Aloha: Farewell and Hello

By Barry A. Currier

Aloha. Thanks to my office colleagues for offering an opportunity to say aloha—farewell—to Syllabus readers as I leave the Consultant’s Office in June. And aloha—hello—to each of you in my new role as dean of the relatively new Concord Law School in California, the nation’s premier online law school and part of Kaplan, Inc.

I look forward to continuing friendships and collegial relationships developed over the years.

My farewell observation is a simple one: we are all in this together. We are the law schools (and their constituent groups) and the legal profession (and its constituent parts, including judges, lawyers, bar admissions authorities, and members of the public with a particular interest in the law and lawyering). This is the important task of serving as a gatekeeper for those who would enter our profession.

The Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar is a crossroads where we come together to establish basic standards that law schools must meet to assure new lawyers an appropriate educational foundation as they begin the practice of law. There is no clear answer to the question of what the foundation should be, and the best answer changes over time.

A central place for a conversation about legal education and standard setting is useful and efficient. It does not have to be within the ABA, although all of us should appreciate the leadership and support that the ABA provides. The ABA is a logical place for this activity because it naturally brings together those who should be involved in this standard-setting process. If it works well, state bar admission processes can rely on a national law school approval process and need not maintain their own separate processes. Law schools can avoid monitoring the requirements of every state where a graduate might wish to be admitted to the bar and qualifying themselves in those states.
From Brown to Grutter: Reflections on Life's Education and Legal Education

One of the important truths in life is that we receive as much education outside of the classroom as we do inside the classroom. This is equally true for primary school education as it is for legal education. Some personal experiences help to illustrate this point and compel me to suggest that in legal education we must think of the world as our classroom and learn to build on the educational foundation that each of our students brings to the classroom. Permit me to share some personal experiences to explain my point.

In May we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in Brown v. Board of Education. Brown holds a lot of symbolism for me since it was discrimination that initially led to my personal interaction with some of the legal architects instrumental to that decision and ultimately influenced my decision to go to law school. After completing undergraduate school, I participated in a program designed to get more minorities into the foreign service. While doing graduate work in international relations, I took the foreign service officers exam and while awaiting my results, I became engaged. Although I passed the exam, this was at a time when our government was not taking married women into the foreign service. I was kicked out of the program and stripped of my fellowship in mid-semester and had to make plans for alternate employment.

I joined the Washington office of an action-oriented think tank that was headed by Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, the noted professor and social psychologist whose doll study conducted with his wife, Dr. Mamie Phipps Clark, is cited in footnote 11 in Brown. During the eight years that I worked with that organization prior to going to law school I met some of the key players on the legal team involved in Brown and other critical U.S. Supreme Court decisions. In many ways it also was the beginning of my legal education. It was this experience that focused my thinking about what I wanted to do with my life and shaped what I have done with my life professionally.

I was born in New Jersey and spent my early years in the all-black town of Gouldtown. My mother was a Gould, the descendant from a union between the daughter of a wealthy Englishman who became involved with one of his slaves. My earliest schooling was in all black schools. I also recall as a child having to sit upstairs in the balcony of the movie theater, being invited to join a segregated Girl Scout troop (I declined) and the Klu Klux Klan burning crosses in Bridgeton, the small town to which we moved when I was about seven or eight. I also recall that because of the segregated housing patterns in my hometown, our town probably was among the first in the nation to voluntarily institute a busing program to try to integrate the schools in the early 1960s.

Since those early years of racially separate schools, I have studied at a variety of educational institutions, most of which were more racially diverse. At every one, except Howard University, I was one of a very small group of students of color. Not surprisingly, my level of comfort and engagement at those schools varied, in large part based on the faculty and other students. Two examples come to mind.

I was a student at Yale Law School when the U.S. Supreme Court considered the Bakke case. I recall a white male student from New York verbally attacking black students whom he considered less qualified than white students, saying that he had friends who were being denied admission because "you people" are being admitted based on lower standards. Since I worked in the admissions office, I knew for a fact that the student with the lowest objective indicators in any class was not a person of color.

Painfully I recall how ambivalent black students at Yale were about having been admitted under an affirmative action plan. Many of them had graduated from prestigious prep schools and Ivy League colleges and had GPAs and LSAT scores comparable to those of their white classmates. Yet they were filled with self-doubt because admission under the affirmative action plan carried with it a certain stigma. With a small number of black students in each class, it was difficult to create the critical mass that might provide a positive presence to other classmates and also reinforce black students' sense of belonging.

Ironically, after graduating from law school and spending
time at a firm, and in both the federal and District of Columbia governments, I joined the law firm of Hunton & Williams. This firm, I would come to learn, had been on the wrong side of Brown. The firm represented Prince Edward County, Virginia, in arguing that separate but equal was constitutional. Justice Lewis Powell had been a partner in the firm before he became an associate Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court.

How do these personal experiences and painful memories relate to Brown and Grutter, and more specifically, legal education? Brown taught us that separate was inherently unequal. But more importantly, Brown dismantled a way of life and transformed some fundamental assumptions about race and society in America.

What flowed from that decision was a small but steady increase in the numbers of students of color in institutions that once denied or limited significantly their admission. In the early 1960s, the combination of student sit-ins, southern marches, church bombings and brutal assassinations led to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The education gathered in the streets also led to "affirmative" efforts to increase the number of blacks admitted to colleges and universities.

The inevitable backlash came with the Bakke decision. There was, however, that glimmer of hope offered by Justice Powell's opinion for the Court in which he expressed the view that attaining a diverse student body was a compelling state interest and that our "nation's future depends upon leaders trained through wide exposure to the ideas and mores of students as diverse as this nation."

Based on Justice Powell's articulation of a compelling state interest in diversity that would be constitutionally permissible if narrowly tailored, many colleges and universities since then have crafted admissions programs and policies that considered race as a factor, along with other factors, in admissions decisions. As a result, the number of minority students in ABA-approved law schools has grown to the highest levels ever, totaling more than 28,300 in the fall of 2003.

Thus, the challenge of Grutter and the possibility that race could no longer be used as a factor in admissions decisions, raised alarm and fears of a return to an era when there once again would be one or two, not 20 or 30, in an entering law school class.

