we limit opportunities for new people to become lawyers.

It is important to understand that the ABA only evaluates those law schools that request an evaluation, and it evaluates those schools against a rigorous set of standards designed to ensure that the schools are graduating students capable of representing the public.

MSL is not ABA approved simply because it did not satisfy the ABA standards. Just as Professor Sowell would have us substitute the pass-fail rate of MSL students on the bar examination for an evenhanded application of fair and appropriate standards to ensure the public is served by properly educated lawyers. But MSL students spend six credit hours specifically on learning test-taking skills to increase their chances of passing the Massachusetts bar exam—time that ABA approved law schools devote to training their students in the law.

The ABA is proud of the role it has played in elevating the quality of legal education. Indeed, as the First Circuit Court of Appeals noted in affirming the dismissal of one of MSL’s failed suits over ABA accreditation: “It is widely believed among legal educators and regulatory organizations that compliance with the [ABA] Standards enhances the quality of legal education.” The ABA fairly and objectively applies a set of rigorous standards to those law schools that request an ABA evaluation. Professor Sowell’s argument that the ABA should lower its standards does a disservice to the public’s reliance on a well-educated legal profession.

Sincerely yours,

Philip S. Anderson

Public Hearings on the Standards

The Standards Review Committee is seeking comments from members of the practicing bar, the judiciary, bar administrators, and the legal academy regarding Chapters 3 and 4 of the Standards and the proposed changes relating to the ABA’s compliance with certain requirements of the U.S. Department of Education’s Criteria for Secretarial Recognition of Accrediting Agencies. The Committee considers it extremely important to receive input from as many constituents as possible. This input might include suggestions for change in one or more Standards or Interpretations, as well as expressions of opinion that a particular Standard or Interpretation is, or a collection of them are, valid as currently expressed.

The Standards Review Committee has scheduled hearings to allow persons to make oral comments in addition to, or instead of, written comments. Hearings will be held during the AALS Annual Meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana, January 6-10, 1999, and at the ABA Midyear Year Meeting/Annual Deans Workshop in Beverly Hills, California, February 3-9, 1999.

Specific and updated information regarding public hearings will be posted on the Section’s website as soon as it is available. Please note that on the Section’s website, you can also review the current Standards, the proposed changes thereto, and the September 9, 1998 interim report to the Department of Education submitted by the Council of the Section as required by the Secretary of Education.

Finally, please submit your comments to the Standards Review Committee, ASAP, at the Office of the Consultant on Legal Education at the following address: Standards Review Committee, Office of the Consultant on Legal Education, 550 West North Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46202.
FROM THE CHAIR

DOE Designation IssuesNearly Settled

by Randall T. Shepard

For most of the 1990s, our Section’s business has seemed overshadowed by a series of contentious crises. These now appear about to end, and the Section’s energies should be directed to more positive projects.

There was, you will recall, the antitrust claim brought by Anne Bingaman, late of the Department of Justice. The Association defended itself against the Department for some two years at an expense of well over a million dollars. The Board of the ABA decided to settle with the Department, and a ten-year consent decree covering various aspects of our work became part of daily life.

Both staff and volunteers alike chafed under the yoke of this litigation, believing that the claims were much exaggerated. In the end, however, it has turned out that the decree has been relatively easy to live with. Its most unusual aspect is the anomaly it creates about salaries: law schools are the only part of American higher education for which comparative salary data is not readily available. Other than that, staying within the corners of the decree has been straightforward.

Anne Bingaman was hardly behind us when we encountered a series of private lawsuits. These were filed on various grounds, variously brought by students, faculty, and, most notably, the Massachusetts School of Law, which we had declined to accredit early in the decade. While some of these cases are still alive, the weightiest of them have been decided favorably to the Association and the work of the Section. Judgments in our favor in the MSL litigation, for example, have been recently affirmed by two different federal circuits.

The last forum in which we have found ourselves engaged has been the U.S. Department of Education. The ABA’s accreditation work, of course, rests on two bottoms. For some seventy-five years, state high courts have recognized the Association as the accreditor of law schools for bar examination purposes. When the U.S. Office of Education came into being in the 1950s, it designated the ABA to accredit law schools so that it could reliably make student loans.

