

Are law schools failing when it comes to employment Transparency?



Despite lawsuits and Congressional action over employment data, many schools are still reporting misleading data on their websites. But that is starting to change, thanks to a new report that details transparency on law school websites. The National Jurist turns that report into grades.

BY ELIZABETH EWING

Last June, Dean Rudy Hasl unwittingly became the public face for legal education in the firestorm over employment data.

His school, **Thomas Jefferson School of Law** in San Diego, was the first to get sued by a former student, Anna Alaburda, who alleged various fraud claims related to the school's use of employment numbers.

Alaburda, who graduated with honors in 2008 with \$150,000 in debt, said her alma mater had misled prospective students on its website and in advertising materials, and that the school provided false and inaccurate information to *U.S. News & World Report* for the magazine's annual law school ranking.

Hasl has said that his school followed American Bar Association guidelines, has reported detailed employment data for some time now and expected to win in the court system.

But he also said the lawsuit was not unexpected given the state of the entry-level hiring market. The number of jobs at big law firms shrunk considerably starting in 2008, and many new graduates have found it challenging to land full-time legal jobs. "Every law school is vulnerable to this kind of action in a down economy," Hasl said. "The risk is if anyone has tinkered with the numbers, it seems to me they're at particular risk."

Despite 15 lawsuits against law schools and even Congressional posturing, there has yet to be any proof that a law school has tinkered with its employment data. But a new report by Law School Transparency, a non-profit organization, shows that 38 percent of law schools are "misleading" prospective students on their websites when it comes to salary information, and a majority are doing a substandard job with all employment data. Still, since Law School Transparency released the report in early January, close to 40 schools have improved their data.

Why a report on website transparency?

Kyle McEntee is the public face on the other side of the employment data firestorm. The 2011 graduate of **Vanderbilt University Law School** started Law School Transparency (LST) with fellow-student Patrick Lynch soon after he started at the Nashville, Tenn., law school.

In Fall 2010, the two then-students launched an effort to gather more useful employment data from the ABA-approved law schools. Their goal was to

gather data that would break out each graduate by position name, whether the bar was required, full-time or part-time status and salary.

But the law schools balked, leaving LST with high hopes, but no data. Still the pressure the non-profit placed on schools had an impact.

This past June, the ABA decided to publish more information on an individual school basis about the job a graduate is employed in — if a J.D. is required, if it's funded by a law school, what type of employer and where located.

For McEntee, it was a step in the right direction. But as he said at the time, the changes will only be made in the ABA's official guide to law schools and not apply to how a law school presents information on its own website.

Enter LST's latest report — a detailed accounting of every law school website that details whether the school has specifics on full-time versus part-time employment, long-term versus short-term, aggregate salary data, how many graduates' employment status is unknown and how easily accessible the information is.

"[The website] is a critical place that people go to for information, if not the first place, and schools understand when people look for information on their program, that's the place they're going to go," McEntee said.

Although it is such an important source of information for prospective and current students, the school website is also fairly unregulated by any source other than the school itself. This means law schools provide a wide range of data, from extensive lists and breakdowns to minimal data sets.

LST looked at 197 law school websites in January and published an index based on 19 different categories.

"We started asking very basic questions about what a perspective student would want to know,"

PHOTO BY STUART HANDY



Dean Rudy Hasl said the lawsuit was not unexpected given the state of the entry-level hiring market.

McEntee said, describing how LST staff came up with the 19 categories. “They are basic consumer questions that someone wants to know, if they know to ask them. Often what we find is that the basic employment rate schools advertise is insufficient, and a lot of people didn’t know that it’s insufficient.”

LST does not rank or score law schools. But based on feedback from McEntee and others, *The National Jurist* derived a calculation to grade each school. The result is that 41 percent of law school websites are failing, and an additional 15 percent receive a D. The National Jurist gave an A to any school that reported information equivalent to what NALP collects and reports in the aggregate. Schools that report data equivalent to what was included in the 2012 ABA Official Guide to Law Schools received at least a C. However, schools were penalized for misleading salary or employer data, dropping them by a full grade or more. For example, Indiana University-Bloomington would have received a B, but instead fell to a C-, due to misleading salary and employer data.