The result in Grutter was perceived by many as the best possible outcome. For the first time a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court, drawing on Justice Powell's analysis in Bakke, agreed that there was a compelling state interest in diversity. Another significant aspect of the decision was the recognition of the need for a critical mass in order to achieve the benefits that flow from diversity. There can be little doubt that when there are a meaningful number of minority group students, all students feel more comfortable sharing their views and all students are exposed to differing view points within the smaller subgroup.

The attorneys representing the University of Michigan focused also on the fact that, in many ways, our educational system today may be more segregated than it was prior to Brown. This is largely the result of housing patterns. We have overwhelming black and Hispanic inner cities surrounded by overwhelmingly white suburbs. Most of us live in neighborhoods that are not racially or ethnically diverse. We have few meaningful opportunities to interact with individuals who are racially, ethnically or culturally different from us.

Race is a pervasive and insidi-

Continued on page 18
In this column, I wish to highlight some of the major activities of the Section and its committees over the past few months, and to call your attention to upcoming conferences and programs that I believe deserve your careful consideration.

In April, our Out-of-the-Box Committee, co-chaired by Dean John Attanasio of SMU (Southern Methodist University) and Diane Yu (a former Chair of the Section), sponsored an important conference in Dallas: “Critical Choices: Educating the Next Generation of Lawyers.” The program included a panel in which university presidents and provosts who are former law school deans shared their perspectives on the place of law schools in the academy, and a segment that focused on what legal educators might learn from how the case method is used in other professional disciplines. Another panel explored ways in which, through technology, professional education—including some aspects of legal education—can be and is delivered to those who find it impractical to attend classes in a fixed locus. Among the other highlights was a presentation of illuminating data concerning the career paths of a large sample of recent law graduates who were first admitted to practice in 2000. The presentation was a preliminary report of data resulting from the “After the JD Study,” undertaken by the American Bar Foundation, the NALP Foundation for Education and Research, LSAC and other organizations. A comprehensive written report of the results of the first stage of the project is expected from those organizations this summer.

Two of our regular conferences aimed at assisting deans and other senior law school administrators are scheduled for this spring. The Law School Administration Committee, chaired by associate dean Jack Pratt of Notre Dame, has planned the biannual Associate Deans’ Conference, scheduled for June 3-6, and we already have over 100 registrations for that conference. Our annual Seminar for New Deans, the planning committee for which is chaired by Dean David Van Zandt of Northwestern, will be held at Northwestern June 10-12.

Four of our committees are sponsoring or co-sponsoring programs at the ABA Annual Meeting in Atlanta on Saturday, August 7. Since I as a faculty member and dean was particularly invested in continuing to improve my school’s curricular offerings, I personally will be most interested in the Curriculum Committee’s program that afternoon reporting on the results of its comprehensive survey of law school curricula. Descriptions of all three of the Section’s Annual Meeting programs, and a schedule of all Section events at the Annual Meeting, will be on found pages 10-11.

The Section will sponsor or co-sponsor two major conferences this coming fall. On October 1 and 2, in Chicago, there will be a Conference on Legal Education and Bar Admissions. The Conference is sponsored jointly by the ABA, the National Conference of Bar Examiners, the AALS, and the Conference of Chief Justices, and the planning committee is chaired by Dean Mary Kay Kane of the University of California, Hastings. This conference will provide an excellent opportunity for dialogue among legal educators, bar admission officials, and the judiciary about issues of mutual concern.

On October 15 & 16 in Newark, New Jersey, the Section will sponsor a Law Technology Conference—Pedagogy to Practice: Maximizing Legal Learning with Technology. Dean Tom Galligan of Tennessee chairs the planning committee, which is focusing this year’s conference on ways in which technology may be employed to enhance the learning environment in and associated with the classroom. More information about each of these conferences will also be found on page 9.

The Standards Review Committee, chaired by Professor Michael Davis of Kansas, this year has assisted the Council in undertaking a comprehensive review of Chapters 3 (Program of Legal Education) and 4 (Faculty) of the Standards. The proposed revisions to Chapter 3 were printed in the last issue of Syllabus and the proposed revisions to Chapter 4 are included, beginning on page 14. It is expected that the Council will take final action on revisions to both chapters at its June 2004 meeting. During 2004-05, the Standards Review Committee plans to make recommendations to the Council for revisions to all or most of the remaining chapters of the Standards.
By the time you read this, the offices of the Section (and all of the ABA) will have moved to our new offices, on the north bank of the Chicago River near the Loop. (See the detail on page 18.) Although all of our staff have contributed to making the move as uneventful as possible, special thanks go to Director of Operations Carl Brambrink, who oversaw all moving arrangements for the Section and personally packed more boxes in the past month than anyone should in a year.

The lead article in this issue is an “Aloha” from my good friend and four-year collaborator, Barry Currier. The Office, the Section, and legal education in general have been very fortunate that we have had the benefit of Barry’s great talents, insights and energy over these four years that he has served as deputy consultant. I have never had a closer working relationship with a colleague than I have had with Barry, and he has contributed much to the enhancement of legal education during his tenure here. He will be greatly missed. We wish Barry and Marilyn the best as they move home, to Los Angeles, and as Barry takes on his exciting new responsibilities as dean of Concord Law School.

We welcome Stephen Yandle, long-time associate dean at Yale Law School, as the new deputy consultant. I have known Steve for a number of years and greatly value the breadth of experience and thoughtful perspective that he will bring to our endeavors. Steve has already been attending meetings of the Council and the Accreditation Committee, and he has worked closely with those of us on the staff during the transition. He will begin full-time duties on June 14.

Comprehensive Guide to Bar Admission Requirements

The National Conference of Bar Examiners and the ABA’s Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar publish the Comprehensive Guide to Bar Admission Requirements each year. It sets forth the rules and practices of all U.S. jurisdictions for admission to the bar by examination and on motion: legal education, character and fitness, bar examinations, special licenses, etc. Supplemental information follows each chart.

Request ABA product code: #5290087(04ED)

Character and Fitness Determinations
Permitted Means of Legal Study (Bar Exam)
Additional Requirements
Application Dates & MBE Requirements
MPRE, MPT & MEE Requirements
Grading and Scoring

Admission on Motion
Reciprocity, Comity and Attorneys Exams
Bar Admission Fees
Other Licenses and Registrations
Directory of State Bar Admission Agencies
Mandatory Continuing Legal Education

To order your copy today, call the ABA Service Center at (800) 285-2221 or to view the publication online, visit the Section’s Web site at www.abanet.org/legaled
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Law students at Barry University attend a legal writing course taught by Professor Timothy Blevins.

