



The State Bar of California

Committee of State Bar Accredited and Registered Schools Teleconference

Open Session Minutes
Wednesday, April 19, 2023
1:00 p.m.–3:00 p.m.

Time Meeting Commenced: The Committee on State Bar Accredited and Registered Schools meeting commenced in open session at 1:00 p.m.

Time Meeting Adjourned: 2:40 p.m.

Chair: Linda Keller

Committee Coordinator: Natalie Leonard

Members Present: Michael Clancey, Linda Keller, George Leal, Kevin Marshall, Jessica Park

Members Absent: James Efting

OPEN SESSION

ROLL CALL

The Committee on State Bar Accredited and Registered Schools was called to order by Chair Keller. Roll call was taken and a quorum was established.

CALL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Keller called for public comment, inquiring as to whether there were person(s) who wished to comment on any agenda item.

Verbal Public Comment:

Martin Pritikin: Regarding proposed fee increases for California-Accredited Law Schools (CALS): 1) Asks for more than two options; 2) notes that the higher fee proposal is similar in cost to the ABA, and that ABA schools are generally larger; 3) asks if a tiered structure has been considered based on enrollment; 4) requests status of the Jointly Accredited Law School rule that is a part of the new rules for accredited law schools that are being phased in from January 1, 2022 through December 31, 2023.

Sandra Brooks: Regarding proposed fee increases for CALS: 1) Interested to understand how the break-even cost of staff review of the annual report amounts to \$22,900; 2) concerned that the costs of a quality affordable legal education will increase as a result of the fee proposal, perhaps up to \$2,000 per student if the higher fee level is chosen at her law school; 3) the law school's most recent inspection cost \$26,300, but proposals estimate future inspections will cost \$30,000 or \$40,000; and 4) law schools have been waiting for the necessary implementation of the jointly accredited rule (4.147), since the rule was first adopted in January 2022.

I. CHAIR'S TIME

a. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – March 22, 2023 CSBARS MEETING

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the March 22, 2023 CSBARS meeting be approved.

Moved by Clancey, seconded by Marshall.

Aye – (6) Clancey, Keller, Leal, Marshall, Park

No – (0)

Motion carries.

b. CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair reported that while the discussion of preserving transcripts when law schools close is not on this agenda, it will return to a future agenda.

II. STAFF REPORT

- a. Admissions and Educational Standards Rules and Fees Posted for Public Comment.
Members of State Bar Admissions and Finance advised the location of the fee proposal and advised that public comment will be accepted through the public comment web page through May 15, 2023.
- b. Recent Developments
Staff mentioned recent developments including CSBARS application posting with an application deadline of June 30, 2023 and applications available on the State Bar's CSBARS web page.

III. DISCUSSION OF CURRENT FORMAT OF CALIFORNIA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 6061.7(A) DISCLOSURES

Members reviewed both the unaccredited and accredited web disclosure documents required by California Business and Professions Code section 6061.7(a). Suggestions for changes focused on whether to recommend and amendments related to the cumulative bar exam formulas used in item 8 of that disclosure. Members raised interest in having the unaccredited law schools begin to report a minimum, cumulative bar exam pass rate using the formula applied to accredited schools, but without having to meet the minimum threshold that the accredited law schools must meet.

Members observed that the CALS MPR cumulative pass rate measure limits the calculation to those who graduated in the most recent five years, while the formula used for unaccredited law schools includes all graduates who took the bar exam during that period, regardless of when they graduated. It is believed that the effect of including all takers in this manner can result in a substantially different cumulative value than the MPR formula.

Staff also asked for feedback regarding adding a sample calculation using the two-year ultimate pass rate required by ABA approved schools, to better allow consistency and comparison. Members believed this would be confusing.

Staff noted that there would be significant cost related to implementing the MPR for unaccredited law schools. Members discussed adding a section that would allow schools to post alternative unverified calculations on the form, as a more cost-effective solution.

MEETING ADJOURNED