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Section A. Unit Assessment: Quality, Centrality, and Strategic Focus

The College of Law is now in its twenty-fifth year, and this APR Self Study reflects the College’s many accomplishments, challenges, and goals for the future. Having established a foundation based upon the development of a strong academic program, a talented faculty devoted to teaching, scholarship and service, and a strong student and alumni base, the College has become a very respected institution in the community, state and region. Thanks in part to its growing reputation, attractive urban location, and affordable tuition, the College attracts a diverse and talented student body. Its alumni are highly regarded, and its faculty increasingly recognized nationally and internationally.

In addition to these developments, this Self Study reflects the challenges that come with the College of Law’s success and its transition into a new phase of institutional maturity: continuing to implement its mission and maintain the qualities that make it unique while enhancing its educational program. Since the last Academic Program Review in 2001, the College has expanded the curricular options available to students, significantly increased scholarly output, added a live client clinic, upgraded its technological capacity, substantially increased its endowment, and with the University laid the foundation for significant improvement of its physical facilities.

Since the last Academic Program Review, the College conducted an extensive strategic planning process that culminated in a 2002 Strategic Plan and a 2003 Action Plan updated in 2004-2005. Strategic planning continued in 2006-2007 as the COL faculty engaged in a year-long process to prepare a self study document for the American Bar Association’s (ABA) and the Association of American Law School’s (AALS) sabbatical evaluations of the COL. Following the COL’s submission of this Self Study, a team of ABA and AALS representatives visited the COL for a comprehensive three-day inspection, February 18-21, 2007. ABA and AALS external review committees submitted their evaluations and reports in May and June of 2007. Copies of the ABA Self Study and the ABA and AALS external reports are attached as Appendix A2a-2d.

Overall College Assessment

The College of Law continues to distinguish itself in the quality of its program and in developing a professional course of study that is both central to the education of professional students and to the University/College’s mission as an urban research institution.

The College of Law’s admissions data, 2004-2007, shows the enrollment of our most highly credentialed classes in our history. During this period, we have had a record number of applicants (ranging from 2700-3700 per year), high enrollments (220-235 per
year), our highest average LSAT scores (159-160), our highest average GPA (3.3), and impressive selectivity ratios (admits/applicants). Our 17.3% selectivity rate in 2007 ranked 13th among all law schools. See Appendix A-4. Our students’ pass rate on the Georgia bar exam is annually among the best in the state, including July 2007 when our students’ pass rate of 96.7% surpassed the test-takers from all other law schools by several percentage points. See Appendix A-3. Job placement rates have been equally impressive, reaching a high of 96% for graduates who entered the job market in 2006-2007. The 2007 edition of U.S. News and World Report ranked the College of Law among the top 100 American law schools (85/200), making us the youngest law school to be included in this ranking, and also ranked our Health Law Program 10th in the nation.

As for programmatic development, the College of Law has initiated new programs since 2004 designed to take advantage of our urban environment, promote interdisciplinary study and research, and enhance our distinctiveness as a law school in an urban setting. These programs include a live-client HeLP Legal Services Clinic; a Center for Law, Health & Society; a Center for the Comparative Study of Metropolitan Urban Growth; and a new study abroad program in comparative law based in Brazil.

Faculty scholarly productivity is also at an all-time high, with a growing number of faculty members gaining or already having national reputations in their field. These faculty members include Julian Juergensmeyer (Urban Growth); Colin Crawford (Environmental Law); Charity Scott (Health Law); Doug Yarn (Dispute Resolution); Mary Radford (Elder Law and Probate); Michael Landau (Intellectual Property); Eric Segall (Constitutional Law); Neil Kinkopf (Constitutional Law); Mark Budnitz (E-Commerce and Consumer Law); Bill Edmundson (Jurisprudence); Patrick Wiseman (Teaching and Technology); Clark Cunningham (Professionalism and Legal Ethics); Wendy Hensel (Disability Law); Natsu Saito (Human Rights and Plenary Power); Paul Lombardo (Law, Science and Biotechnology); and Leslie Wolf (Public Health Law and HIV Testing).

In addition, College of Law faculty continue to develop their reputations as publishers of leading casebooks, hornbooks, and treatises: Paul Milich (Evidence), Bill Gregory (Casebook on Corporations; Hornbook on Agency & Partnership); Lynn Hogue (Nutshell on National Security Law); Julian Juergensmeyer (Land Use Law); Michael Landau (Intellectual Property/Entertainment Law); Doug Yarn (ADR); Ron Blasi (Tax), Janice Griffith (Local Government Law); Jack Williams (Bankruptcy Law); and Nancy Johnson (Legal Research).

College of Law faculty also enhance our distinctiveness and strategic focus as a law school in an urban setting by actively partnering with members of the legal, governmental and academic community. A few examples include Mary Radford’s leading work with the legislature on the Georgia Probate Code; Paul Milich’s work with the legislature on a new Evidence Code; Clark Cunningham’s role as reporter to the Commission on Indigent Defense; Charity Scott’s role in creating the Health Law Partnership in collaboration with Children’s Health Care and Atlanta Legal Aid; Mark Kadish’s work in support of the Fulton County Jail Project; Andi Curcio’s work with bar
organizations on alternatives to the bar exam; Anne Emanuel’s work on the ABA’s Study on the Administration of the Death Penalty; Roy Sobelson’s work as reporter to the Georgia Supreme Court Committee on Legal Education; and Charles Marvin’s work assisting former eastern block countries to develop new administrative codes. Many of these activities generate or are linked with faculty scholarship. Professor Kadish’s work with the Fulton County Jail Project included data collection and research that necessitated IRB approval and will result in a published journal published report. Similarly, Charity Scott’s work with HeLP includes a human subject research dimension and a study of whether the inter-professional partnership improves patient health.

Amidst these strengths are challenges. Scholarly output and professional engagement while very high overall is still unevenly distributed across the faculty. The College also needs more resources to improve support for scholarly productivity. Current summer research grant levels are well below law school norms, and we lack resources to support periodic course releases or buyouts for our most productive scholars, except in rare circumstances.

In addition, the COL needs to hire additional faculty members to cover key areas of the curriculum in which course coverage is thin. These include: international law, tax law, wills and estates, antitrust and regulatory law, criminal law, intellectual property, skills training, first year areas in civil procedure and torts, and seminars that offer more writing opportunities.

An overarching challenge for the COL is its thin level of administrative staffing. Staff levels are inadequate to support the COL’s rapid growth, particularly in the areas of career services, communications, student life, development, and event programming. With the addition of new academic centers, and the COL’s growth in the sponsorship of conferences, speakers, colloquia, seminars, and external events, the COL’s academic growth has outpaced staffing levels to support these activities.

The COL also must anticipate the challenge of having to replace over one-third of its faculty over the next 5-7-10 years as many of the faculty members hired in the law school’s early years attain retirement age. For the COL to be successful in replacing such a high percentage of its faculty, it must have sufficient salary resources to compete in the national market for the kind of talented and diverse scholars that will move the college forward. Similarly, it must acquire greater resources to retain its rising stars, including resources for endowed professorships and chairs.

In a process begun this year, the COL also seeks to undertake a comprehensive review of its curriculum to better ensure that it meets the needs of the profession in the 21st century. The COL takes seriously a recent report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Learning, titled Educating Lawyers, that is critical of the way American law schools separate the teaching of skills and professional identity from doctrinal substantive courses. Genuine curriculum reform in these areas will require additional resources because effective skills training and clinical programs are labor intensive.
New Centers: Quality and Centrality

The College of Law has two recently established centers: The Center for Law, Health & Society and the Center for the Comparative Study of Metropolitan Growth. The University approved these centers in spring 2004. Reports on each of the centers are included in the Appendix at B5a and B5b.

The Center for Law, Health & Society

Quality: The mission of the Center for Law, Health & Society is to provide opportunities for faculty and students to engage in interdisciplinary education and research with respect to contemporary issues at the intersection of law, health, and society. During its first three years, the Center has advanced this mission on several fronts, including: a legislative advocacy program (with the Georgia Assembly); interdisciplinary classes for law, medical and graduate students; a faculty fellows program; an annual speaker and seminar series; and the Health Law Partnership (HeLP), a medical-legal collaborative among the College of Law, Atlanta Legal Aid, and Children’s Health Care of Atlanta in which legal and health care professionals and students work to improve patient care by recognizing the interplay of medical and non-medical determinants of health. A component of HeLP now includes a live client clinic within the law school.