Innovative Technology Helps Develop Lawyer Skills

"Good morning, Mr. Phelps. The photographs you are viewing are of a man wanted in connection ..."

—Opening line from the Mission Impossible television series (circa. 1965)

The "mission," provided by a mystery caller, was always accepted and it never proved to be impossible. My self-initiated mission at Barry University was to bring to life the doldrums of legal research and writing by engaging students in the problems we gave them to research and analyze in their writing through the use of technology. I found my mission to be not only possible but also delightfully interesting.

I wanted to give first-year students a sense of what it was like to work with client information in a way that avoided the dry delivery technique of handing them a facts sheet. The information must be made available to 12 sections of students enrolled in the legal writing course, a total of 175 students. The quantity and quality of the information needed to be uniform and there was the need for permanence such that the students could return to the information as often as if they had been handed a facts sheet. I found the solution in the use of web-based video files.

The common means for distributing facts in a legal writing course was to create a paper document, perhaps a summary of a client’s problem, a partial transcript of an interview or deposition, or the entire problem laid out in story form. I wanted to create an experience that avoided the "paper distribution" while providing the students with the challenge of identifying the facts.

In reality, no client ever comes to an attorney with the problem written out and, without any additional explanation, expects the attorney to research possible solutions. There would be some conversation and the attorney would get a feel for what the client wanted based not only on the words spoken but also recognizing how the words were spoken, e.g., tonal inflection and body language.

I began by creating a screenplay from which two people would act, an attorney and the client. I would be the off-camera attorney who was interviewing a client. I obtained a digital camcorder and set up the scene in an empty study room in the law library. Because there was no budget for professional editing I knew that I would need to get the scene in a single take. Upon completion, I downloaded a free video editing program and set about turning the film images into a computer file. The resulting vignette was a 15-minute truncated interview, which was placed on a Web site for easy access.

Students were then given an assigning memo from the senior partner that instructed them to view the web-based interview. The assigning memo also directed the students to write a six-page memorandum analyzing the application of a rule of law to the facts found in the video.

"The video interview is better because it makes you think and it is something different," one student remarked in the course evaluation. Perhaps one of the reasons this student was made to think can be found in the delivery media. Many of our students have computer skills that exceed those of us from earlier generations and the students are therefore very comfortable accessing information from the computer.

Another aspect of learning that plays into the success of the video is the multimedia makeup of the delivery; many of today’s students...
are better attuned to visual/audio learning environments than our generation of note takers. Finally, the students could identify with the client, a person-to-person connection that is absent in the facts sheet scenario. One student comment, referring to the client, was quite telling, "I don't think she was sincere." Certainly something the student would not get from a facts sheet.

The success of the project was extended into the next semester when the students were presented with another vignette. This time it was the deposition taken from the other party. I believe we have created a learning environment that more closely approximates what a new associate in a firm might encounter without sacrificing any quality in education. I found the project interesting and I was excited by the student feedback. Future classes of legal writing will incorporate this and other forms of technology as I continue to explore better means of making the learning experience more meaningful for the students.

Timothy D. Blevins is assistant professor at Barry University Dwayne O. Andreas School of Law, Orlando, FL.

If your school offers a unique law program that you would like to share and write for this column, please contact Editor Joe Puskatz at puskarj@staff.abanet.org for editorial consideration.

Statistical Digest:
Questionnaires Streamlined with Technology

By David Rosenlieb, Data Specialist

Instead of presenting the traditional statistical charts in my column, I wish to take this opportunity to educate the members of the Section of major statistical projects that either have been completed or are currently in progress. These projects will not only give more accurate information to the law school community, but also will simplify the process of gathering data.

The Questionnaire Committee, under the leadership of Allen Easley, has been conducting an extensive review of the Site Evaluation Questionnaire. Administration, faculty, and staff complete this questionnaire when law schools are scheduled for a full site visit. The Questionnaire includes an extensive self-study, and information on the history of the law school, program of legal education, faculty, students, administration, information resources, finances, and facilities. The results of the questionnaire are very important to both the site visit team and the Accreditation Committee.

The Questionnaire Committee has spent eight months reviewing and revising this questionnaire. The new questionnaire, which will be presented to the Section Council for approval in early June, along with other questionnaires, has been standardized for language and Standard citations, simplified by clarifying questions and eliminating questions asking for similar information, and streamlined by identifying required attachments by category. All of the questionnaires, upon Council approval, will be available on the Section's Web site in early June.

Beginning in the fall of 2004, the Section will be moving the Foreign Summer Program Annual Questionnaire to a web-based application. The web-based system will not only allow law schools to complete questionnaires for the current year, but also to review questionnaires from prior years. A free training session on the new application will be offered in the fall.

The Section will also host a training session on Friday, July 9, 2004, at the new ABA Headquarters in Chicago, 321 N. Clark Street, for those law schools having a full site evaluation during the 2004-05 academic year. There will be multiple training sessions for the 2004 Annual Questionnaire during late July and early August. Dates, locations, and other information will be posted on the Section's Web site at www.abanet.org/legaled.

The Statistical Take-off Reports for 2003-04 have been mailed to all subscribing law schools. The Section has updated some of the reports to reflect new information gathered for the first time in the 2003-04 Annual Questionnaire. Also in progress is a web-based system that will give individualized reports using specific data elements from the Annual Questionnaire. The first step will be to create reports using the information gathered in the Library Section of the Annual Questionnaire. This system is projected to be online by the end of 2004. As an ongoing effort, the Section has plans to expand the web-based application's functionality and data availability over the next year.
"Welcome to the Section of Legal Education, Christina speaking."

"I was 'curved out' of my school; then I was told that if I wish to transfer to another ABA-approved law school that I will need a '505' letter. What is that and where do I get one? "A '505' letter or sometimes referred to as 'a letter in good standing,' is for an academically dismissed student who wishes to attend a different law school that is not the dismissing school. You must obtain a letter from that school explaining that, though you did not meet the academic requirement set for that school, you do have the potential to study law—just not at that school. Or, you may remain out of law school for two years—during which time, maintaining law-type work and studies and then petition to return to either the dismissing school or another ABA-approved law school."