Six schools receive an A+ in our study, including Michigan State. But five of those schools improved their scores between the time that Law School Transparency released its data in early January, and we went to press in late February. Several other schools also improved their data.

One surprise: Thomas Jefferson School of Law received one of the best grades — an A, ranking it in the top 15 of the 197 ABA schools.

“We have tried to have that kind of information available for prospective students and it is one of the factors a student ought to consider when choosing a law school,” Hasl said.

Hasl said the school has reported such detailed data for two or three years, and what was available on its website as far back as 2003 was not that different.

Beth Kransberger, associate dean for student affairs at Thomas Jefferson, said the move toward greater transparency is a positive trend for legal education.

“There’s no reason law schools can’t be posting the information they’ve always been gathering on their website,” she said. “You have to feel good enough about the integrity of your law school and the legal education you’re providing that there’s no reason to shy away from transparency.”

Transparency Grades

Law school transparency reviewed all law school websites in January and again in February and scored each school on 18 criteria. We list six of the most important criteria. All data is available in the digital issue of this magazine.

Class of 2010: whether the school publishes employment information for the class of 2010.

Employment status: whether you can tell the employment status of every graduate.

Percentage unknown: percent of class for

whom employment status was unknown.

FT/PT: Whether you can tell difference between part-time and full-time employment.

Employer list: Does the school include a sample list of employers that is representative of actual employment. **Mis** = provides a list that is misleading.

Salary Information: Whether the school provides salary information. **Mis** = provides misleading salary info.

197	Class of 2010	Employment Status	Percentage Unknown	FT/PT	Employer Lists	Salary Info	Grade
Michigan State University	Yes	Yes	4.6%	Yes	No	Yes	A+
St. John's University	Yes	Yes	2.4%	Yes	No	Yes	A+
Temple University	Yes	Yes	1.0%	Yes	No	Yes	A+
University of Dayton	Yes	Yes	1.8%	Yes	Yes	Yes	A+
University of Nevada--Las Vegas	Yes	Yes	0.0%	Yes	No	Yes	A+
University of Tulsa	Yes	Yes	0.8%	Yes	Yes	Yes	A+
Florida State University	Yes	Yes	0.4%	Yes	No	Yes	A
Seattle University	Yes	Yes	0.0%	Yes	No	Yes	A
Seton Hall University	Yes	Yes	1.3%	Yes	No	Yes	A
Thomas Jefferson School of Law	Yes	Yes	19.0%	Yes	No	Yes	A
University of Denver	Yes	Yes	1.4%	Yes	No	Yes	A
University of Florida	Yes	Yes	0.2%	Yes	No	Yes	A
University of Houston	Yes	Yes	0.7%	Yes	No	Yes	A
University of Idaho	Yes	Yes	5.3%	Yes	No	Yes	A
University of Minnesota	Yes	Yes	0.0%	Yes	No	Yes	A
Catholic University of America	Yes	Yes	1.0%	Yes	No	Yes	A-
Charlotte School of Law	Yes	Yes	4.9%	Yes	No	Yes	A-
George Mason University	Yes	Yes	0.4%	Yes	No	Yes	A-
Northern Illinois University	Yes	Yes	7.1%	Yes	No	Yes	A-
Northern Kentucky University	Yes	Yes	3.4%	Yes	No	Yes	A-
Oklahoma City University	Yes	Yes	0.0%	Yes	No	Yes	A-
University of Arizona	Yes	Yes	1.5%	Yes	No	Yes	A-
University of Colorado	Yes	Yes	2.8%	Yes	No	Yes	A-
University of New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	0.8%	Yes	No	Yes	A-
University of Utah	Yes	Yes	3.2%	Yes	No	Yes	A-
Wayne State University	Yes	Yes	2.1%	Yes	No	Yes	A-
Boston College	Yes	Yes	1.5%	Yes	No	Yes	B+
Duke University	Yes	Yes	0.0%	No	No	Yes	B+
Golden Gate University	Yes	Yes	12.1%	Yes	No	Yes	B+
Regent University	Yes	Yes	2.4%	Yes	No	No	B+
University of Southern California	Yes	Yes	1.0%	No	No	Yes	B+
Vanderbilt University	Yes	Yes	1.5%	No	Yes	Yes	B+
Cleveland- Marshall College of Law	Yes	Yes	4.5%	No	No	Yes	B
Loyola University Chicago	Yes	Yes	1.1%	Yes	Mis	Yes	B
University of Akron	Yes	Yes	0.0%	Yes	Mis	Yes	B
University of California-Hastings	Yes	Yes	2.4%	Yes	Mis	Yes	B
University of Michigan	Yes	Yes	0.8%	No	No	Yes	B
Western New England College	Yes	Yes	5.8%	No	No	Yes	B
Hamline University	Yes	Yes	9.1%	Yes	No	Mis	B-
Northwestern University	Yes	Yes	1.0%	Yes	No	Mis	B-
South Texas College of Law	Yes	No	7.3%	Yes	No	Yes	B-
Southwestern Law School	Yes	Yes	4.7%	Yes	No	Mis	B-
University of Kansas	Yes	Yes	1.8%	Yes	Mis	Yes	B-
Villanova University	Yes	Yes	2.1%	No	No	No	B-
Washington and Lee University	Yes	Yes	4.1%	No	No	Yes	B-
Capital University	Yes	No	20.9%	No	No	Yes	C+
Drake University	Yes	Yes	0.0%	No	No	No	C+
John Marshall Law School	Yes	Yes	4.6%	Yes	No	Mis	C+