DOE’s requirements for designated accrediting agencies evolve over time, of course, and amendments to the Higher Education Act prompted new requirements in the early 1990s. Perhaps a dozen or so new points were added to DOE’s procedures. We were among the first accrediting agencies to which these new rules have been applied. The Section managed to meet all but three or four in short order, and the Department extended our designation for three years.

The trailing issue has been a requirement that accrediting agencies be “separate and independent” of any associated trade or professional association. Until recently, this seemed like an insurmountable problem.

For one thing, the fact that American law school accreditation occurs as a joint venture of the bench, the bar, and the academy has been a central feature of its success. My view, widely shared by my fellow officers and Council members, has been that we should strive to maintain this collaborative aspect of our work. This is not easy to do under DOE’s definition of “separate and independent.”

Happily, in recent months the highest leadership of the Association has put its shoulder to the wheel with us on this problem. The officers, board, and management of the ABA have endorsed a plan under which decisions made by the Section would be overseen by the House of Delegates. The House could either approve the Council’s actions or refuse to do so and remand for further consideration. This regime would allow the Council to make final decisions, but only after serious debate in the profession’s most representative body, the House of Delegates.

There is every reason to believe that this arrangement will allow the ABA to remain as the accreditor of law schools for both the state supreme courts and the Department of Education. Any other outcome would impose terrible costs and confusion on students, firms, schools, and admitting authorities.

Moreover, the solution of this third challenge should largely bring to a close this half-decade of crisis management and permit the Section, its Council and committees to refocus our collective energies on improving legal education and admissions to the bar. I believe that our schedule for this year reflects our renewed commitment to be proactive in this cause.

In short, I see light at the end of the tunnel, and I am confident that it is not the lamp on an oncoming train.

SAVE THE DATE

Workshop for Graduate Programs for Foreign Students and How to Plan Foreign Programs for American Students

Durham, North Carolina
March 5-6, 1999

For more information: http://www.abanet.org/legaled
Temple Professor Receives Alpern Award

Temple University Law Professor Marina Angel received the Anne X. Alpern Award from the Pennsylvania Bar Association’s Commission on Women during its annual meeting in Hershey, Pa., on May 14.

The award honors a female lawyer or judge who demonstrates excellence in the profession and has made a significant professional impact on women in the law.

“We are pleased to have such a magnificent award recipient,” said Judge Rosalyn K. Robinson, who presented the Alpern Award. “Professor Angel is highly regarded for her teaching, scholarship and mentoring of young women in the legal profession.”

Temple University President Peter J. Liacouras, former dean of the law school, said, “Those of us who work with Professor Angel know of her commitment and effective work on behalf of gender equality. So, when institutions recognize Marina with prestigious awards we are not surprised, and are happy and proud.”

After accepting the award, Angel said, “In the year I started law teaching, women were 3% percent of the legal profession; in 1995 we were 23%. . . . The bad news is that we’re still over-represented in traditional women’s areas and in the lower rungs of the legal profession.”

Outlining the progress made by women in the law, she added, “Discrimination still exists, but it’s more subtle. We need to recognize it, define it, and eliminate it.”

This is a second major award for Angel, who was the first law professor to receive the Sandra Day O’Connor Award presented in 1996 by the Philadelphia Bar Association’s W.M. Keck Foundation Award and Lectureship.

Kutak Foundation Seeks Nominations

The American Bar Foundation is now inviting nominations for the fourth W.M. Keck Foundation Award and Lectureship. The award was established with a grant from the W.M. Keck Foundation to honor scholarly contributions in the area of professional responsibility and legal ethics and thereby advance this field of research in the academic and professional communities. The American Bar Foundation is administering the awards process.

Individuals may be nominated for the award in recognition of a single work or a body of scholarship over a period of time on professionalism and professional responsibility. The award recipient will be expected to deliver an address on professional responsibility in February 2000 at the annual meeting of The Fellows of the American Bar Foundation that is held in conjunction with the Midyear Meeting of the American Bar Association. The lecture will be published as a monograph and distributed widely. The lectureship carries an honorarium of $5,000 plus expenses.