"I am the director of student affairs and we have one student who would very much like to spend time studying in Australia. How do we acquire ABA approval to allow this student foreign study privileges?" 

"First, submitting an application form to the Office of the Consultant is no longer required for independent study abroad participation. Second, criteria for foreign study abroad are available at our Web site. I would encourage both you and your student to review them and welcome the opportunity to clarify any items not clearly understood."

"My son has been accepted to a law school that is 'provisionally' approved. Will he be able to take the bar exam when he graduates?"

"I invite you both to visit the Section's Web site where you can better prepare yourselves as you research various law schools. The information on the site contains the ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure and information about the accreditation process. From a consumer prospective, knowing these Rules is going to help you make the best law school decisions. Our bar admissions section also includes contact information to each state bar administrator's office for further information."

Interesting anecdotes? Prank calls? Hardly!

The preceding scenarios are common examples based on actual telephone and email communications received by the Section on a daily basis. In fact, the Section answers about 16 inquiries daily, 80 weekly calls, totaling to 4,160 annual inquiries about legal education.

For example, of the 4,160 inquiries in 2003, the Section answered approximately 2,500 inquiries related to information about graduation status between an ABA-approved law school and a non-ABA-approved law school, and how it might impact one's career.

Sixty percent of the inquiries, domestic and foreign, are about criteria requirements to sit for the state bar. Twenty percent ask about the accreditation status of their current and prospective law school. Ten percent want to know if their school is or is not in compliance with the ABA Standards and Rules on various procedural issues. The final ten percent are miscellaneous calls that are transferred to the wrong division of the ABA or callers seeking attorney referrals.

The Section frequently directs callers to its Web site (www.abanet.org/legaled), as it provides comprehensive information on the Standards and the accreditation process, ABA-approved law.
A national conference entitled *Examining the Landscape of Legal Education and Bar Admissions* will be held at the Inter-Continental Hotel in Chicago on September 30 through October 2, 2004.

Four organizations have combined to develop this program under the banner of the Joint Working Group, chaired by Dean Mary Kay Kane of Hastings College of Law. The Joint Working Group is a committee co-sponsored by the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, the Association of American Law Schools, and the National Conference of Bar Examiners, with the participation of the Conference of Chief Justices.

The program is designed for legal educators and administrators, bar examiners, and Supreme Court justices. It will probe issues relating to design of examinations and assessment alternatives in both law school and licensing settings. The purpose of the program is to promote exchanges about the technical and policy considerations that surround the making of sound assessment decisions. The program planners hope for broad participation and the presentation of diverse viewpoints.

Registration materials will be sent to law schools, bar examining boards, and Supreme Courts in early summer and will also be available on the ABA Web site at www.abanet.org. Information about the program is also available from Myra Hajny of the National Conference of Bar Examiners at mhajny@ncbex.org or 608/280-8550, ext. 229.

---

**LAW TECHNOLOGY CONFERENCE**

**Pedagogy to Practice: Maximizing Legal Learning with Technology**

**October 15-16, 2004 • Newark, NJ**

Mark your calendars to attend the technology and education conference at Rutgers University, Newark, N.J., on October 15-16, 2004. The American Bar Association's Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, and its Technology and Education Committee will sponsor the event.

Designed for faculty, deans, librarians, and information services professionals, the program will explore: how today's students learn both with and without technology; what they expect; and what technological expertise law practice in the digital age demands. Speakers will address ways in which the legal academy and other disciplines can and are using technology to enhance teaching and learning.

After initially setting the pedagogical and practical background for the discussion, the program will address five areas in which technology can improve student learning. First, law faculty are using non-textual messages to sharpen and improve learning, including film, the Internet, and virtual contributors. Second, collaboration and the promises of technology to facilitate group learning will be discussed from the perspectives of education, the business school experience, and the law school experience. Third, skills teachers in law schools and practicing lawyers are employing technology in clinics, legal writing courses, and the delivery of legal services. Fourth, technology does not threaten the traditional classroom; it can make it better—this session will show how. Finally, improving learning with technology raises issues of infrastructure, support, and reward; the last session will ask how formidable issues are.

Registration and program materials will be distributed this summer. Watch for additional information at www.abanet.org/legaled.
The 126th ABA Annual Meeting will take place August 4–8, 2004, in Atlanta, GA. Headquarters for the Section is the Ritz Carlton Hotel. The Annual Meeting offers growth opportunities to attorneys in all areas of practice, and more than 200 CLE programs. For further information about the event, visit the Section’s Web site at www.abanet.org/legaled and click on the Annual Meeting link for registration and program information.

### 2004 ANNUAL

#### Section Schedule at-a-Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, August 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Section Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, August 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section Council Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Session followed by Open Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairperson’s Reception and Dinner (Invitation Only) Capital City Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday, August 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Section Council Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kutak Award Presentation and Reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday, August 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABA/AALS/LSAC Deans' Breakfast (Invitation only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program: Ready from Day One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-Sponsors: Legal and Clinical Skills Education Committee, Communication Skills Committee, Law Practice Management Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 p.m. – 3:20 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program: Teaching Professionalism in Law Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program: Results from the Curriculum Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 p.m. – 5:45 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Section Business Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunday, August 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming Chairperson’s Breakfast (Invitation only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar

MEETING • AUGUST 4-8, Atlanta, GA

Programs

Ready from Day One: What Should Law Graduates Be Able to Do?
Saturday, August 7 • 10:15 - 11:45 a.m. • Ritz Carlton Hotel

This panel discussion will take on questions about the content of legal education and its relationship to legal practice: What are the core competencies that law graduates should possess? Can we reach consensus about anything? And, looking beyond the core, what is reasonable to expect law schools to accomplish in three years?

Recent proposals for revising the law school curriculum that come from the Best Practices Project of the Clinical Legal Education Association provide the springboard for this panel discussion. The Best Practices Project, a national public forum engaging academics, lawyers, judges, bar admissions authorities and others in a search for better ways to educate new lawyers, has recently published a proposal suggesting that law schools should become more focused on outcomes (that is, what graduates can do and how they do it) rather than just what law graduates know.