What are the real employment numbers?

David Anziska believes that law schools are reporting employment data that isn't even close to the real numbers. The New York attorney and **University of Michigan Law School** graduate is the attorney behind 14 of the 15 lawsuits against law schools.

"I believe that with a proper accounting method, the real employment number would be 40 percent," Anziska said. "Law schools send out questionnaires, and I think a good deal of graduates don't fill

it out or say they are employed [when they are not]."

Anziska said his estimate for full-time legal employment, which is much lower than the 68 percent reported by the National Association for Legal Placement, is based on the number of graduates who disclose their salary. He reasons that the others do not disclose that figure because they don't really have a job.

Anziska is so adamant in his belief that he has pulled together a consortium of eight law firms to file class action suits in

five different states.

There are now 73 plaintiffs behind Anziska's 14 lawsuits against **Thomas M. Cooley Law School, New York Law School, Albany Law School, Brooklyn Law School, California Western School of Law, Chicago-Kent College of Law, DePaul University College of Law, Florida Coastal School of Law, Golden Gate University School of Law, Hofstra Law School, The John Marshall Law School, Southwestern Law School, University of San Francisco School of Law** and **Widener University School of Law**.

A law firm not connected to the consortium has sued Thomas Jefferson School of Law.

Most of the schools, including Widener, Albany and Hofstra, said in statements that they stand by their job-placement statistics, which adhere to reporting guidelines set by the ABA and NALP.

NALP has said that its data is accurate and beyond reproach.

Jesse Strauss, an attorney working with Anziska, acknowledged that Anziska's 40 percent figure is "speculation."

"But there is a real number out there," Strauss said. "Law schools have been trying to explain why they can't figure it out. It is not hard to find out what people are doing. I guarantee their alumni offices are keeping track."

Their suit depends, in part, on it.

The lawsuits will need to prove that the schools reported misleading data, and that it was reasonable for the students to rely on the numbers when they made enrollment decisions. Experts have said that will be a hard sell, especially given the fact that the schools state they followed ABA guidelines. The plaintiffs may need to prove that the ABA is also at fault.

What the report shows

LST's report shows that many law schools are reporting what the organization calls misleading information.

McEntee says that the two categories where data is possibly misleading — the employer list and salary information — are the most important part of the index. An employer list is defined as a list describing places where graduates found work.

"It's worse to provide a list than not to provide a list, if it's misleading," McEntee said.