The Health Law Center’s Director, Professor Charity Scott, is recognized nationally among her health law colleagues as a leader and pioneer in her field. With the support of the University’s Urban Health Initiative and the Institute of Public Health, the COL has been able to hire three additional scholars to support the work of the Center: Professors Paul Lombardo, Leslie Wolf and Jonathan Todres. In 2007, after just three years of operation, U.S. News ranked the college’s health law program as 10th in the nation.

Centrality: Both the University’s and the College of Law’s strategic plans emphasize the value of our urban setting, and the importance of developing interdisciplinary programs of distinctiveness that take advantage of that setting. The Health Center’s current research, programmatic and outreach initiatives all strongly reflect this interdisciplinary and urban focus. Within the University, the Center is a partner in the University’s Urban Health Initiative coordinated by the Institute of Public Health, has a joint degree program with RCB’s Institute of Health Administration, and has opened its law and science courses (Biotechnology Law, Law and Genetics, HIV and the Law, and the Law of Human Subject Research) to graduate students in public health, philosophy and the hard sciences,

Center for the Comparative Study of Metropolitan Growth

Quality: The mission of the Center for the Comparative Study Metropolitan Growth is to advance dialogue, academic exchanges and research relating to the challenges facing the physical and built environment in Atlanta and around the world.
With its focus on the *comparative* study of metro growth, the Center fills a niche not addressed by other centers in the country.

In pursuit of this mission, the Center has implemented a variety of initiatives that include: small, focused seminars taught by visiting foreign scholars; the Urban Fellows Program (in which top law and GSU graduate students conduct research on planning issues); a Foreign Study Program in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; and a student working papers series that shares student research online with policy makers.

The Metro Growth Center is led by a deep and talented faculty group. Professor Julian Juergensmeyer is a nationally acclaimed scholar in the area of growth management; Professor Crawford is quickly acquiring a national reputation in urban environmental law; and Professor Griffith is widely known for her work in local government law.

Centrality: As with the Health Law Center, the Metro Growth Center’s agenda strongly reflects an interdisciplinary and urban research focus and significantly takes advantage of the Atlanta setting as a model for comparative study with other urban areas in the U.S. and abroad.

Section B. Historical and Current Contexts

B.1 Historical Context

In the early 1970's, the leadership of Georgia State University envisioned legal education as an essential part of the educational offerings at the University. While a proposal to create a second publicly-supported law school in Georgia initially proved to be controversial, community support ultimately swung in favor of the proposal. The Board of Regents sanctioned the creation of the Georgia State University College of Law in 1981, and Ben F. Johnson, Jr., a former State Senator and former Dean of Emory University’s Law School, was appointed founding Dean that same year. The College of Law opened in the Fall of 1982, with an enrollment of 199 from an applicant pool of 620.

In 1983, the College of Law received provisional accreditation from the American Bar Association. Thereafter, the faculty and staff increased, and the first class graduated in 1985. Upon Dean Johnson’s retirement, Marjorie F. Knowles became Dean of the college in 1986. From 1986-1990 the College added talented faculty and staff, and expanded its physical space from the first floor to the first four floors of the Urban Life Building. In 1990 the College secured full accreditation from the A.B.A.

In 1991 Marjorie L. Girth became the College’s third Dean. Under her leadership, 1991-1996, the College received membership in the Association of American Law Schools, the faculty continued to grow in number, the law school expanded to part of the 6th floor of the Urban Life Building, and the College opened its first live-client clinic (the Tax Clinic). With Marjorie Girth’s return to full-time faculty status, the leadership of the College of Law passed to Janice C. Griffith in 1996. Under Dean
Griffith’s leadership the College substantially grew its endowment, established several named scholarships, and laid the groundwork for the establishment of the College’ first two centers. Steven Kaminshine became the College’s fifth dean in 2005.

The size of the college’s J.D. program has expanded modestly over the years. Throughout the 1980’s each entering class numbered between between 180-190 students; total enrollment stood at approximately 560-580. Class size expanded to about 200 students per class in the early-mid 1990s with total enrollment staying constant at about 600 students. Since the mid 1990s, entering class enrollment has expanded, ranging from 200-215 entering students per year until 2002, and expanding to a range of 220-235 since 2004. Total enrollment is now at 670 students. See Admissions data, Appendix A4.

Faculty size expanded consistently in the 1980s and early 1990s to support the development of a full J.D. curriculum. Since the mid-1990s faculty growth has slowed. Hiring since 2000 has been designed to replace not add faculty members, with exceptions for the hiring of two endowed chair holders, and the hiring in FY 2007 and FY 2008 of three new faculty members to support the University’s urban health initiative that is funded through the Institute of Public Health as an area of focus.


This section provides a description of the three-year period of review, fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007.

Administrative and Faculty Staffing

The basic staff and faculty configuration of the College has been relatively constant during the three years under review. Administrative staffing remains very lean, but we have been able to add a new position for a Director of Communications. In 2004, when all University units were asked either to cut their administrative budgets by 5% or undergo a full budget review to justify why their particular unit should not be cut up to 10%, the College of Law opted to undergo the latter review. The University review team concluded that the College’s administrative staffing level was lean and that the College could not afford staffing cuts.

During the review period, the total number of tenure-track faculty members, including deans and associate deans, has held at 39.‡ Of this total, 36 are tenured and 25 are full professors. Five of 39 (12.8%) are minority (three are African-American, one is Asian American, and one is Native American). Fourteen of 39 (36%) are women. In addition to tenure-track faculty, the College has seven non-tenure track faculty members, two of whom are clinical professors who operate our newly opened HeLP Legal Services Clinic, and five of whom are lecturers who run our first-year program in legal research and writing. See Table B1.

‡ The college’s current tenure track faculty, including deans and associate deans, stands at 41 as a result of new faculty hired in FY 2008 (outside the review period) as part of the funding made available through the University’s Urban Health Initiative, coordinated by the Institute of Public Health.
Faculty Scholarship

The faculty engages in original and influential scholarly inquiry through publication vehicles that predominate in legal education: law reviews, journals and books (funded/sponsored research is uncommon in the legal academy). From 2004-2006 alone the faculty published 18 books or monographs; 135 articles; 21 book chapters and treatise revisions, and several book supplements. A complete inventory of the faculty’s scholarship can be found in our newly established Faculty Publications page, which is located on the Law Library website at http://law.gsu.edu/library/index/faculty_publications/page.

Enrollment and Credit Hour Production

Law student enrollment for fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007 is displayed in Appendix A4, and Tables B3 and G1. These numbers show that the law school has been able to maintain the level of increased enrollment that began after 2001, following our last Academic Program Review. Until 2001, entering class enrollment rarely exceeded 200 and the overall student body size hovered at 600. Since then, entering class enrollment has averaged 220 students and student body size has climbed to an annual range of 650-675 students.

Credit hour production reflects this same growth. While overall credit hour production in FY 2001 stood at 15,738, it has since 2003 consistently exceeded 18,000 hours, with steady numbers of 18,353 (FY 2005), 18,566 (FY 2006), and 18,660 (FY 2007). Credit hour comparison between FY 2007 and FY 2001 shows an increase of 19% in credit hour generation. See Appendix Tables B-5a and B5b. The College of Law has managed this increase without a notable budget increase for faculty or administrative staffing.

Retention and Graduation

The College of Law has a successful record of retaining students and in having them graduate within the conventional expectations for their course of study. See Table B4. The full-time law program is a three year course of study, and full-time students generally graduate within that time period. The part-time program allows students to graduate within 4-6 years, but part-time students typically graduate within 4-5 years.

The College of Law requires students to earn a final grade average of 73 in order to graduate, and excludes students who fail to maintain a 70 grade average at the end of the first year of law school. The college excludes students after the first year if they are placed on probation for two consecutive semesters. Students are placed on probation if their grade average falls below 73.

Relatively few students fail to meet these academic standards. In 2005 six students were excluded and 17 placed on probation; in 2006 13 were excluded and 16
placed on probation. Students on probation are assigned faculty mentors, and the college’s Academic Assistance Program provides upper class tutors in two required first year courses. More detailed information about academic exclusion and probation statistics are provided in section D.1c.ii. See also Appendix Table B-4.