Sponsors: Clinical and Skills Education Committee, Communication Skills Committee, Law Practice Management Section

Speakers include:
- Prof. Linda H. Edwards, Mercer University School of Law
- Prof. Peter Joy, Washington University School of Law
- Erica Moeser, President of the National Conference of Bar Examiners
- Professor Roy Stuckey, South Carolina University School of Law

Moderator:
- Prof. Molly O'Brien, University of Akron School of Law

Teaching Professionalism in Law School
Saturday, August 7 • 2:00 - 3:20 p.m. • Ritz Carlton Hotel

This program will explore whether or not law schools and practitioners are experiencing a cultural shift regarding professionalism in education, and will also look at ways to further professionalism instruction.

Panelists will focus on a series of topics, including what is new in legal education, new developments occurring in order to become a member of the bar, the acceptance of professionalism instruction by law students and by lawyers, and what are the "Best Practices" in professionalism instruction?

The panelists will also discuss ways to engage in law student surveys regarding professionalism, and of lawyers three, four, and five years into the practice regarding their law school and CLE instruction. Identifying and defining best practices will also be discussed.

Speakers include:
- Prof. Anita Bernstein, Sam Nunn Professor of Law
  Emory University School of Law
- Sally Lockwood, Executive Director
  Chief Justice’s Committee on Professionalism
  Georgia Supreme Court
- Prof. Clark D. Cunningham
- Prof. and W. Lee Burge Chair in Law & Ethics
  Georgia State University College of Law
- Professor Patrick E. Longan
  Professor of Law and William Augusts Bootle Chair in Professionalism and Ethics
  Mercer University Law School

Comprehensive Study of Law School Curricula
Saturday, August 7 • 3:30 - 5:00 p.m. • Ritz Carlton Hotel

The Curriculum Committee, chaired by Prof. Catherine Carpenter, Southwestern University School of Law, and assisted by Vice-Chair, Prof. Mary Anne Bobinski, University of Houston, will present its survey findings of law school curricula over the past ten years, since the issuance of the MacCrate Report.

The Committee will present the changes, innovations and trends that have occurred over the last decade. The survey also gathers information on first year requirements, upper division course offerings, requirements for graduation, and information on post-J.D. and non-J.D. programs. The committee will also present general information concerning the most significant changes in teaching methodology and course content.

153 ABA-approved law schools participated in the curriculum survey, which is the most comprehensive survey of law school curricula undertaken in the past 15 years.
national dialog and national standards are appropriate, perhaps essential, as legal education and the practice of law become less local and more national (or international) in character.

The pace of change in the world, our country, the legal profession, and higher education is quickening. Today our communities are more diverse and our business and social spheres more global. Tomorrow's world will be even more dependent upon, benefited by, and comfortable with technology than is the case today. The financing of legal education and the economics of the legal profession are systems in stress. That stress manifests itself in the increasing debt that new lawyers carry with them into the profession.

To continue successfully playing its role, our law school approval process must respond adequately and appropriately to these (and other) facts and circumstances. Our students, the legal profession, and the public interest deserve full, frank, and fearless discussion of how the process can adapt to the world in which we do and will live. We, whether through the ABA or otherwise, must provide access and realistic opportunities to those who would be excellent lawyers to obtain quality legal education, and we must assure that our country has the good lawyers that are required to do all of the work that needs to be done to take care of the needs of individuals and businesses, serve the public interest, and promote the rule of law.

I look forward to working with all of you in this important endeavor.

Lastly, thanks: to John Sebert for inviting me to serve as the deputy consultant on legal education; to members of the Council, Accreditation and Standards Review Committees for welcoming me to your conversations and deliberations; to law school deans, with whom it has been a pleasure to work; to the hundreds of volunteers on site teams and committees for their time and talent; and to my colleagues in the Consultant's Office for your friendship and support.

Barry Currier is the Section's deputy consultant on legal education.

STEPHEN YANDLE
Continued from page 1

organizations as LSAC and NALP make him especially familiar with the myriad issues faced by our law schools and is well suited to serve in this very important position."

During Yandle's tenure at Yale, he had principal responsibility for budgets, finance and administration, including managing the law school's $115 million renovation project. Yandle also served as acting librarian and, as a lecturer in law since 1989, has taught a course in Diversity in Higher Education.

"That course has given me the opportunity to examine closely issues critical to legal education, building on a professional commitment to equality of access to legal education, which has been a central theme of all my work in higher education," said Yandle.

Yandle has both undergraduate and law degrees from the University of Virginia and has an extensive career in law school administration. He currently works with national organizations related to legal education, including The Access Group and NALP Foundation for Research and Education.

"Steve brings to the Section important and valuable insights and perspectives that will assist us in continuing to provide excellent support for the Council, our committees, and legal education in general," said John Sebert, consultant on legal education. "He has an amazing breadth of experience in legal education and law school administration."

Yandle began his administrative career as assistant director of admissions at the University of Virginia, from 1972 to 1976. From 1976 to 1985, he served as assistant dean, associate dean and dean of students at Northwestern University School of Law. His initial portfolio at Northwestern also was admissions, including financial aid. Yandle was involved with the Law School Admissions Council (LSAC), serving on the Programs, Education and Prelaw Committee from 1978 to 1984.

In 2002, Yandle also served as the executive director of the Housing Authority of New Haven in Connecticut, and was successful in raising $100 million in grants to fund the revitalization of aging public housing in New Haven.

Joe Puskarz is the editor of Syllabus.

The 2005 edition of the Official Guide to Approved Law Schools is now available for purchase. The publication is a result of much work and cooperation between the staff of the Consultant's Office on Legal Education and the Law School Admissions Council (LSAC).

The book is published as a resource for law schools, prospective students, placement, and guidance personnel. The information contained in the Official Guide is the most timely and comprehensive data on American law schools. Standard 509, modeled after the Department of Education regulations, requires law schools to "publish basic consumer information in a fair and accurate manner reflective of actual practice."

The revised edition contains a wealth of information, including admission data, tuition, fees, library resources, financial aid, J.D. enrollment, bar passage rates, and other valuable data.