An Advisory Committee, composed of noted practitioners and academics in the field of legal ethics, will be accepting nominations until December 31, 1998. Nominators may suggest several persons, and self-nominations are also welcome. The Advisory Committee will present its recommendations to the Board of Directors of the American Bar Foundation that will name the award recipient. Letters of nomination accompanied by the curriculum vitae of the nominee may be sent to:

Advisory Committee
W.M. Keck Foundation Award and Lectureship
American Bar Foundation

750 N. Lake Shore Drive
Chicago, IL 60611

The first recipient of the W.M. Keck Foundation Award and Lectureship was Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr., Director of the American Law Institute and Trustee Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania. His lecture, “A Lawyer’s Moral and Ethical Discretion,” was delivered on February 2, 1997, in San Antonio, Texas. The second award recipient was David J. Luban, Frederick J. Haas Professor of Law and Philosophy, Georgetown University. His lecture, “Milgram Revisited,” was delivered on February 1, 1998, in Nashville, Tennessee. The third Keck Award recipient is Deborah L. Rhode, McFarland Professor of Law, Stanford Law School. Her lecture will be delivered on February 7, 1999, in Los Angeles, California.
Site Evaluation Workshops

In early September, the Consultant’s Office conducted its annual series of day-long workshops related to the accreditation process. The first workshop was designed for law schools which are scheduled for sabbatical reviews within the next two academic years. The program topics included legal issues related to the accreditation process; how the accreditation process works; the Self Study; how to prepare for the site visit; the conduct of the site visit; and sessions on various substantive aspects of the review. The workshop was attended by 37 individuals representing 24 law schools that will be reviewed over the next two years.

The second workshop was conducted for individuals who will chair site evaluation teams during the 1998-99 year. The 17 participants were also debriefed on current legal issues related to the accreditation process and heard from both the Accreditation Committee and the Council about what the site evaluation teams need to provide these bodies for their over-sight of the accreditation process. The participants then discussed the new format for the site evaluation report and engaged in discussions of some of the major problems encountered in the site evaluation process.

The final session provided training for individuals who will serve as site evaluators for the first time. The group of 24 participants included: two federal magistrates; one state supreme court justice; one judge from a state intermediate court of appeals; four practitioners; five provosts or senior vice presidents of universities; and ten law school administrators and faculty members. The program included a discussion of legal issues related to the accreditation process; an overview of the site evaluation and annual questionnaires used in the review; and a discussion on the team’s role in the evaluation process. Additional topics focused on substantive aspects of the site evaluation visit and writing the site evaluation report.
Deans Starting in the Past Academic Year

Foreign Summer Program Enrollment
Section Publications

The Standards for Approval of Law Schools sets forth the standards that a law school must meet to obtain or retain ABA approval. The book also contains additional information on legal education. The book is divided into ten parts: (1) Standards & Interpretations; (2) Rules of Procedure; (3) Criteria for Approval of Semester Abroad Programs for Credit Granting Foreign Segment of Approved J.D. Program; (4) Criteria for Approval of Foreign Summer Programs; (5) Criteria for Approval of Individual Student Study Abroad for Academic Credit; (6) Criteria for Approval of Cooperative Programs for Foreign Study; (7) Statement of Ethical Practices in the Process of Law School Accreditation; (8) Internal Operating Practices; (9) General Information; and (10) Prior Council Statements. Product Code: 5290084, Price: $12.00.

In the past year, the Professionalism Committee published two books. The first book, Teaching and Learning Professionalism, examines the recent decline in professionalism and makes a number of recommendations designed to increase the level of professionalism among American law students, practicing lawyers, and judges. The second book, Teaching and Learning Professionalism: Symposium Proceedings, brings to conclusion the professionalism projects of the Section and the ABA Professionalism Committee by reproducing the papers presented at, and summarizes the discussion from, a national invitational Symposium on Teaching and Learning Professionalism in October 1996, cosponsored by the Section and two other ABA entities, The Standing Committee on Professionalism and The Standing Committee on Lawyer Competence for the Center for Professional Responsibility.


ABA Section Reception for Faculty Group Members

The Officers and Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar cordially invite you to a Reception honoring your school's participation in the Faculty Group Membership Program

Thursday, January 7, 1998 - 6:30 to 8:00 pm
New Orleans, Louisiana
to include women faculty of all colors as well as minority faculty who are both male and female. The Council accepted this recommendation.

In 1997, Chairperson Beverly Tarpley reappointed the Committee with essentially the same membership, and charged it with the implementation of the study proposed by the 1996 Committee and approved by the Council, as well as the continuation of its efforts to improve the position of women in legal education.