Rankings

There are 200 law schools nationally. The 2007 U.S. News and World Report ranks the College of Law 85th among the nation’s top 100 law schools, an upward movement of 12 places from 97 in 2006, and the youngest law school with a top 100 ranking. Another national ranking service, the Consus Group, ranked the College 60th. The 2007 U.S. News also ranked the college’s health law program 10th in the nation. U.S. News’ admissions rankings shows the College’s admissions selectivity (admits/applicants) as 13th nationally. The 2007 online edition of Vault named the College the nation’s 11th most underrated law school, and the 2007 edition of National Jurist magazine named the college as the 3rd ranked best value.

Section C. Progress Toward Goals and Objectives

In this section we are asked to report on the college’s goals and progress as they relate to the findings of the previous academic program review, which the college underwent in 2001. That process was an amalgam of the closely timed sabbatical review of the college by the American Bar Association and Association of American Law Schools. The documents used for that academic program review consisted of the Self-Study prepared for the ABA and a separate more streamlined document, titled “Plan of Improvement” submitted to the provost and the academic program review subcommittee. The Plan of Improvement captured the key features of the instruments submitted to the ABA, the report and findings of the external reviewers, and the College’s Strategic Plan. The Plan of Improvement identified the following goals and areas in which attention was needed:

- Law Curriculum: need for full review of the first year program.
- First Year Legal Writing Program: need to add sections to reduce class size to support more effective student-teacher consultation.
- Interdisciplinary and Urban-focused Initiatives: goal to develop interdisciplinary initiatives linked to urban setting.
- International Initiatives: goal to add to existing international programs.
- Student Life and Advisement: need for an Associate Dean of Students to support student life issues.
- Faculty Research: need to increase summer research support to a level closer to that of peer institutions.
- Standing Visiting Professorship: goal to create a generic visitorship line to attract national scholars and support course reductions / professional development leaves for COL’s strongest scholars.
- Physical Facilities: need to improve adequacy of facilities and goal to plan for a new law building.
• Instructional Technology Support: need to expand technology unit to improve support for instructional technology and improve faculty proficiency in this area.
• Law Library: need to increase library space and acquisition budget
• Media and Public Relations: Communications Director needed to promote COL’s program and develop more effective publications, web presence, press coverage, and marketing.

Below is a list of the action plan items and implementation efforts (or lack thereof) that resulted from the Plan of Improvement and the previous academic program review:

• Learning outcomes for the program are to be developed and submitted to the Provost office. Action item completed in 2004.
• Rooms on 2nd and 3rd floors of Urban Life will be reallocated to COL from the former continuing education conference center. Additional physical facilities on the sixth floor of Urban Life will be made available once the Psychology Clinic can be relocated. First part of action item completed in 2004; sixth floor renovation completed in 2006.
• Increase support for summer research. $50,000 provided in FY 05
• Staff person to support faculty with instructional technology. No funding to complete action.
• A 5th legal writing instructor to support first year legal writing program. Action completed in 2005.
• Continue to advocate to the Regents for the designation of eminent scholar status for the Ben F. Johnson Chair in Law. No action
• International Initiatives: Study abroad program in Brazil added in 2004; visiting foreign scholar / foreign enrichment program in 2004.
• Standing Visiting Professorship: No action
• Student Life and Advisement: Without any addition of funds to COL budget, created and filled Dean of Students position as administrative add-on for an existing faculty member.
• Media and Public Relations: Hired Director of Communications from dedicated COL tuition increase.
• Interdisciplinary and Urban-focused Initiatives. Aided by the University’s area of focus initiative and a dedicated law school tuition increase, the COL created interdisciplinary centers in Health Law and the Comparative Study of Metropolitan Growth.

Following the 2001 academic program review, the college embarked on a strategic planning process that resulted in a 2002 Strategic Plan, an Action Plan, updates to that action plan in 2005 (see Appendix C1), and a fresh strategic planning process and Self Study in preparation for the ABA’s site inspection in March 2007 (See Appendix A1).

Section D. Curricular Quality

The College of Law offers a traditional 90 hour J.D. curriculum on a full- and part-time basis as well as five optional joint degree programs. The joint degree programs allow J.D. students to earn a concurrent M.A. degree in either business, philosophy, public administration, health administration, or city and regional planning.
The college’s 2002 Strategic Plan and follow-up action plans included a directive for the faculty to review aspects of the college’s curriculum. Pursuant to this directive, the Curriculum Committee led the faculty in a year-long review of our curricular offerings in light of offerings at peer institutions, as well as a review of the college’s traditional approach to the required first and second year curriculum.

This review produced the following important findings:

- Recognition of a need to enrich course offerings in certain important foundational areas (international law, tax, wills and estates, antitrust and regulatory law, criminal law, intellectual property, skills training, first year areas in civil procedure and torts, and seminars that offer more writing opportunities).
- Recognition that the required portion of college’s first and second year was successful and should be maintained “as is” in the short term.
- While an action step from the last Academic Program Review enabled the college to increase to five the number of sections in the required first course in Research Writing and Advocacy, the faculty recognized that a top notch legal writing program will require smaller sections, more legal writing instructors, a broader range of writing and drafting products, and better integration with other parts of the curriculum.
- Beyond the immediate term, the faculty recognized that the law school must re-think the traditional legal education model in which law schools separate the doctrinal subjects from skills training and the development of professional identity, and consider new models of integration (as is the practice in other fields of professional education). Toward this end, the dean has formed a seven member “Working Group on Legal Education” to lead the faculty in this multi-year effort, an effort that is occurring across legal education in the wake of the very critical 2006 report, titled “Educating Lawyers,” issued by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Learning.

The COL believes it offers a very solid program of legal education, while continuing to work to adjust the program to meet students’ needs. Important programmatic improvements since the last Academic Program Review include: the addition of new electives to enable more advanced study and increased writing opportunities; the addition of a fifth legal writing instructor to improve the faculty student ratio in the legal writing program; the strengthening of the professionalism curriculum by reducing class size in the required Professional Responsibility sections and by filling a chaired professorship in this area; establishing and building centers of excellence in Health Law and Metropolitan Growth; creating a second live-client, in-house clinic and an additional study abroad program; and developing programmatic linkages with the Georgia Assembly in the areas of health law and urban growth.

To build on this success the COL must continue to re-examine the curriculum and invest strategically in our centers and other distinctive areas of focus. Priorities for the next few years must include a comprehensive review of our legal
writing/skills/professionalism curriculum and its relationship to doctrinal courses, and the need to bolster curricular offerings in areas of thin coverage including, international law, antitrust and regulatory Law, intellectual property, tax law, criminal law, wills and estates, first-year areas of Civil Procedure and Torts, and seminars that offer more writing opportunities. Filling these holes must be balanced with the need to cover new holes in our curriculum that will be created by the likely retirement of several faculty members over the next five-seven years.

D1. Outcomes

In 2004, the COL faculty approved a new Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan to better evaluate the effectiveness of the college’s academic program. The results below reflect the College’s application of this plan and the assessment of learning outcomes in 2005-2006. See Appendix D1a.

The Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan provides for expected learning outcomes in the following areas: communication skills, legal research, analysis and critical thinking, knowledge of legal doctrine, lawyering skills, professionalism and ethics, and preparation for a legal career or a career in a non-legal area that is related to graduate law study. The Plan then outlines the assessment methods to obtain each of the above outcomes.

Procedurally, the Plan calls for the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs to oversee the collection of data and the dissemination of reports on the various assessment results. Although the new Plan assisted in the identification of student learning outcomes and non-academic outcomes, the College continues to rely upon several traditional benchmarks (some of which are incorporated in the Plan) used in the past that provide valuable information on the effectiveness of instruction and the subsequent success of our students. These include student success in moot court and mock trial competitions, bar passage rates, employment statistics of graduates, placement of graduates in judicial clerkships, and the success of our graduates in obtaining employment and partnerships in prestigious regional and national law firms. See Appendix D1.