Request ABA product code: #5290085(05ED)

Publication Chapters

- Being a Lawyer
- Law School Admissions Process
- Applying to Law School
- Choosing a Law School
- Opportunities in Law for Minority Men and Women
- Accreditation Process
- Financing Your Legal Education
- Admissions to the Bar
- Finding a Job
- Post. J.D. Programs
- Legal Education Statistics

Order your copy today! Call the ABA Service Center at (800) 285-2221 or visit the Section's Web site at www.abanet.org/legaled
Proposed Comprehensive Revision of Chapter 4 of the Standards

In February 2004, the Council of the Section approved for notice and comment revisions to Chapter 4 (Faculty) of the ABA Standards: Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools. These proposals are below and are also available, with some background and discussion, on the Section’s Web site at www.abanet.org/legaled.

Hearings will take place during the Annual Meeting of the American Law Institute on Wednesday, May 19, 2004, in Washington, D.C., at the Renaissance Mayflower Hotel at 10 a.m.

Final action is expected at the Council meeting scheduled for June 4-5, 2004, in Washington, D.C.

Chapter 4 THE FACULTY [marked-up - 2/04]

Standard 401. QUALIFICATIONS.
(a) A law school shall have a faculty that whose qualifications and experience are appropriate to the stated mission of the law school and to maintaining a program of legal education consistent with the requirements of Standards 301 and 302. The faculty shall possess a high degree of competence, as demonstrated by its education, classroom teaching ability, experience in teaching or practice, teaching effectiveness, and scholarly research and writing.

(b) A law school shall take reasonable steps to ensure the teaching effectiveness of its faculty.

Interpretation 401-1:
A faculty committee on effective teaching, class visitations, critiques of videotaped teaching, institutional review of student evaluation of teaching, and colloquia are among the means to accomplish this objective.

Standard 402. SIZE OF FULL-TIME FACULTY.
(a) A law school shall have a sufficient number of full-time faculty to fulfill the requirements of the Standards and meet the needs goals of its educational program. The number of full-time faculty necessary depends on:

(1) the size of the student body and the opportunity for students to meet individually with and consult faculty members;

(2) the nature and scope of the educational program; and

(3) the opportunities for the faculty adequately to fulfill teaching obligations, conduct scholarly research, and participate effectively in the governance of the law school and in service to the legal profession and the public.

(b) A single-division law school in its first year of operation shall have no fewer than six full-time faculty members in addition to a full-time dean and a full-time director of the law library. A dual-division law school, or a law school after its first year of operation, shall have additional faculty members.

(eb) A full-time faculty member is one whose primary professional employment is with the law school and who during the academic year devotes substantially all working time during the academic year to teaching and legal scholarship, participates in law school governance and service, has no outside office or business activities, and whose outside professional activities, if any, are limited to those that relate to major academic interests or enrich the faculty member's capacity as scholar and teacher, are of service to the legal profession and the public generally, and do not unduly interfere with one's responsibility as a faculty member the responsibilities described in Standard 404(a).

Interpretation 402-1:
In determining whether a law school complies with the Standards, the ratio of the number of full-time equivalent students to the number of full-time equivalent faculty members is considered.

(1) In computing the student/faculty ratio, full-time equivalent teachers are those who are employed as full-time teachers on tenure track or its equivalent who shall be counted as one each plus those who constitute "additional teaching resources" as defined below. No limit is imposed on the total number of teachers that a school may employ as additional teaching resources, but these additional teaching resources shall be counted at a fraction of less than 1 and may constitute in the aggregate up to 20 percent of the...
full-time faculty for purposes of calculating the student/faculty ratio.

(A) Additional teaching resources and the proportional weight assigned to each category include:
(i) teachers on tenure track or its equivalent who have administrative duties beyond those normally performed by full-time faculty members: 0.5;
(ii) clinicians and legal writing instructors not on tenure track or its equivalent who teach a full load: 0.7; and
(iii) adjuncts, emeriti faculty who teach, non-tenure track administrators who teach, librarians who teach, and teachers from other units of the university: 0.2.

(B) These norms have been selected to provide a workable framework to recognize the effective contributions of additional teaching resources. To the extent a law school has types or categories of teachers not specifically described above, they shall be counted as appropriate in accordance with the weights specified above. It is recognized that the designated proportional weights may not in all cases reflect the contributions to the law school of particular teachers. In exceptional cases, a school may seek to demonstrate to site evaluation teams and the Accreditation Committee that these proportional weights should be changed to weigh contributions of individual teachers.

(2) For the purpose of computing the student/faculty ratio, a student is considered full-time or part-time as determined by the school for residence purposes, provided that in the school's determination the student meets the minimum defined in Standard 304. In no event shall a No student taking more than thirteen credit hours of coursework (or the equivalent) shall be considered to be part-time for the purposes of calculating the student/faculty ratio. A part-time student is counted as a two-thirds equivalent student.

(3) If there are graduate or non-degree students whose presence might result in a dilution of J.D. program resources, the circumstances of the individual school are considered to determine the adequacy of the teaching resources available for the J.D. program.

**Interpretation 402-2:**
Student/faculty ratios are considered in determining a law school's compliance with the Standards.

(1) A ratio of 20:1 or less presumptively indicates that a law school complies with the Standards. However, the educational effects shall be examined to determine whether the size and duties of the full-time faculty meet the Standards.

(2) A ratio of 30:1 or more presumptively indicates that a law school does not comply with the Standards.

(3) At a ratio of between 20:1 and 30:1 and to rebut the presumption created by a ratio of 30:1 or greater, the examination will take into account the effects of all teaching resources on the school's educational program, including such matters as quality of teaching, class size, availability of small group classes and seminars, student/faculty contact, examinations and grading, scholarly contributions, public service, discharge of governance responsibilities, and the ability of the law school to carry out its announced mission. (August 1996)

**Standard 403. INSTRUCTIONAL ROLE OF FULL AND PART-TIME FACULTY.**

(a) The major burden of a law school's educational program rests upon the full-time faculty shall teach the major portion of a law school's curriculum, including substantially all of the first one-third of each student's coursework.

(b) The full-time faculty shall provide students with substantially all of their instruction in the first year of the full-time curriculum or the first two years of the part-time curriculum...
(c) A law school should include experienced practicing lawyers and judges as teaching resources to enrich the educational program. Appropriate use of practicing lawyers and judges as faculty requires that a law school shall provide them with orientation, guidance, monitoring, and evaluation.