During the 1997-98 year, the Diversity Committee met at the AALS annual meeting in San Francisco on January 9, 1998, and at the midwinter ABA meeting in Nashville on February 1, 1998, and held several conference calls. In addition, the Committee Chair was present by conference telephone call at a meeting convened by Dean Frank Newton at Texas Tech College of Law on April 15, 1998. The Committee presented its preliminary report to the Council at its meeting in Newport, Rhode Island, on June 6-7, 1998.

What follows is the “Diversity Committee Report” submitted to the Council for the Section at its August 1998 meeting in Toronto, Canada. At that meeting, Chairperson Tarpley stated she would accept the report from the committee to the Council and request the consultant to distribute it to deans of ABA approved law schools as a committee report. Please note that this information is also available on the Section’s Website at http://www.abanet.org/legaled.

I. Our Charge:
The Dilemma of Maintaining Broad Access to Legal Education When Race and Ethnicity Cannot Be Taken into Account

In the vast majority of law schools, the U.S. Supreme Court’s 1978 decision in the Bakke case permits the use of race-conscious factors in the admissions process. During the two-year period of this Committee’s work, however, the use of race and ethnicity as factors in the admissions process has been prohibited in two sections of the country. The three states within the jurisdiction of

All ABA approved law schools currently use the LSAT to comply with section 503. We assumed that this universal practice would continue. Questions have been raised concerning how the LSAT is and should be used in the selection process. For those who would like to explore this matter further, we append a list of readings. To examine these issues, we focused our analysis on how schools use the LSAT and on a range of options for refining its use to improve its accuracy and to maximize diversity.

A. Methodology

The Committee worked closely with President Philip D. Shelton of the Law School Admission Council in conducting its study of ways that a school using the LSAT might choose to broaden its pool of qualified applicants using race-neutral devices. To conduct the study, the Committee asked LSAC to provide it with a substantial amount of data.

The initial data provided to the Committee by LSAC were drawn from ten unidentified public law schools—nine from California and the Fifth Circuit and one school outside these areas. The report for each school included descriptive historical data for the applicant/admit pools for application years 1994-95, 1995-96, and 1996-97; and the same information for the number of actual admits in fall 1997 if the school had used as the criteria for admission the index only, or the LSAT only, or the undergraduate grade point average (UGPA) only.

Three hypothetical models were constructed (called Alternatives A, B, and C). These models used baseline LSAT scores drawn from each school’s actual admit pool for the 1995-96 admission year to identify “qualified” applicants. Alternative A used an LSAT score equal to the score that was actually tenth from the lowest score of all admitted applicants for that school. (The lowest score was not used to avoid outliers.) Alternative B expanded the LSAT range by five points and Alternative C expanded the range by an additional five points. In each instance, applicants who met the “qualifying” LSAT score were then
ranked according to UGPA and a matrix that displayed the characteristics of the students admitted (a number equal to the number of actual admits in the class entering in the fall of 1997).

Each of the above methods for identifying admitted applicants was matched against the following characteristics: gender, ethnic identity (including American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black/African American, Caucasian/White, Chicano/Mexican American, Hispanic/Latino, Puerto Rican, and Other); LSAT scores, including the lowest, highest, and 75th, 50th, and 25th percentiles; UGPA, including the 75th, 50th, and 25th percentiles; undergraduate major, categorized broadly under Arts & Humanities, Business & Management, Computer Science, Engineering, Health Professions, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences; age, categorized by 22 and under, 23-25, 26-30, 31-35, and over 35; graduate degree earned; and resident/nonresident status as determined by the location of the law school and the permanent residence of the applicant.

The Committee focused on Alternatives A and B, and the final data report produced by LSAC reduced 310 pages of data to a single page identifying the 1995-96 applicant/admit counts, the 1996-97 applicant/admit counts, the number of applicants "qualified" for Black/African Americans, Asian/Pacific Islanders, Chicano/Mexican Americans, and Hispanic/Latinos for each of the hypothetical models. The findings and conclusions of this study are based on the data from this analysis.

In the course of our study, we learned that, while many schools combine two numerical indicators, UGPA and the LSAT score, to produce an index number that can be used to rank applicants, schools also rely on an array of additional factors. These nonnumerical indicators include undergraduate majors, postgraduate study or work experience, letters of recommendation, community activities, indicators of leadership both in high school or college, and special efforts made to overcome disadvantage.