LST staffers looked at whether or not

197	Class of 2010	Employment Status	Percentage Unknown	FT/PT	Employer Lists	Salary Info	Grade
Nova Southeastern University	Yes	Yes	1.4%	Yes	No	Mis	C+
Suffolk University	Yes	Yes	4.3%	Yes	No	Mis	C+
University of Cincinnati	Yes	Yes	1.6%	No	No	Yes	C+
University of Illinois	Yes	Yes	2.6%	Yes	No	Mis	C+
Washburn University	Yes	Yes	5.0%	No	No	No	C+
Yale University	Yes	Yes	0.5%	Yes	No	Mis	C+
Albany Law School	Yes	Yes	2.0%	No	No	No	C
Atlanta's John Marshall Law School	Yes	Yes	0.0%	No	No	No	C
Brigham Young University	Yes	Yes	0.7%	Yes	No	Mis	C
Cornell University	Yes	Yes	0.0%	No	No	No	C
Faulkner University	Yes	Yes	1.2%	No	No	No	C
Illinois Institute of Technology	Yes	Yes	1.9%	No	No	Mis	C
Stanford University	Yes	Yes	0.5%	Yes	Mis	No	C
University of Connecticut	Yes	No	5.7%	No	No	Yes	C
University of Iowa	Yes	Yes	0.0%	No	No	Mis	C
University of Miami	Yes	Yes	8.9%	Yes	No	Mis	C
University of Missouri	Yes	Yes	0.7%	No	No	No	C
University of North Carolina	Yes	Yes	3.8%	Yes	No	Mis	C
University of Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	0.7%	No	No	Mis	C
University of Tennessee	Yes	Yes	3.0%	Yes	No	Mis	C
University of the Pacific	Yes	Yes	1.6%	No	No	Mis	C
West Virginia University	Yes	Yes	1.6%	No	No	No	C
Boston University	Yes	Yes	0.3%	Yes	No	Mis	C-
Drexel University	Yes	Yes	4.4%	No	Mis	No	C-
Duquesne University	Yes	Yes	12.3%	No	No	No	C-
Florida Coastal School of Law	Yes	Yes	7.6%	No	No	Mis	C-
Georgetown University	Yes	Yes	0.6%	No	No	Mis	C-
Indiana University--Bloomington	Yes	Yes	2.6%	Yes	Mis	Mis	C-
Loyola Marymount University	Yes	Yes	0.3%	No	No	Mis	C-
New York University	Yes	Yes	0.0%	No	No	Mis	C-
Pennsylvania State University	Yes	Yes	4.3%	No	No	Mis	C-
University of Chicago	Yes	Yes	0.0%	No	No	Mis	C-
University of St. Thomas	Yes	Yes	0.0%	Yes	Mis	Mis	C-
University of Virginia	Yes	Yes	0.3%	No	No	Mis	C-
University of Washington	Yes	Yes	0.0%	No	No	No	C-
William Mitchell College of Law	Yes	Yes	0.3%	No	No	Mis	C-
Baylor University	Yes	Yes	3.1%	No	No	Mis	D+
Chapman University	Yes	Yes	2.3%	Yes	Mis	Mis	D+
CUNY	Yes	Yes	0.8%	No	Mis	No	D+
Gonzaga University	Yes	Yes	7.9%	No	No	No	D+
Liberty University	Yes	No	10.5%	No	Yes	No	D+
New York Law School	Yes	Yes	5.0%	No	No	Mis	D+
Pace University	Yes	Yes	8.5%	Yes	No	Mis	D+
Santa Clara University	Yes	Yes	0.0%	No	No	Mis	D+
University of California--Davis	Yes	Yes	0.5%	No	No	Mis	D+
University of Hawaii	Yes	Yes	1.2%	No	No	Mis	D+
University of Mississippi	Yes	Yes	11.1%	Yes	No	Mis	D+
University of Nebraska	Yes	Yes	4.9%	No	No	Mis	D+

the list was representative of actual outcomes the school's graduates achieved. If certain segments of employment, such as big firms, were overrepresented in the list, LST characterized the list as misleading because it potentially colored the expectation of the people reading it.

On the other hand, to decide if salary data was misleading, LST used a more complicated analysis based on seven different triggers. These triggers included factors such as: Did the school indicate how much of the graduating class the salary data represented (was it just 10 percent of the class); Was it 50 percent of the class; Was the mean or median salary listed without the twenty-fifth and seventy-fifth percentiles listed; and Did the site simply list a salary range with no further details? Such triggers helped LST decide if data was misleading or not.