D1a. Bar Passage Rate

The assessment tool that may be most significant is the Georgia Bar exam, which is taken by nearly every graduate of the College. The exam consists of three sections: (i) essay questions; (ii) a case file/performance & analysis problem; and (iii) a separately scored multistate Bar examination (MBE). Students consistently perform extremely well on the Georgia Bar exam. In the most recent July exam (2007), the College’s overall pass rate was 96.3 % and its rate for first-time takers was 96.7%, both of which were the highest among all Georgia law schools. The College’s statistics consistently are among the best in the State and over the years have been on a par or better than those of the University of Georgia and Emory University. This is true not only for the overall pass rate but for Georgia State students’ average MBE score on the objective (standardized) portion of the exam. Notably, while Emory and UGA law students entered law school
with higher average scores on the standardized LSAT exam, Georgia State graduates match and occasionally exceed Emory and UGA students on the standardized MBE portion of the bar exam.

For a table showing overall bar passage numbers and how the College compares to the other ABA Georgia accredited schools, see Appendix A3.

**D1b. Job Placement Rate**

In addition to the Bar passage rates, graduate placement rates are also a significant assessment tool. Each year, the College’s Career Services Office (CSO) surveys all members of the graduating class six months after spring graduation. Survey response rates are excellent (94.19% for the class of 2004; 95.85% for class of 2005). Of those who responded, placement rates for 2004-2006 were as follows: In 2004 -- 88.36% full-time legal employment, 10.27% full-time non-legal employment, and 1.37% part-time legal employment. In 2005 -- 88.65% full-time legal employment, 10.27% full-time non-legal employment, and .54% part-time legal and non legal employment. In 2006 the numbers were all but identical with 87.04% full time legal employment, 9.26% full time non-legal employment, and 3.71% part time legal and non legal employment. Combining the percentages for the different types of employment, job placement rates of COL graduates consistently exceed 90%.

Another measure of the effectiveness of legal instruction provided by the College is the success rate of graduates becoming partners in law firms, being elected or appointed to the bench, serving as in-house counsel for corporations, or working in public interest positions. College graduates have achieved remarkable success for a relatively young law school. There are associates and partners at every type and size of law firm, judges at most levels of the state judiciary, corporate counsel in both small and large businesses, lawyers working for countless state agencies and non-profit organizations, and several state legislators, including the current speaker of the Georgia House of Representatives.

**D1c. Other Output Measures**

i. **Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE)**

During the FY 2005, the College participated for the first time in the LSSSE, which is the law school equivalent of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The mean national response rate by students was 57%, with a range from 34% to 73%; the response rate for students at the College’s rate was 58.8%. One of the questions that concludes the Survey asks the students to evaluate their entire educational experience on a scale of 1-4, with 1 equaling Poor and 4 equaling Excellent. The College’s first-year students ranked their educational experience at 3.29, as compared to 3.14 for comparable schools, 3.19 for responding public law schools, and 3.20 overall. Second-year students at the College ranked their educational experience at 3.30, as compared to 3.00 for comparable responding schools, 3.09 for responding public law schools, and 3.08 overall.
Third-year students at the College ranked their educational experience at 3.36, as compared to 3.06 for comparable schools, 3.12 for responding public law schools, and 3.08 overall. Finally, fourth-year law students at the College ranked their educational experience at 2.90 at the College, as compared to 2.97 for responding schools comparable, 3.20 for responding public law schools, and 3.15 overall.

When our students were asked whether they would choose the same law school if they were starting over, the answer was a strong “yes.” From first year to fourth, the mean answers were 3.44, 3.39, 3.37, and 3.40, as compared to 3.20, 3.07, 3.01, and 3.12 overall.

ii. Probation and Exclusion

The College’s Registrar creates an annual report for the Dean and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, which sets forth data about students who are placed on probation or excluded from the College because of poor academic performance. A first-year student must have a grade average 70.0 at the end of the first year in order to remain in the program, and a 73.0 to be in good standing. If a student is not excluded but has an averaged below 73.0, the student is afforded two semesters in which to raise the average to 73.0. Failure to do so results in exclusion.

Of the few number of students who are excluded at the end of each year, most are students who have completed the first year of law school but have not yet begun to take second and third year electives. This is because grading is stiffer in the first year where the College imposes mandatory means in first-year courses (77.5-79.0). Since these means do not extend to second and third year courses, averages in the second and third years tend to be higher. Hence, a student who finishes the first year core curriculum in good standing (i.e., with an average of at least 70.0) is very likely to graduate.

At the end of the Spring 2005 semester, six students were excluded from the college. Four had completed the first year of full-time studies, one had completed the first year of part-time studies, and one had completed the third year of part-time studies. Seventeen students were placed on probation. Sixteen had completed the first year of full-time studies and one had completed the first year of part-time studies. Their averages ranged from 70.17 to 72.9.

At the end of the Spring 2006 semester, 13 students were excluded. Eleven had completed the first year of full-time studies, one had completed the first year of part-time studies, and none had completed the third year of part-time studies. Sixteen students were on probation. Nine had completed the first year of full-time studies and seven had completed the first year of part-time studies. Their grade averages ranged from 71.3 to 72.83.

The College believes that all of these outcome measures -- the small number of students who fail to maintain good standing or who are excluded, and the extremely high number of graduates who pass the Bar on their first attempt and secure full-time legal
employment within six months of graduation, are collectively valid indications of the strength of the College’s program.

iii. Student Competition Teams: Trial and Appellate Practice

The success of the College’s trial and appellate advocacy teams in national competition is another gauge of the success of the program. The College was the first law school in the state to have won both national mock trial (two competitions in 1994; others in 1996, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2003 and 2004) and national moot court competitions (1988 and 1992).

In the 2004-2005 academic year, the Student Trial Lawyers Association’s (STLA) mock trial teams won the William Daniel National Competition and placed second in the Lone Star Classic National Competition. Moot Court teams won the John J. Gibbons National Criminal Procedure Moot Court Competition and the Georgia Intrastate Moot Court Competition. The College also placed third in the Saul Lefkowitz Southern Regional Moot Court Trademark Competition.

In the 2005-2007 academic years the COL’s mock trial teams finished 2nd in the ABA National Mock Trial Competition, 3rd in the National Trial Advocacy Competition, 2nd and 3rd in the ATLA Competition, and were semi-finalists in the Buffalo-Niagara Mock Trial Invitational. The Georgia Intrastate Moot Court Competition team advanced to the final round. In November 2006, a college mock trial team won the national title in the William Daniel National Mock Trial competition, and in 2007 won a national competition sponsored by the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers.

The success of both of the College’s Moot Court and Mock Trial programs is due, in large part, to the extensive coaching support faculty give the student competitors, and to the strength of our first year writing program in which students devote the spring semester to both written and oral advocacy. Success in mock-trial competition is also due to the college’s required second-year Litigation Program, a requirement that is unique among American law schools.

iv. Annual Assessment of RWA Program

Because research, writing, and advocacy skills are critical components of legal education, Research, Writing and Advocacy (RWA) is a first-year, two-semester, required course. The program’s five instructors teach from the same syllabus and meet regularly to assess the effectiveness of the program and the materials.

The lawyering skills taught in RWA include the ability to engage in critical reading, to problem solve, to engage in legal reasoning and analysis, and to be an effective communicator. Each year students are assigned a complex legal problem that requires them to conduct research and produce several products of legal writing including an appellate brief. Student work is critiqued individually in writing and through one-on-one conferences with the faculty.
The strengths of the RWA program are evidenced in the overall effectiveness of the program, as reflected in such measurements as the school’s success in national and regional moot court programs and the general perception among the local bar that graduates from the College possess solid legal skills.

In 2005-2006 the COL surveyed second and third year students to gauge their assessment of the effectiveness of RWA in preparing them for the research and writing components of their summer employment at law firms. The survey included questions about the types of writings student prepared, the length of documents prepared, other lawyering skills students used, how confident students felt in their writing, analytical, and oral communications skills, and how their skills matched up with students from other law schools.