We also learned that not all law schools use an index number in their admissions process, and those that do use it vary the amount of weight given to the two variables that constitute the measure. Thus, for the application year 1997-98, the 179 ABA-approved law schools used the following types of index formulas:

- 106 (59%) used a formula based on correlation study results (either the most recent or based on a prior year's study);
- 46 (26%) used a different formula representing alternative weightings of LSAT and UGPA; and
- 27 (15%) used no index formula produced by LSAC.

Of the 168 ABA-approved schools that participated in the 1997 LSAT Correlation Study, most weighted the LSAT between 65 and 55 percent and the GPA between 35 and 45 percent in the formula. Only a very few schools weight the LSAT above 70 and the GPA below 30. These relative weightings can make an important difference in how a law school applicant's credentials will be evaluated and considered by different schools. For example, an applicant with a 3.75 UGPA and a 145 LSAT will rank much better under an index calculation that weighs UGPA and LSAT equally than one that weighs the LSAT at 70 percent of the index value. Moreover, some schools blend in other variables, such as putting greater weight on the last half of an applicant's college grades. And some schools recalculate their indices over time in order to account for changing applicant pools, while others have kept the index calculation the same to preserve consistency.

B. The Role of the LSAT as a Qualifying Credential

Our project examined the effect on minority admissions at a sample of unidentified schools if the LSAT were to be used to set a minimum threshold below which, in the absence of compelling factors, schools would not consider applicants, rather than using the LSAT score in combination with UGPA to produce an index number to be used in the admission process. We do not propose the establishment of a "cutoff" score below which files would not be read. Rather, we envision the identification of a group of applicants below the threshold whose files would be carefully scrutinized for compelling factors that might support a favorable decision despite the LSAT score.

After reviewing the data described above, the Committee focused on an analysis that compared the proportion of admits to total applicants with the proportion of actual minority admits to qualified minority applicants. The purpose of this analysis was to determine whether using the LSAT as a qualifying credential might give schools an opportunity to expand minority admissions. We hypothesized that a school would expand its pool of qualified applicants by using the LSAT as a qualifying credential if the ratio of its actual minority admits to its qualified minority applicants was greater than the proportion of total admits to total applicants.

Given this hypothesis, the Committee expanded its analysis to include 31 law schools, public and private, from across the country and across the spectrum of schools, including the original ten. As noted above, the Committee used two "baseline" LSAT scores in defining "qualified": (1) [Alternative A]: a 1997 applicant is qualified for admission if the applicant's LSAT score is equal to or higher than the 1996 admitted student's score which was 10th from the lowest LSAT score in the school's admitted pool for 1996; and (2) [Alternative B]: a 1997 applicant's LSAT score was within five points of the LSAT score that was 10th from the lowest LSAT score in the admitted pool for 1996. Using
these two definitions of “qualified” as the criteria for being eligible for consideration for admission to each individual law school, the following results were achieved:

The number of schools that would expand the subset of qualified minority applicants in their pool through using Alternative A are shown in Table 1.

Further analysis reveals that there is little overlap among these schools across the different ethnic identity groups. The total number of schools that would expand their pool of one of these four ethnic identity groups was 20. When Asian/Pacific Islanders are not counted, 18 schools would expand their pool for at least one of the remaining three groups. When all four minority groups were added together, however, i.e., when summing the estimated number of qualified applicants across all four groups and comparing that total to the number from these groups that actually were admitted in 1997, 14 law schools expanded their pools with this approach. Using the same analysis, but omitting the Asian/Pacific Islanders, 16 schools did so.

It thus appears to us that nearly half the law schools might give themselves a better opportunity to broaden the subset of eligible applicants in their pool and to improve their minority admissions if they utilized “Alternative B.” Interested schools should request the data underlying this analysis from the LSAC in order to determine the effect of either alternative on their applicant pool.

In addition to the analysis described above, the Committee asked the LSAC to run several other tests to determine whether the use of other factors might broaden the pool. We inquired about whether factors, such as age or undergraduate major, might correlate with either minority status or gender in a fashion that would enhance a school’s ability to achieve a diverse student body. We learned that minority status and gender do not strongly correlate with these factors.