When the complete index was compiled in January, the results didn't look good for law schools. Twenty-seven percent of schools didn't list any 2010 salary data at all, while a little over half didn't list how many grads responded to their survey, a key piece of information to give context to the data.

After LST published the index and report, many law schools were quick to respond. McEntee said LST has been contacted by several schools about updates to their websites.

One school that updated was University of Colorado School of Law. Todd Rogers, the assistant dean for career development, said the school was working with their data for several months before the index was released.

"We put a lot of time and a lot of care in making sure the way we presented it would be easily accessible and easily understood," Rogers said.

This effort included new charts displaying the post-graduate data for three different employment fields, as well as text explaining the data in word form.

"Having the data here in-house and being able to share it with prospective students, current students and employers was an important step to take," Rogers said. "It was something that was the right thing to do."

It was also something the school may have felt obligated to do. Paul Campos, a law professor at the school, wrote an article in the New Republic last April about how law schools misrepresent their job placement numbers.

"If we exclude people employed in non-legal jobs, and people doing part-time work, the NALP number drops to 62.9 percent," he wrote. "But the bigger problem is that the 62.9 percent figure is still too high. While it excludes non-legal jobs and part-time work, it does not exclude people in temporary positions. So it seems worth asking: How many of the graduates who report doing full-time

legal work have permanent jobs — in the employment law sense of permanent — as opposed to doing temp work, such as being paid \$20 an hour to proofread financial documents in a warehouse, or \$12 an hour to do slightly glorified secretarial tasks?"



Paul Campos

197	Class of 2010	Employment Status	Percentage Unknown	FT/PT	Employer Lists	Salary Info	Grade
University of Notre Dame	Yes	Yes	1.7%	No	Mis	No	D+
University of Oregon	Yes	Yes	6.0%	No	No	Mis	D+
University of Richmond	Yes	Yes	2.5%	No	No	Mis	D+
University of San Diego	Yes	Yes	1.1%	No	No	Mis	D+
Washington University in St. Louis	Yes	Yes	1.5%	No	No	No	D+
Widener University	Yes	Yes	8.5%	No	No	Mis	D+
College of William and Mary	Yes	No	3.7%	No	No	No	D
George Washington University	Yes	Yes	0.4%	No	Mis	Mis	D
Indiana University--Indianapolis	Yes	Yes	0.0%	No	No	Mis	D
New England School of Law	Yes	Yes	10.0%	No	Mis	Mis	D
Ohio State University	Yes	Yes	0.0%	No	Mis	Mis	D
Roger Williams University	Yes	Yes	4.7%	Yes	Mis	Mis	D
Wake Forest University	Yes	No	5.0%	No	No	No	D
Charleston School of Law	Yes	No	8.1%	No	No	No	D-
Creighton University	Yes	No	4.3%	No	No	No	D-
Lewis & Clark College	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	No	D-
Phoenix School of Law	Yes	Yes	0.0%	No	Mis	Mis	D-
University of Missouri--Kansas City	Yes	No	0.0%	No	No	No	D-
University of Montana	Yes	No	2.6%	No	No	Mis	D-
American University	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	Mis	F
Appalachian School of Law	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Arizona State University	Yes	No	0.0%	No	No	Mis	F
Ave Maria School of Law	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Barry University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Brooklyn Law School	Yes	No	3.0%	No	Mis	Mis	F
California Western School of Law	Yes	No	8.8%	No	No	Mis	F
Campbell University	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	Mis	F
Cardozo (Yeshiva University)	Yes	No	3.4%	No	No	Mis	F
Case Western Reserve University	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	Mis	F
Catholic University (Puerto Rico)	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Columbia University	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	Mis	F
DePaul University	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	Mis	F
Elon University	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Emory University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Florida A&M University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Florida International University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Fordham University	Yes	No	1.0%	No	Mis	No	F
Georgia State University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Harvard University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Hofstra University	Yes	No	4.0%	No	Mis	Mis	F
Howard University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Inter-American University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Louisiana State University	Yes	No	2.0%	No	No	Mis	F
Loyola University New Orleans	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Marquette University	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	Mis	F
Mercer University	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	Mis	F
Mississippi College	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
North Carolina Central University	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Northeastern University	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Ohio Northern University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Pepperdine University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F

To answer this question, Campos said he reviewed 183 individual NALP forms from graduates at a top-50 law school.