Overall, survey results indicate students were very confident in their writing skills (objective and persuasive writing) and their oral advocacy skills. Additionally, in assessing how their research and writing skills compared to students from other schools, a majority of students reported their skills were stronger, 43% reported their skills were similar and only 7% reported their skills were weaker. Also, most students reported that their RWA professor had “somewhat higher” standards than their summer supervisors. In response to a question on how RWA could be revised to train them more effectively, students suggested writing shorter memos, having more opportunities for oral presentations, and allocating more credits to RWA.

v. Annual Assessment of Externship Program

The College of Law places students in externships at over 40 locations per semester. Placements include judicial clerkships, state and federal agencies, and non-profit legal organizations. Two tenure track faculty members supervise the program each semester. They conduct mid-semester and end of semester interviews with each student in order to evaluate the placement. In addition, students’ on-site supervisors complete lengthy evaluations which the supervising faculty members review with the students at their exit interviews.

If a student reports insufficient engagement with legal issues in the course of an externship experience, the faculty member contacts the on-site supervisor with a view to remedying the situation. This generally occurs at one or two sites a year. The supervising faculty member sends each on-site supervisor a mid-semester e-mail asking them to confirm that the student extern=s work is satisfactory; also, each student must have the on-site supervisor sign a form confirming that the student is on track for passing the class and must bring that form to the mid-semester interview.

If an on-site director reports that a student is not fulfilling the responsibilities assigned to the student, the faculty member meets with the on-site director and with the student. If the student's performance does not improve, the student fails.
Externship placements allow students to hone analytical and advocacy skills, to put substantive learning to practical use, and to confront professionalism issues under the guidance of an experienced mentor. The constant monitoring of the externship sites and the student externs permits ongoing assessment and adjustment with a view to ensuring a rich educational experience.

D2. Survey Information from Faculty Survey

Summary survey data and information is collected in Appendix Table D5.

Section E. Student Quality

The College of Law actively recruits students who possess the intellectual capacity, maturity and motivation necessary for the successful completion of the J.D. program. The College does not admit any students who do not appear capable of completing the program and being admitted to the bar.

The College has a rolling admissions policy. Each applicant must have a baccalaureate degree from an accredited college or university prior to registering for the first semester in the College. Each applicant also must take the standardized law school entrance exam, the Law School Aptitude Test (the LSAT).

Candidates for admission to the College are evaluated on the basis of academic and personal criteria. Academic criteria include the candidate's undergraduate work and the Law School Admission Test (LSAT) score. Personal criteria include letters of recommendation from professors, employers or colleagues; work experience; other graduate work; ethnic/racial/personal background; capacity to contribute to student diversity; the candidate's personal statement for admission; and extracurricular activities.

The College of Law expends considerable effort on recruitment to attract a well qualified and diverse student body. The college’s director and assistant director of admissions travel extensively to college campuses, speak to pre-law clubs and classes, and attend pre-law forums and conferences, as well as visit government agencies. A large portion of these recruitment activities focus on the Southeast, but some of our recruitment extents into other regions in an effort to further diversify our applicant pool and increase the visibility and recognition of the College of Law. The College of Law also has been successful in hosting recruitment programs on campus as a way of attracting applicants and showcasing the law school.

Once applicants have been admitted, the College attempts to follow up the offer of admission in ways designed to focus the applicant’s interest on the College of Law and increase the chances that the applicant will decide to attend. The main effort in this regard is “Brief Encounter,” a half-day program held at the law school each April, to which the College invites applicants who have been admitted and who, by making a deposit, have indicated an interest in enrolling in the Fall.
In pursuing these various recruitment activities, attracting minority applicants remains a priority. As part of her efforts to establish relationships with pre-law advisors, the Director of Admissions annually contacts pre-law advisors at historically black colleges and universities and encourages the advisors and students to make special visits to the College of Law. The College of Law’s Black Law Students Association (BLSA) assists the Director in these visits. In addition to hosting visits, each year College of Law representatives go out and visit Georgia’s historically black colleges.

The College’s commitment to attracting a diverse student pool is also reflected in its support of academic support programs for applicants deemed to be at risk of experiencing academic difficulty. The College of Law provides its own four week Summer Skills program for such incoming students. The College formally encourages these students to attend the Summer program but does not require attendance as a condition of admission. In addition, the College of Law participates in the Georgia Law Schools Consortium Fellowship Program, a summer skills program in which each Georgia school conditionally admits four at-risk students who must satisfactorily complete the program as a condition of enrolling in classes in the Fall.

**E.1 Input Quality Metrics**

The College strives to admit and enroll classes that are highly credentialed and diverse, and it has made significant advances on all counts since the last Academic Program Review. As noted in Appendix A-4 and Tables E-1 and E-2, the median and mean LSAT scores of admitted and enrolled classes has increased to 160 (up from 157 in 2002) and the median undergraduate GPA has increased to 3.32 (up from 3.19). These entering class enrollment statistics compare favorably with those of our peer law schools. See data at Appendix B1.

Minority enrollment, which averaged 15-17% from 1996-2001 has consistently exceeded 20% in the last several years. The number of applicants rose dramatically during most of the past seven years, reaching a record high of 3610 in 2004 before tapering to 3308 in 2005 and 2910 in 2006. This modest decline in applications, which is consistent with national trends, has not adversely affected our ability to maintain the quality and diversity of our entering classes in 2005 and 2006. Indeed, the College’s admissions selectivity consistently ranks as one of the best in the nation. Data from the 2007 *U.S. News and World Report* Law School Rankings shows the College’s 17.3 selectivity rate as 13th among all law schools.

The College continues to promote the option for students to study law on a part-time basis. As noted in the Appendix A-4 , in 2006 the College enrolled approximately 215 new students, 70% of whom enrolled as full-time students and 30% of whom enrolled as part-time. These numbers are consistent with the full-time/part-time distribution range over the last several years. The chart also consistently shows roughly equal enrollment of men and women in each of the past entering classes.
One way in which the College is attempting to achieve its goals to increase both the diversity and the quality of the student body is to ease students’ financial burden to attend law school. The College has been successful since the last site inspection in establishing several endowed scholarships. In 2000, the College’s scholarship endowments stood at $225,000 from which it awarded scholarships to 24 students, whereas in 2006 the College of Law’s scholarships endowments stood at $1.76 million from which it awarded scholarships to 50 students. At the same time, the COL is only able to provide scholarship support to 14.3% of its student body, a number that is below that of our peer law schools. See data at Appendix B1.

E.2 Output Quality Metrics

The following output measures reflect the quality of the student at the college of law:

- Bar Passage Rate: See section D1a., above.
- Average MBE Score in multi-state portion of the bar exam: See section D1a., above.
- Job Placement Rate: See section D1b., above.
- Performance on Mock Trial and Moot Court Competitions. See section D1c., above.

Section F. Faculty Quality

The faculty currently consists of forty-one faculty members who are either tenured or on the tenure track. In addition, the COL has seven non-tenure track faculty members, two of whom serve as clinical professors in the HeLP Legal Services Clinic, five of whom serve as Research, Writing and Advocacy instructors in our first-year legal writing program. Tenure track faculty holding part or full-time administrative responsibilities include the Dean, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, the Associate Dean for Student Affairs, the Director of Lawyer Skills Development, the Executive Director of CNCR, the three Co-Directors of the Externship Program, the Director of the HeLP Legal Services Clinic, the Director of the Tax Clinic, and the Law Librarian.

F.1 Faculty Qualifications and Awards

Every member of the tenure track faculty holds a J.D. degree from a distinguished law school. Several faculty members hold LL.M. degrees, while others hold graduate degrees, at both Masters and Ph.D. levels in other fields. Several faculty members have served as law clerks to federal judges prior to practicing or entering the academy. All members of the faculty practiced law prior to entering the academy, many in private practice and others in governmental positions, including the White House Counsel’s Office. Almost half of the tenure track faculty members taught at other law schools prior to joining the faculty at the College.

Members of the faculty have been regularly invited to visit at other law schools, including Hastings, Southern Methodist University, the University of Houston, St.
John’s, Stetson, Buffalo, the University of North Carolina, and the University of Alabama. These visiting opportunities have extended to foreign academic institutions as well including institutions in Bulgaria, China, the Dominican Republic, England, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and South America. Through these visits, faculty members enrich their teaching and scholarship and extend the College’s reputation.

In recent years several faculty members have had their work recognized through the grant of Fulbright Fellowships in foreign countries and other prestigious awards. Recent Fulbright recipients include Professor Charles Marvin (constitutional and administrative law teaching in Latvia), Professor Michael Landau (intellectual property study in Finland and England); Professor Colin Crawford (comparative environmental law study in the Dominican Republic); and Professor Andi Curcio (comparative law in China).