**Interpretation 403-1:**
The full-time faculty's teaching responsibility will usually be determined by the proportion of student credit hours taught by full-time faculty in each of the law school's programs or divisions (such as full-time, part-time evening study, and part-time weekend study). For purposes of Standard 403(a), a faculty member is considered full-time if that person's primary professional employment is with the law school.

**Interpretation 403-2:**
Efforts to ensure teaching effectiveness may include: a faculty committee on effective teaching, class visitations, critiques of videotaped teaching, institutional review of student evaluation of teaching, colloquia on effective teaching, and recognition of creative scholarship in law school teaching methodology. A law school shall provide all new faculty members with orientation, guidance, mentoring, and periodic evaluation.

**Standard 404. RESPONSIBILITIES OF FULL-TIME FACULTY.**
(a) A law school shall establish policies with respect to a full-time faculty member's responsibilities in teaching, scholarship, service to the law school community, and professional activities outside the law school. The policies need not seek uniformity among faculty members, but should address:
(1) Faculty teaching responsibilities, including carrying a fair share of the law school's course offerings, preparing for classes, being available for student consultation, participating in academic advising, and creating an atmosphere in which students and faculty may voice opinions and exchange ideas;
(2) Research and scholarship, and integrity in the conduct of scholarship, including appropriate use of student research assistants, acknowledgment of the contributions of others, and responsibility of faculty members to keep abreast of developments in their specialties;
(3) Obligations to the law school and university community, including participation in the governance of the law school;
(4) Obligations to the profession, including working with the practicing bar and judiciary to improve the profession; and
(5) Obligations to the public, including participation in pro bono activities.

(b) A law school shall evaluate periodically the extent to which each faculty member discharges their responsibilities under policies adopted pursuant to Standard 404(a).

**Standard 405. PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT.**
(a) A law school shall establish and maintain conditions adequate to attract and retain a competent faculty.

(b) A law school shall have an established and announced policy with respect to academic freedom and tenure of which Appendix I here-in is an example but is not obligatory.

(c) A law school shall afford to full-time clinical faculty members a form of security of position reasonably similar to tenure, and non-compensatory perquisites reasonably similar to those provided other full-time faculty members. A law school may require these faculty members to meet standards and obligations reasonably similar to those required of other full-time faculty members. However, this Standard does not preclude a limited number of fixed, short-term appointments in a clinical program predominantly staffed by full-time faculty members, or in an experimental program of limited duration.

(d) A law school shall afford legal writing teachers such security of position and other rights and privileges of faculty membership as may be necessary to (1) attract and retain a faculty that is well qualified to provide legal writing instruction as required by Standard 302(a)(2), and (2) safeguard academic freedom.

**Interpretation 405-1:**
A fixed limit on the percent of a law faculty that may hold tenure under any circumstances violates the Standards.
Interpretation 405-2:
A law faculty as professionals should not be required to be a part of the general university bargaining unit.

Interpretation 405-3:
A law school shall have a comprehensive system for evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure, including written criteria and procedures that are made available to the faculty.

Interpretation 405-4:
A law school not a part of a university in considering and deciding on appointment, termination, promotion, and tenure of faculty members should have procedures that contain the same principles of fairness and due process that should be employed by a law school that is part of a university. If the dean and faculty have made a recommendation that is unfavorable to a candidate, the candidate should be given an opportunity to appeal to the president, chairman, or governing board.

Interpretation 405-5:
If the dean and faculty have determined the question of responsibility for examination schedules and the schedule has been announced by the authority responsible for it, it is not a violation of academic freedom for a member of the law faculty to be required to adhere to the schedule.

Interpretation 405-6:
A form of security of position reasonably similar to tenure includes a separate tenure track or a renewable long-term contract. Under a separate tenure track, a full-time clinical faculty member, after a probationary period reasonably similar to that for other full-time faculty, may be granted tenure. After tenure is granted, the faculty member may be terminated only for good cause, including termination or material modification of the entire clinical program.

A program of renewable long-term contracts should provide that, after a probationary period reasonably similar to that for other full-time faculty, the services of a faculty member in a clinical program may be either terminated or continued by the granting of a long-term contract that shall thereafter be renewable. During the initial long-term contract or any renewal period, the contract may be terminated for good cause, including termination or material modification of the entire clinical program.

Interpretation 405-7:
In determining if the members of the full-time clinical faculty meet standards and obligations reasonably similar to those provided for other full-time faculty, competence in the areas of teaching and scholarly research and writing should be judged in terms of the responsibilities of clinical faculty. A law school should develop criteria for retention, promotion, and security of employment of full-time clinical faculty.

Interpretation 405-8:
A law school shall afford to full-time clinical faculty members an opportunity to participate in law school governance in a manner reasonably similar to other full-time faculty members. This interpretation does not apply to those persons referred to in the last sentence of Standard 405(c).

Interpretation 405-9:
Subsection (d) of this Standard does not preclude the use of short-term or non-renewable contracts for legal writing teachers.

AT YOUR SERVICE
Continued from page 8

Eighty-five percent of the incoming questions can typically be answered through the information on the Section’s Web site.

In fact, approximately 30,000 visitors access the Section’s Web site on a monthly basis. For example, during January, 2004, 25,957 inquiries were made to the site’s section; 10,287 inquiries on ABA-approved law schools; 2,717 inquiries on study abroad programs; 2,467 inquiries on bar admissions; 1,925 inquiries on distance education and 1,980 on Standards Rules of Procedure.

The Section continually processes calls relating to legal education and its accreditation process. However, customers are never transferred directly into voice mail without having the opportunity to talk with a real-live human being first. It is an essential service the Section provides in its efforts to maintain communication in real-time. An aspect that has not been lost on callers, who either receive an immediate answer, or a knowledgeable, courteous and most importantly, timely response to an email or voice mail message.

We strive to recognize what is convenient for the caller and guarantee that every inquiry is met with, “How may I help you?”

Christina Williams is the Section’s receptionist and answers the majority of daily inquiries.
ous wound that eats at America’s core values. Race is a barrier to the achievement of full potential for many people of color in this country but it also deprives all of us of the intellectual capital and positive contributions that these individuals could make if, but for race, they were not prevented from doing so. Each student who comes to our classrooms, in one way or another, carries the benefit or burden that race has visited on Americans of every color.