Findings and Recommendations

The work that the Committee has done leads us to offer several findings and recommendations:

(1) Purposes of the LSAT. The LSAT can be used for two purposes: (1) to provide evidence that an applicant can succeed in the first year of law school; and (2) to allow the school to compare one applicant to another applicant. Schools have most frequently used the LSAT for the second purpose, and have mistakenly assumed that small differences in scores indicate great differences in individual ability. In order to correct this mistaken assumption, the LSAC has begun to report LSAT scores to schools in bands that show the margin of error surrounding a particular score: an applicant who scores 150, for example, should be viewed as falling within a band of 156-162.

(2) Achieving diversity. For the vast majority of law schools, the most effective way to achieve diversity is to take into account the diversity that applicants from racial and ethnic minority groups bring with them. As noted above, this approach is solidly grounded on the Bakke decision.

(3) Achieving diversity when race and ethnicity cannot be taken into account. Public schools in California and the Fifth Circuit are prohibited from using race and ethnicity as factors in admissions. The challenge of maintaining significant diversity is more difficult in these jurisdictions for highly selective schools with large applicant pools. Under these circumstances, the smaller numbers of minority applicants are vastly outnumbered by other applicants at all levels of the pool. The use of Alternative B may prove quite helpful to some schools in this category, and we recommend that such schools request appropriate data from LSAC to make this determination for themselves.

(4) Overreliance on the LSAT. Even those schools that would not expand their pools by using Alternative B should scrutinize their current processes to eliminate overreliance on the LSAT and to incorporate more individualized assessment of candi-
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dates. We share the view repeatedly voiced by the Law School Admission Council that many schools use the LSAT incorrectly in the admissions process.

(3) Experiments recommended.
The Committee urges schools to develop their own unique admissions processes to achieve the mix of students they desire. We found that there is no uniform standard that identifies a single measure of “merit” in evaluating numerical indicators in the admissions process. Schools should feel free to experiment with the numerical indicators in relation to each other and to other, non-numerical, indicators in making their admission decisions. Schools that wish to experiment with Alternative A or B described above may instruct the LSAC to report only that an applicant is “qualified” and to omit the specific LSAT score or scores. A school using this approach will, of course, be expected to disclose fully to prospective applicants and the ABA how it uses the LSAT. The school will still be able to participate in the annual correlation study performed by the LSAC to permit evaluation of the propriety of using the LSAT in this manner.

Conclusion
Our Committee believes that Chairpersons Hasl and Tarpley charged us to look into possible ways for schools prohibited from using race or ethnicity to continue to provide broad access to admissions because they view the provision of legal education without a diverse student body as unacceptable. We strongly support this view for the following reasons.

In 1965, when affirmative action requirements for federal contractors became official U.S. government policy, the legal profession in the United States was constituted almost entirely of white men. Only three out of every 100 lawyers were women; less than 1% were African American; and the number of other minority lawyers was so small that it was not even tallied in the reporting sources. The changes that have occurred in the legal profession since that time are dramatic indeed. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported in October 1997 that of 925,000 total lawyers and judges employed in the United States, 26.6% were women, 2.7% were African American, and 3.8% were Hispanic. Asians still were not.

In fall 1997, 19.6% of J.D. enrollment were members of minority groups. In addition, the rising application rate of women to law school has been a major success story of the decades after 1960: between 1965 and 1985, the proportion of women J.D. students in ABA approved schools went from 4% to 40% of the total. Today, in fall 1997, women constitute 42.5% of J.D. enrollment.

These numbers say something vitally important about our concept of ourselves as a society. The ideal of American democracy—equal justice under law—ultimately must rest on public confidence that the system of justice is fair and evenhanded in its treatment of all people regardless of their status or condition. Thus, it is essential that all of the people of our nation be able to sustain an abiding trust in the fairness of the rule of law. Otherwise, they may not be willing to obey the law. As we all know, today that trust has been severely tested. The poor, the underprivileged, and various other groups that remain outside the mainstream of our country do not have full confidence that the law treats all persons fairly and with respect. We can help allay this mistrust by making sure that the future lawyers, judges, and

law teachers of this country are more representative than they now are of the nation as a whole. The need to diversify the legal profession is not a vague liberal ideal: it is an essential component of the administration of justice. The legal profession must not be the preserve of only one segment of our society. Instead, we must confront the reality that if we are to remain a government under law in a multicultural society, the concept of justice must be one that is shared by all our citizens.

Unless law schools—the gateway to the profession—are able to maintain diversity by providing broad access to legal education, these goals will be unattainable.