In the Spring and Summer of 2006 Law and Philosophy scholar William Edmonson was invited to University College, Oxford, to serve as a prestigious H.L.A. Hart Visiting Fellow at the Oxford University Centre for Ethics and Philosophy of Law. In the spring of 2006 Professor Charity Scott was awarded the national Jay Healey Distinguished Health Law Teacher Award, presented by the American Society of Law, Medicine & Ethics in recognition of Professor Scott’s interdisciplinary work in the area of Health Care Law.

In May 2006 Burge Chair Professor Clark Cunningham was admitted to membership in the Society of Writers to Her Majesty’s Signet in recognition of his work with the Glasgow Graduate School of Law and the College of Law of England and Wales. This work is leading to fundamental changes in the way client interviewing is being taught in Great Britain. In April of 2006 Professor Julian Juergensmeyer was inducted into the Alpha Lamda chapter of Phi Beta Delta, the Honor Society for international scholars.

College faculty members have been elected to membership in the prestigious American Law Institute (“ALI”). In 2006 Professors Scott and Radford became the most recent faculty members to become members of the ALI, joining Professors Marjorie Girth, Marjorie Knowles, Mark Budnitz, and former colleague Ellen Podgor as ALI members.

F.2. Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

Faculty members are actively engaged in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, although the precise mix among these areas varies with the strengths of individual faculty members. The faculty continues to increase its level of scholarly and professional engagement, while not compromising its longstanding commitment to teaching and service.

F.4.1a Teaching
Faculty members view themselves as dedicated and effective teachers, and student survey responses as well as student evaluations confirm this assessment. These vehicles show that students and graduates rate the faculty’s teaching very highly. There is no single teaching method required or used in the faculty. Pedagogical methods range from traditional Socratic dialogue to lecturing, role-playing, group discussions, directed research, problem-solving, computer exercises and blends of all methods. The faculty uses the informal format of brown bag lunches to share teaching experiences with each other and discuss various issues related to classroom teaching and to scholarly works in progress.

F.4.1b Scholarship

Legal scholarship constitutes a vital part of the College’s mission, and the College of Law faculty continues to increase its scholarly output and the influence and reach of its research. As noted in the AALS’s 2007 sabbatical review of the COL, “[a] culture of scholarship exists at the law school, with almost all faculty engaged in active programs of scholarship and with faculty regularly engaged in activities aimed at fostering scholarship.” AALS Report, page 2, Appendix A2d. See also Appendix Tables B-6 (showing a faculty average of 58 scholarly works a year over the last three years, a rate of 1.5 per faculty member).

The faculty engages in original and influential scholarly inquiry in the vehicles that predominate across the legal academy: law reviews, journals and books; funded/sponsored research is uncommon among law faculty in general). With our growing scholarly reputation, faculty members are regularly invited to visit at other law schools, and several members have received national or international recognition for their work. From 2004-2006 alone the faculty published 18 books or monographs; 135 articles; 21 book chapters and treatise revisions, and several book supplements. A complete inventory of the faculty’s scholarship can be found in our newly established Faculty Publications page, which is located on the Law Library website at http://law.gsu.edu/library/index/faculty_publications/page. Listed below is a sampling of faculty publications from 2006:


---

§ This is reflected in online student course evaluations and the high marks generally given the faculty in the LSSSE.

Clearly, faculty scholarly productivity and professional engagement has grown substantially over the last decade as has the number of faculty who are recognized as leaders in their field. But for our trajectory to continue, the COL must move forward in two ways: First it must review its existing Promotion and Tenure Document to ensure it reflects the kind of standards that will enable the college to continue to enhance its reputation nationally. Second, the College must be more competitive in the support it provides for scholarly and professional growth. Such support should include: raising summer research grants to levels offered at many other law schools; workload adjustments in faculty teaching loads that would include more aggressively offering
course releases to support important scholarly activity; considering making offers with reductions in teaching loads beyond the first year as a recruitment tool to attract young scholars. While the College has increased summer research stipends by nearly 40% over the last few years, the current level of $7500 remains below the prevailing amount at many law schools.

F.4.1b Service

Service is a vital component of the College’s commitment to serve communities of which it is a part. Such service supplements and supports the faculty’s teaching and scholarship. To that end, the faculty is actively engaged in professional service activities at the local, regional and national level. This service is extensive and takes many forms.

Many faculty present papers at Continuing Legal Education programs and at programs sponsored by the AALS and other scholarly organizations and groups; many hold leadership positions on bar committees or task forces of the American Bar Association (including the Task Force on Consumer Involvement, the Cyberspace Law Committee and others), the Association of American Law Schools, the Law School Admissions Council, the State Bar of Georgia (including the Formal Advisory Opinion Board, the UCC Committee, and the Fiduciary Law Section, among others), and the Atlanta Bar Association; some write amicus briefs on a pro bono basis; several serve on committees or boards of non-profit organizations, such as Atlanta Legal Aid, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Georgia Resource Center, the Georgia Center for Law in the Public Interest, the Women’s Legal Defense Fund, Georgia Volunteer Lawyers for the Arts, Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, and the Southeastern Legal Foundation. Several faculty members have testified before Congress and/or the Georgia General Assembly, or served as reporters and advisors on law reform projects associated with the State Bar or the ABA. Several of these law reform efforts have led directly to proposed or enacted revisions of the Georgia Code. Professor Radford’s work on the new Georgia Guardianship Code, adopted since the last site visit, is emblematic of this work.

Promotion and Tenure

The following faculty members were reviewed for tenure or promotion during the review period 2004-2007. All reviews were successful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>Neil Kinkopf</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Colin Crawford</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Mark Kadish</td>
<td>Promotion to Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Wendy Hensel</td>
<td>Promotion to Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Steven Kaminshine</td>
<td>Promotion to Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Paul Lombardo</td>
<td>Tenure on Appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Kelly Timmons</td>
<td>Tenure &amp; Promotion to Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Tanya Washington</td>
<td>Promotion to Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section G. Resource Adequacy

Annual University Budget Allocations to the College of Law: 2001-2007

From 2001-2007 the College of Law received some important budget increases and some significant cuts. The chart below provides a summary of these net changes to the College’s budget. (Note: Annual raise pool funding to support faculty and staff salaries is not included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget Increases</th>
<th>Budget Cuts*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY01</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY02</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>- $37,272*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY03</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>- $495,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY04</td>
<td>$218,100</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY05</td>
<td>$175,760</td>
<td>- $78,254*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>$148,650</td>
<td>- $197,129*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>$102,917</td>
<td>- $180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>======</td>
<td>======</td>
<td>======</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$732,427</td>
<td>- $988,171*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The budget increases shown in the chart above reflect the University’s support for the following: an additional legal writing instructor, a new faculty hire in biotechnology law and to fill a faculty chair in legal ethics, library acquisition funds, and a staffing upgrade in our development office. The College will not be able to enhance its educational program further without increased funding.

Dedicated Fee/Tuition Increase for Professional Schools

Board of Regents policy permits professional programs to request approval of dedicated tuition increases to support specific programmatic activities. In FY 04 the College of Law received approval for a dedicated fee increase of $20/credit hour targeted specifically to create a communications program and to fund its new centers in Health Law and Metropolitan Growth. In FY 07 the College of Law received approval for an increase of $120/credit hour spread over a five year period primarily to support the College of Law’s contribution to debt service on the proposed new Business and Law Professional Center at Sun Trust Plaza.

Faculty Resources

In the current (2008) fiscal year, the College of Law has just filled three tenure track positions, raising the total number of tenure-track faculty members from 39 (which is the number that controlled during the 2005-2007 review period) to 42. These three

* These budget figures include both permanent cuts and one-time give-backs in a particular year. The one-time give-backs include $18,636 in FY 02, $78,254 in FY 05, and $197,129 in FY 06. Excluding these one-time give-backs, permanent budget reductions, 2001-2007, total $694,192, offset by increases of $732,437 and yielding a net budget gain of $38,235, or $5,462 per year.
new positions are all in the health law field with funding made available by the University’s Urban Health Initiative (an area of focus) and its support of interdisciplinary and interdepartmental collaboration. Outside the health law area, faculty size has remained static. As noted in its report to the ABA accreditation committee, the college needs resources to hire additional faculty members to improve coverage in certain core areas such as International Law (where the faculty growth has not kept pace the increasing globalization of law curricula), Intellectual Property (where we have no coverage or scholarly presence on the patent and science side of IP), Criminal Law (where we have just one faculty member for whom criminal law is the primary scholarly focus), and Antitrust and Regulatory Law (where we have no faculty presence in the area of law, economics, antitrust law, and regulation), Wills and Estates (where we have insufficient number of faculty to support high student demand); Tax Law (where our main Tax Scholar also is responsible for running the Tax Clinic); first year areas in civil procedure and torts; and seminars that offer more writing opportunities.