“When we take temporary employment into account, it appears that approximately 45 percent of 2010 graduates of this particular top-50 law school had real legal jobs nine months after graduation,” he wrote.

While Campos did not name the top-

50 law school, it was clear that it might have been his school — the **University of Colorado**.

The article has made an impact.

Anziska said it was this article that led him to pursue the current litigation. On the other side, Phil Weiser, dean at University of Colorado, has made career placement his No.1 priority.

“We doubled down on career services

operations,” he said. “We are all out there looking for opportunities for our students. Students need to work on their career from day one. We want to be there to help them.”

Weiser said the additional staffing and resources would result in better placement numbers in three years.

Colorado is just one of many schools taking steps to improve placement services and to report more complete data.

Kransberger at Thomas Jefferson said employment information isn’t just useful for future law students. Current students can use the data to learn more about the opportunities available in the legal field, as well as where to target their studies and post-graduation employment plans.

Hasl said it’s important for students to keep in mind that the information is just a snapshot of where alumni are at a particular time in their careers, nine months after graduation.

“The one caution I would give is that it is a terrible mistake to put too much emphasis on what happens at graduation or nine months after graduation,” he said. “If one looks at the way a legal career evolves, very few [new attorneys] stay in the same position for the first five years. You really have to look over a longer span of time to understand if the investment is worth the cost.”

Meanwhile, Anziska said he plans to file suit against 20 additional schools and is seeking additional plaintiffs.

And McEntee is hopeful there will be a hearing soon before the Senate Subcommittee on Consumer Protection about the need for greater transparency in employment data. Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-CA) and Sen. Chuck Grassley (R-IO) have both already been involved in the issue, writing to the ABA about the matter. In October, Sen. Tom Coburn (R-OK) joined Boxer in calling for the Department of Education to start investigating law schools.

But there still has been no legislative action.

In fact, the most visible and immediate changes in employment reporting haven’t come from Congress, the ABA or under court order. The changes have come from the law schools themselves on their own websites.

For more information, visit us at
www.NationalJurist.com

197	Class of 2010	Employment Status	Percentage Unknown	FT/PT	Employer Lists	Salary Info	Grade
Quinnipiac University	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	Mis	F
Rutgers, Camden	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	Mis	F
Rutgers, Newark	Yes	No	3.5%	No	Mis	Mis	F
Samford University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Southern Illinois University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Southern Methodist University	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	Mis	F
Southern University Law Center	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
St. Louis University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
St. Mary's University	Yes	No	2.5%	No	No	Mis	F
St. Thomas University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Stetson University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Syracuse University	Yes	No	UNK	No	Mis	Mis	F
Texas Southern University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Texas Tech University	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Texas Wesleyan University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Thomas M. Cooley Law School	Yes	No	16.5%	No	Mis	Mis	F
Touro College	No	No	UNK	No	Mis	No	F
Tulane University	Yes	No	UNK	Yes	Mis	No	F
University at Buffalo	Yes	No	3.0%	No	Mis	Mis	F
University of Alabama	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of Arkansas--Fayetteville	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of Arkansas--Little Rock	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of Baltimore	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of California--Berkeley	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	Mis	F
University of California--Los Angeles	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	Mis	F
University of Detroit Mercy	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of Georgia	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of Kentucky	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	Mis	F
University of Louisville	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of Maine	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of Maryland	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	Mis	F
University of Memphis	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of New Mexico	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of North Dakota	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of Oklahoma	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of Pittsburgh	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of Puerto Rico	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of San Francisco	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of South Carolina	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of South Dakota	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of Texas	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	Mis	F
University of the District of Columbia	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of Toledo	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of Wisconsin	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
University of Wyoming	Yes	No	UNK	No	Yes	Mis	F
Valparaiso University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Vermont Law School	Yes	No	UNK	No	Mis	No	F
Western State University	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Whittier College	No	No	UNK	No	No	No	F
Willamette University	Yes	No	UNK	No	No	No	F