This report is submitted by the Committee, all of whom worked diligently and showed sensitivity and good judgment in addressing these difficult matters.

Justice Joseph F. Baca
New Mexico Supreme Court
Dean David Hall
Northeastern University School of Law
Professor Michael Olivas
University of Houston Law Center
Dean Burnele V. Powell
University of Missouri (Kansas City) School of Law
Professor Judith Resnik
Yale Law School
Professor Katherine L. Vaughns
University of Maryland School of Law
Ms. Diane Yu
Monsanto Corporation
Dean Herma Hill Kay, Chair
University of California (Berkeley) School of Law

Herma Hill Kay is Dean and Barbara Nachtrieb Armstrong Professor of Law at the University of California, Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall). She is also a member of the Council of the section and chairs the Diversity Committee.
ABA Consumer Guide to Law Schools

The Consultant's Office is pleased to announce the availability of the 2nd edition of the Official American Bar Association Guide to Approved Law Schools. We believe that the information contained in this book is the most accurate, timely and comprehensive ever published on American law schools. As a result, we hope and expect the book to be used as an educational resource by law schools, prospective students, parents, placement/guidance personnel, and attorneys. If you are interested in objective data supplied by ABA approved law schools as part of the accreditation process or if you are advising people who need this type of information—you should buy this book.

It is available in bookstores nationwide and the ABA Service Center for a price of $21.95, (800) 285-2221, Product Code: 5290085.

WASHINGTON REPORT

By Kristi Gaines

With partisan wrangling over what to do with the budget surplus and the distraction of the Independent Counsel's investigation of the president, 1998 may be defined more by what Congress didn't accomplish, than what it did. Nonetheless, in the waning weeks of the session, several important pieces of legislation were passed. After two years of hearings and months of discussion to resolve disputes between Congress and the administration, legislation to reauthorize the Higher Education Act of 1965, which governs most college undergraduate and graduate programs, was passed on September 29, 1998. On October 7, President Clinton signed the bill, entitled the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, into law.

The most controversial issue in the debate was over how to implement a cut in student loan interest rates that Congress and the president had committed to in 1993. Faced with the rate reduction proposals, banks claimed that making student loans would no longer be profitable and threatened to withdraw from the program. In a compromise, the final version of the legislation lowers the interest rate that borrowers pay while in school and provides a new federal subsidy to lenders to make up for the reduction from current rates. In addition, for a period of time, it makes loan consolidations available at the lower rate from the Department of Education's Direct Loan program, as well as private lenders participating in the Department's government-guaranteed (FFEL) loan program. Persons applying before January 31, 1999, will receive an interest rate of 7.46 percent on consolidated loans. For those applying after this deadline, the loan consolidation interest rate will be calculated based upon a weighted average of the interest rates of the original loans.

The bill renewed authorization for and increased the amount of several financial aid programs. This includes an increase for the maximum Pell Grant of $4,500 for the 1999-2000 academic year, rising to $5,800 for 2003-04. It also increases the annual Perkins Loan limits for undergraduate students to $4,000, and for graduate and professional students to $6,000. The aggregate Perkins loan limits is raised to $40,000 for graduate and professional students. The bill retains current limits on amounts in federally guaranteed loans that a student may receive each year—$6,500 for graduate students and the current total limits on loans for students—$95,500 for graduate students, including debts they have incurred as undergraduates.

Several changes were also made in the provisions governing graduate education. The bill eliminates the Patricia Roberts Harris Fellowship Program that gave grants to female and minority graduate students by folding it into the Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need Program. GAANN provides funds to academic departments and programs to support graduate students in subjects deemed critical to the nation.

Although initially targeted for elimination by the House, the bill continues the Jacob K. Javits Fellowship Program, which provides competitive grants for graduate study in the arts, humanities and social sciences with an authorization level of $30 million for fiscal year 1999. Of special interest to law students, the bill creates the Thurgood Marshall Legal Educational Opportunity Program, to provide low-income, minority or disadvantaged students with information, preparation and financial assistance to gain access to and complete law school. The Marshall Program is authorized at $5 million for fiscal year 1999 and would be administered by the Council on Legal Education Opportunity, which the American Bar Association helped found in 1966 to make it possible for economically and culturally disadvantaged students to attend law school.

Changes in most of the programs will take place in the 1999-2000 academic year.
Comments Relating to Law School Accreditation

In the 1998-99 academic year the Consultant's Office on Legal Education to the American Bar Association will coordinate the following site evaluation visits.