With respect to the College’s non-tenure track faculty members, two clinical faculty positions were added during the review period to staff our newly established HeLP Legal Services Clinic. The College of Law obtained temporary (three-year) funding for these positions (and other clinic start-up costs) by applying for and securing a Woodruff Grant. This funding will expire in FY 2009, after which the law school and the University will need to identify sources of permanent funding. As part of the Woodruff grant application, the law school and the University jointly provided assurance to the grant agency that they would secure permanent funding following the grant period.

In addition to needing faculty resources to improve coverage of important curricula areas, is the need for competitive faculty salaries. Our faculty salaries are not strongly competitive on the national market to attract the best candidates, especially candidates who would increase faculty diversity. Moreover, the combination of modest salaries, and relatively small annual merit increases, has caused compression problems for our junior-to-mid-level faculty members because the external market has grown faster than their salaries. Funds to combat compression are also important to enable the college to retain its most productive performers. These twin issues -- the need for competitive salaries and funds to combat compression -- will become particularly important over the next few years as the law school enters the hiring market to replace the significant number of faculty members who will be eligible for retirement.

Lastly, resources are needed to improve support for faculty scholarship. While faculty scholarly productivity and professional engagement has grown substantially over the last decade, summer research grant levels remain well below grant levels at other law schools as does the COL’s ability to support periodic course releases for its most productive scholars.

**Administrative Resources**
The law school administration consists of the Dean, an Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, an Associate Dean of Students, an Assistant Dean for Administration and Finance, and the Director of the Law Library.

The College continues to function on a thin administrative structure: we have one business manager, one HR officer, and one communications professional, none of whom have dedicated administrative or secretarial support. The college has four administrative secretaries who support the needs of the college’s 48 faculty members and two Centers.

In addition, as a college whose mission is to support a professional/graduate student population, the college cannot avail itself of central University services for undergraduate admissions, career services, enrollment services, and student advisement. The college provides these services on its own through a registrar’s office and lean admissions and career services offices. The registrar’s office doubles as support for student services; the admissions office doubles in overseeing the administration of student advisement; the career services office is understaffed. There is no dedicated staff support for the Associate Dean of Students. Staff levels are also inadequate to support the COL’s rapid growth in the areas of development, communications and planning for academic events and conferences. The COL’s significant increase in its sponsorship of conferences, speakers, colloquia, seminars, and development/fundraising events have severely outpaced our staffing levels for these activities.

In a 2004 campus-wide review of all units’ administrative budgets, the College of Law was one of the only units whose administrative budget was found too lean to cut. At a minimum, the College needs to add personnel in student services, career services, development, and communications.

Finally, staff salaries in many areas, particularly admissions, career services, and the Law Library have fallen well behind the market at comparable institutions, making the College of Law vulnerable to losing talented staff members who are attracted to more lucrative opportunities elsewhere.

**Technology Resources**

Technology resources for the college of law are adequate through a combination of budget support and funds provided through the student technology fee. These latter funds have enabled the law school to add smart podiums and multiple forms of instructional technology in most of its classrooms, in addition to providing computers for student organizations and computing labs.

The College of Law budget earmarks at least $50,000 for technology, an amount by itself that often proves inadequate. Despite the earmarked $50,000 for technology, technology budget allocations are essentially made on the fly throughout the year in order to meet the needs of the College. If additional funds become available, additional servers, PCs, and/or software may be purchased. If a critical component fails and must
be replaced, funds are identified from elsewhere in the College’s budget to make sure this can occur.

Technological services for the College are provided by the Technology Services Group, which handles web, workstation, instructional, database and e-mail services; support for library services, classrooms, labs, faculty and staff; technical training and consulting; implementation of security policies; AV and digital media support; and inventory management. Through this unit’s efforts, technology is well integrated into the academic and educational mission of the college. The Internet is extensively used by faculty, staff and students to provide online course information, events calendars, training courses, electronic document reserves, and other resources. Students can now take exams online, and both synchronous and asynchronous distance courses are being developed.

In 2006 the Technology unit underwent Administrative Support Unit Review (ASUR), during which it prepared goals and a five year action plan. This action plan included the need for additional resources to support 1) the addition of an instructional Technologist position to develop, support, and promote instructional technology and distance learning at the college; 2) an increase in the college’s network space; and 3) the development of a customer support web portal for single sign-on environment for College of Law community. In response to this plan, the provost expressed support for the hiring of an instructional technologist at an estimated salary of $58,000 plus fringes.

Space Resources

Since the last Academic Program Review, the University has assisted the College in making significant improvements to its facilities and relieving the College of its historical shortage of classroom space. These improvements include:

- Renovation of and expansion into the second half of the sixth floor of the Urban Life Building.
- The expansion of the Law Library by approximately 8,500 ft.
- Allocation to the College of Law of a medium sized classroom (Room 201) and four small seminar style rooms surrounding the Urban Life Building’s West Exhibit Area.

Several significant issues compromise the adequacy of the College of Law’s facilities. These issues include problems with the HVAC systems, water leaks, and that we have reached full capacity for any additional office space for faculty, staff, new programs, or student organizations. The current facilities provide inadequate storage space for equipment, supplies, and archival materials. According to the 2005 LSSSE, students are generally critical of the College’s facilities.

The University Foundation has purchased land and existing facilities at downtown SunTrust Plaza to support new facilities for the College of Law and the Robinson College of Business. Steps are actively being taken to seek external funding to support this new complex. Renovation of the site for Law and Business is to begin when SunTrust
relocates and vacates the property. SunTrust holds a lease on the property that requires it to vacate on or before the spring of 2012.

**GSU Foundation Resources**

Since the last Academic Program Review, the College has been successful in obtaining several major gifts, upgrading its annual fund program, and substantially increasing the size of its endowments. Our progress is reflected in the following indicators: Our overall endowment has grown from $4.5 million to $7.8 million. The number of endowed scholarships has increased from three to fourteen, endowed scholarship funds have grown from $225,000 to $1.76 million, and the number of endowed professorships has grown and from two to five. The Low Income Taxpayer Clinic now has an endowment of over $758,000 and receives grants from the IRS. The total balance for all of these College of Law funds managed by the GSU Foundation was in excess of $9.2M as of 11/30/07.

In addition, the College’s has made significant strides in increasing the level of annual fund giving and the percentage of alumni participation. The alumni participation rate for the Annual Fund reached 23% in FY 2007, our highest rate of giving to date, and a rate well above the 12.9% rate at the time of the last Academic Program Review. The annual amount of gifts and pledges received by the College is also rising, reaching a high of $1.24 million in FY 2007 (our first-ever $1 million annual fund campaign). This 2007 figure represents an increase of $353,000 or 39.8% over FY 2006, and an increase of $553,000 or 80.5% over FY 2005. At the same time, the total amount of dollars raised during our annual campaigns is small by the standard at more established schools due to the small number (3500) and relatively young ages of our graduates. This represents a challenge to our development efforts.