Those of us in legal education can play a role, consistent with Grutter, in bringing students together in settings that allow for meaningful interaction, dialogue and exchange of ideas in and out of the classroom. In a nation where the majority of our population is expected to be non-white within the next 45 years, it is not too soon to think deeply about how we can accelerate the interaction that must occur if we are to truly function as one nation.

So where does this lead me? It simply is a reminder that the students who enter our classrooms do not enter with a clean slate. Their perspectives on the cases we use and the tactics we employ to teach them are viewed through lenses tinted by their life experiences. How successful we are in teaching each student may depend to a significant extent on how we have been “educated,” both inside and outside the classroom, and how fully we appreciate the tints of the lenses.

---

Our New Location: 321 N. Clark St., at Riverfront Plaza

The Chicago headquarters of the American Bar Association, along with the Office of the Consultant on Legal Education and the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, moved on May 17 to 321 North Clark Street, Chicago, IL 60610.

The new headquarters is located just north of the Chicago River between Clark and Dearborn Streets, and only two blocks north of the Loop. The Office of the Consultant is located in the northeast corner of the 21st floor.


The phone and fax numbers for the Office of the Consultant have not changed.
**Calendar**

**AUGUST 2004**
- 5-10  ABA Annual Meeting  
- 5-6  Council Meeting  
- 6  Kutak Reception  
- 7  ABA Dean's Breakfast  
- 7  Section Programs and Annual Business Meeting  
  - Location: Atlanta, GA

**SEPTEMBER 2004**
- 10  Chairs' Workshop  
- 17-19  Standards Review Committee Meeting  
  - Location: Chicago, IL

**OCTOBER 2004**
- 1-2  Conference on Bar Admissions and Legal Education  
  (CABA, AALS, NCBE and Conference of Chief Justices)  
  - Location: Chicago, IL
- 7-8  Accreditation Committee Retreat  
  - Location: Chicago, IL
- 9-10  Council Retreat  
  - Location: Chicago, IL
- 15-16  Conference: Pedagogy to Practice:  
  Maximizing Legal Learning with Technology  
  - Location: Newark, NJ
- 22-23  Bar Admissions Committee  
  - Location: TBA
- 28-30  Accreditation Committee Meeting  
  - Location: Little Rock, AK

**NOVEMBER 2004**
- 12-13  Standards Review Committee Meeting  
  - Location: Chicago, IL

**DECEMBER 2004**
- 4-5  Council Meeting  
  - Location: Richmond, VA

**JANUARY 2005**
- 27-29  Accreditation Committee Meeting  
  - Location: TBA

**FEBRUARY 2005**
- 9-15  ABA Mid-year Meeting  
  - Location: Salt Lake City, UT
- 10-11  Deans' Workshop  
  - Location: Salt Lake City, UT
- 12-13  Council Meeting  
  - Location: Salt Lake City, UT
- 19  Site Evaluation Workshop  
  - Location: Chicago, IL

**MARCH 2005**
- 21-25  Facilities Conference  
  - Location: Seattle, WA

**APRIL 2005**
- 28-30  Accreditation Committee Meeting  
  - Location: Chicago, IL

**MAY 2005**
- 18  ABA Deans' Breakfast  
  - Location: Washington, D.C.
- 18  Standards Review Committee Meeting  
  - Location: Washington, D.C.
- 18  Mayflower I  
  - Location: Washington, D.C.
- 19  Mayflower II  
  - Location: Washington, D.C.
- 31-June 3  Development Conference  
  - Location: Jackson, WY

**JUNE 2005**
- 3-5  New Dean's Seminar  
  - Location: Jackson, WY
- 17-19  Council Meeting  
  - Location: TBA
- 24-25  Accreditation Committee Meeting  
  - Location: Omaha, NE
Nominees Selected for Section Officers and Council of the Section

In April 2004, the Nominating Committee, consisting of the Honorable Gerald W. Vandewalle (Chairperson), Professor Margaret Martin Barry, Professor Catherine Carpenter, the Honorable Martha Craig Daughtrey, J. William Elwin, Jr., Esq., Professor Timothy J. Heinsz, Dorothy S. Ridings, Professor E. Thomas Sullivan, Barry Sullivan, Esq., and Diane C. Yu, Esq., selected the following list of individuals as nominees for Section Officers and members of the Council of the Section.

All of the listed individuals have indicated their willingness to have their names placed in nomination. The election of officers and members of the Council will occur at the Section's Annual Business Meeting during the ABA Annual Meeting on Saturday, August 7, 2004, from 5:15 to 5:45 p.m. at the Ritz Carlton Hotel in Atlanta, GA.

OFFICERS
Chairperson (automatic under the Bylaws)
Honorable Elizabeth B. Lacy
Supreme Court of Virginia, Richmond, VA

Chairperson-Elect Nominee
Dean & President Steven R. Smith
California Western School of Law, San Diego, CA

Vice-Chairperson Nominee
William R. Rakes, Esq.
Gentry Locke Rakes & Moore, LLP, Roanoke, VA

Immediate Past Chairperson (automatic under the Bylaws)
Pauline A. Schneider, Esq.
Hunton & Williams, Washington, D.C.

Re-Election to One-Year Term
Diane Camper, Senior Fellow
Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD

Election to Three-Year Terms
Becky Cain, President and CEO
The Greater Kanawha Valley Foundation
Charleston, W.VA

Professor Phoebe Haddon
Temple University
James E. Beasley School of Law, Philadelphia, PA

Chancellor & Dean Mary Kay Kane
University of California-Hastings
Hastings College of Law, San Francisco, CA

Election to Two-Year Term
Honorable Christine M. Durham
Supreme Court of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT

LAW STUDENT DIVISION MEMBER NOMINEE

Election to One-Year Term
Deborah V. Baker
Stanford Law School
Stanford, CA

 NOMINEE AS SECTION DELEGATE TO ABA HOUSE OF DELEGATES (non-voting two-year term)
Sidney S. Eagles, Jr., Esq.
Smith Moore, LLP, Raleigh, NC

AT-LARGE COUNCIL MEMBER NOMINEES
Re-Election to Three-Year Term
Dean Judith C. Areen
Georgetown University Law Center
Washington, D.C.