Interested persons may submit written comments regarding a school to the Consultant's Office. The comments should be postmarked by December 1, 1998, for schools that are being visited in the fall and by March 1, 1999, for schools that are being visited in the spring. Comments should be sent directly to James P. White, Consultant on Legal Education to the American Bar Association, 550 West North Street, Suite 349, Indianapolis, IN 46202.

1998-1999 SITE EVALUATION CHART*

FALL SABBATICAL VISITS
- Georgetown University Law Center - November 8-11, 1998
- Golden Gate University School of Law - November 15-18, 1998
- Mercer University, Walter F. George School of Law - October 25-28, 1998
- Mississippi College School of Law - November 15-18, 1998
- North Carolina Central University School of Law - November 15-18, 1998
- University of Oklahoma City Law Center - November 4-7, 1998
- Samford University, Cumberland School of Law - October 18-21, 1998
- University of South Dakota School of Law - October 18-21, 1998
- Thomas M. Cooley Law School - October 14-17, 1998
- Touro College, Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center - October 25-28, 1998
- Valparaiso University School of Law - November 11-14, 1998
- Vermont Law School - November 8-11, 1998

SPRING SABBATICAL VISITS
- University of Alabama School of Law - February 24-27, 1999
- University of Albany, C. Blake McDonnell Law Center - April 11-14, 1999
- Arizona State University College of Law - March 28-31, 1999
- Capital University Law School - February 21-24, 1999
- Cleveland State University, Cleveland-Marshall College of Law - March 21-24, 1999
- University of Georgia School of Law - February 24-27, 1999
- Gonzaga University School of Law - April 18-21, 1999
- University of Kansas School of Law - February 28-March 3, 1999
- University of Kentucky College of Law - April 7-10, 1999
- Loyola University School of Law-Chicago - April 11-14, 1999
- McGeorge School of Law - March 14-17, 1999
- University of Michigan School of Law - March 17-20, 1999
- Northeastern University School of Law - March 14-17, 1999
- Pontifical Catholic University of Puerto Rico School of Law - March 14-17, 1999
- Regent University School of Law - March 14-17, 1999
- Rutgers University School of Law-Newark - March 21-24, 1999
- Seattle University School of Law - March 24-27, 1999
- Western New England College of Law - February 26-March 3, 1999
- Whittier School of Law - March 28-31, 1999
- Widener University School of Law - March 21-24, 1999
- University of Wisconsin Law School - March 17-20, 1999

PROVISIONAL SITE VISITS
- Chapman University School of Law - October 18-21, 1998
- University of the District of Columbia School of Law - April 11-14, 1999
- Texas Wesleyan University School of Law - February 14-17, 1999
- Thomas Jefferson School of Law - February 24-27, 1999
- Western State University College of Law - March 21-24, 1999

APPLICATIONS FOR PROVISIONAL APPROVAL
- Southern New England School of Law - January 24-27, 1999
- Florida Coastal School of Law - November 8-11, 1998
- Appalachian School of Law - Undetermined

Please visit the Section’s Website for updates to this chart.
http://www.abanet.org/legaled
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# Correction Notice

Due to an editing/layout error, the article in the last issue on the Africa project opened with Africa being referred to as a country rather than a continent. We regret the error.

---

# Mark Your Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>ABA Accreditation Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>ABA Section Council Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>AALS Annual Meeting*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ABA Section Reception for Faculty Group Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>ABA Accreditation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-9</td>
<td>ABA Midyear Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>ABA Workshop for Deans of ABA Approved Law Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>ABA Council Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>ABA Bar Admissions Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ABA Workshop for Site Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-27</td>
<td>ABA Section Presidents', Provosts' &amp; Deans' Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7</td>
<td>ABA Section Workshop for Foreign Students and How to Plan Foreign Programs for American Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-25</td>
<td>ABA Accreditation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ABA/AALS/LSAC Deans' Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mayflower I Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mayflower II Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-28</td>
<td>ABA Law School Development Conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The following Section Commissions will meet in New Orleans during the AALS Annual Meeting: Diversity in Legal Education, Graduate Legal Education, Independent Law Schools, Law Libraries, Law School Development, New Deans Seminar, Pre-Law, Questionnaire, and Skills Training. For specific information, please contact your committee chair or the Section's Website.