**Library Resources**

The Law Library’s acquisition budget during the years of this review, 2005-2007, is set forth in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Continuing Funding</th>
<th>One-Time Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2005</strong></td>
<td>$813,000</td>
<td>$156,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2006</strong></td>
<td>$813,000</td>
<td>$156,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2007</strong></td>
<td>$938,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Law Library’s current funding level, it has needed to control acquisition growth and cancel certain subscriptions because of the dramatic inflation in the cost of legal materials. The most recent American Association of Law Libraries’ *Price Index for Legal Publications 2d*, which tracks inflation of legal publications, documents that between 1998 and 2004 the inflation rate in the law book industry increased by 28%.
The Law Library has tried to cope with these inflationary pressures through very careful decision-making, including greater reliance on electronic resources, reduction of duplication, and rigorous review of all continuation titles. At the same time, this crunch on library acquisitions will grow more severe without greater budgetary resources to offset continuing hikes in acquisition costs. As shown below, the Law Library is not as well funded as many other law libraries in our region. Thus, an important goal over the next few years is to grow the Library’s budget and for the College to work with the University to secure budget increases in an amount more closely tied to annual inflationary increases in acquisition prices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book titles added</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>22/36</td>
<td>1,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book volumes added</td>
<td>4,839</td>
<td>24/35</td>
<td>6,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial subscriptions</td>
<td>2,408</td>
<td>31/34</td>
<td>4,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for online databases</td>
<td>$127,286</td>
<td>22/35</td>
<td>$153,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatise acquisitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for serials</td>
<td>$489,795</td>
<td>31/36</td>
<td>$767,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditures for lib. operations other than salaries</td>
<td>$894,563</td>
<td>29/34</td>
<td>$1,113,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditures – includes salaries</td>
<td>$1,896,465</td>
<td>22/30</td>
<td>$2,088,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section H. Goals and Objectives

Vision and Context

The COL has achieved remarkable success in its first 25 years -- its first generation. It has built a strong academic program that is well regarded in the state and region and assembled a talented and engaged faculty that is gaining national prominence in several important areas. As it enters its second generation, the COL strives to build on this success by becoming one of the most recognized and accomplished public law schools in the region and a school that is well regarded on the national stage. To accomplish this vision, we must: continue to increase the level of faculty scholarship and professional engagement; continue to develop distinctive programs, centers, clinics, and vehicles of community outreach; improve coverage of certain curricular areas; increase support for scholarly productivity and professional engagement; pursue effective curricular innovation and pedagogy to meet the needs of the profession; attract outstanding new faculty members who help advance these objectives; and build a new free standing law facility that enhances our identity and our capacity to educate students in an improved environment, customized to our needs.

Goals and Objectives
The COL will seek to advance this vision over the next several years by pursuing the following goal and objectives. These goals and objectives are meant to build on the strengths, and work through the challenges, delineated in Section A.

I. Programmatic Development

1. Improve Curriculum Coverage: The COL must improve curricular coverage and depth in the areas of International Law, Criminal Law, Wills and Estates, Skills and Dispute Resolution, Intellectual Property (the science side), Antitrust and Regulatory Law, Tax Law, and Civil Procedure and Torts.

   Action needed: the COL must hire faculty members with strengths in these areas through a combination of new faculty lines and replacements as faculty members retire (note: the COL cannot improve curricular coverage solely through replacing faculty as they retire because the retiring faculty members may create new curricular holes and because the pace of retirements may not allow for an orderly plan for improving curricular coverage).

   Action needed: Salary resources for this faculty hiring must enable the COL to compete effectively in the national hiring market.

2. Curriculum Reform: The COL must re-examine the structure of its curriculum and aspects of its pedagogy as they relate to our methods of skills training, legal writing, and fostering professional identity and their segregation from the doctrinal courses. In conducting such a review, the COL must respond where appropriate to critiques by the Carnegie Foundation and others about the way American law schools approach professional education.

   Action needed: The COL must formulate a plan for curricular review building on the faculty’s 2007-2008 year of study through the dean’s Working Group on Legal Education. The results of such a curricular review likely will have significant resource implications because effective curricular reform in the skills and legal writing areas will require smaller classes characterized by lower faculty student ratios. Implementation of such curricular reform should be phased in on a multi-year basis as resources allow.

3. Grow Interdisciplinary Centers: The COL must continue to support the growth of its interdisciplinary centers in Health Law and Metropolitan Growth to enable both centers to achieve, or achieve greater, national prominence.

   Action needed: The COL will work with the Centers to increase resources from private and grant funding sources and to develop endowments to supplement University and COL support, akin to the endowment that has been raised in the Tax Clinic.

4. Develop Legal Ethics and Professionalism Center: The COL also should consider the establishment of a center of legal ethics and professionalism that would
capitalize on the national reputation of its Burge Chair in Ethics and Professionalism and the many initiatives, national and regional, currently supported by the Burge Chair Endowment.

*Action needed:* Develop plan document for such a center and seek approval from C.A.P. and the University Senate. Seek funding for such a Center as an area of focus in collaboration with new business ethics center in the RCB and the non-profit center in the AYPS.

5. **Intellectual Property, Science and Technology:** The COL must better capitalize on its location, the strength of its Intellectual Property Alumni Advisory Board, and the size of its endowment related to the area of Intellectual Property.

*Action needed:* Hire faculty member to supplement existing strengths and provide a stronger academic focus in the aspects of IP that relate to technology and the sciences (including biotechnology).

II. Faculty Growth and Development

1. **Faculty Productivity:** Faculty scholarly productivity and professional engagement has grown substantially as has the number of faculty who are recognized as leaders in their field. For this trajectory to continue and improve, productivity in these areas must continue to grow, as must the College’s support for such activity.

*Action needed:* Seek funds in budget to increase support for summer research and bring summer grants to the levels of most other law schools.

*Action needed:* Make workload adjustments within the faculty in light of productivity, and secure resources, that will enable the college to support periodic course releases to support the scholarship and professional engagement of its most productive faculty members.

2. **Chairs and Professorships:** The COL must increase the number of faculty members who hold endowed chairs and professorships. Endowed professorships promote national recognition, support faculty retention, and facilitate recruitment of national scholars from the outside. While the COL has created three new professorships over the past three years, its overall total of five is well below the number of endowed professorships enjoyed by faculties at more established institutions.

*Action needed:* Continue to make a endowed professorships a fundraising priority and highlight this need during the upcoming capital campaign.

3. **Salary Compression and Faculty Retention:** The combination of modest salaries, and relatively small annual merit increases, has caused compression problems for our junior-to-mid-level faculty members because the external market has grown faster than their salaries. The COL must secure funds to combat compression to enable it to
retain its most productive performers and to recruit competitively on the national hiring market without exacerbating the compression problems that already exist.

*Action needed:* The COL is not certain how to secure greater funds for compression other than to continue to support and University efforts in this area as a top funding priority and address part of the problem by succeeding in increasing the number of endowed professorships as noted in objective 2 above.

3. **Faculty Diversity:** The COL seeks to be more successful in hiring faculty members who would contribute toward a more racially and ethnically diverse faculty. In this regard, the faculty recognizes the gap that exits between its substantial efforts over the years to recruit a faculty that is diverse and the actual hiring results.

*Action needed:* The COL must continue its aggressive efforts to identify and recruit racially and ethnically diverse faculty, and obtain funding for salary levels that will enable the COL to compete more effectively in the hiring market.

**III. Administrative Support for Academic Mission**

1. **Administrative Staffing:** The COL must increase the level of administrative staffing in key areas in order to keep pace with the growth of the COL’s programs and initiatives. Staff levels are inadequate to support the COL’s rapid growth. This understaffing is felt most acutely in the areas of career services, communications, development, conference and event programming, and student services.

*Action needed:* The COL must secure funds to increase its administrative staffing as follows: a professional counselor in career services, an administrative support person for communications, administrative support for development, an event and conference management professional for development, and administrative support for student services tied to the associate dean of students.

**IV. Students**

1. **Student Life:** Proper attention to student needs and student organization activities requires dedicated administrative staffing to support the work of the Associate Dean of Students. No such support currently exists.

*Action needed:* The COL will seek to hire an administrative support person attached to the office of the Associate Dean of Students.

2. **Scholarships:** The COL must increase the number and financial level of its endowed scholarships to compete effectively for our regions most promising students. If not supplemented, existing scholarship support is in danger of shrinking in relative value if the endowment levels do not grow to keep pace with rising tuition levels.

*Action needed:* Make endowed scholarships a fundraising priority and highlight this need during the upcoming capital campaign.
V. Law Library

1. Acquisition Budget: The COL Library has had to cut acquisitions because of escalating acquisition costs and the fact that it is less well-funded than peer law libraries in the region. The Law Library seeks to reverse this trend in acquisitions and improve its budgetary situation.

*Action needed:* The COL must work with the University over the next few years to grow the Library’s budget and secure budget increases in an amount more closely tied to annual inflationary increases in acquisition prices.