Educational Policy Committee Meeting - Open Session

University of California College of the Law, San Francisco
333 Golden Gate, San Francisco, CA 94102, 501 Deb Colloquium Rm.
2026-11-19 12:30 - 14:00 PST

Table of Contents

1. Roll Call

2. Public Comment Period

3. Action Item: Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes.....2

4. Report of Provost and Academic Dean Morris Ratner

- **4.1. Bar Passage.....7**
- **4.2. Employment.....16**
- **4.3. Accreditation.....18**
- **4.4. Policy Updates.....20**

5. Adjournment

Educational Policy Committee Meeting Minutes

University of California College of the Law, San Francisco
August 20, 2026

University of California College of the Law, San Francisco, Alumni Reception Center, Mary Kay Kane Hall, 200 McAllister St., San Francisco, CA 94102, ARC. Participants and members of the public were also able to join the meeting via the web link or dial-in numbers listed in the public notice of this meeting linked here: https://www.uclawsf.edu/our-story/board-of-directors/board-meeting-notices-agendas-and-materials/.

1. Roll Call

   The Chair called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m., and the Secretary called the roll.

   Directors Present:
   Director C. Don Clay, Chair
   Director Simona Agnolucci
   Director Shashi Deb
   Director Andrew Giacomini
   Director Andrew Houston
   Director Albert Zecher, *ex officio*

   Staff Participating:
   Chancellor & Dean David Faigman
   Associate Dean Binyamin Blum
   Director of Bar Passage Support Margaret Greer
   Assistant Chancellor & Dean/Chief of Staff to the Chancellor & Dean Jenny Kwon
   Assistant Dean for the Career Development Office Amy Kimmel
   Associate Director of Bar Passage Support and Professor of Practice Dan Martin
   Professor of Practice and Bar Success Analyst and Strategist Stefano Moscato
   Associate Dean for Research Dave Owen
   Deputy Chief Financial Officer & Controller Sandra Plenski
   Provost & Academic Dean Morris Ratner
   Dean of Enrollment Management June Sakamoto
   Chief Financial Officer David Seward
   Associate Dean for Experiential Learning Gail Silverstein

2. Public Comment Period

   The Chair invited public comment. No member of the public offered comment.

3. Action Item: Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes

   Motion:
   The Chair called for a motion to approve the committee's May 21, 2026 minutes.

Motion moved and seconded. The motion carried.

4. Report of Provost and Academic Dean Morris Ratner

4.1. Strategic Priorities in the Academic Program in Academic Year 2026-2027

Dean Ratner reviewed the College's strategic priorities for the 2026–2027 academic year. Key priorities include adapting the educational program to the NextGen Bar Exam, which will be administered beginning in 2028; continuing to support 1L and other students amid an increasingly challenging legal employment market; continuing implementation of the College's 2024 AI Strategic Plan; and managing the transition in the Provost role. Dean Ratner noted that the report was prepared jointly with his successor, Prof. Manoj Viswanathan, who will assume the position on January 1, to ensure a coordinated transition.

4.2. Enrollment Report

Dean Sakamoto provided an update on enrollment and the impact of the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, which eliminated Grad PLUS loans and established new federal borrowing limits for law and graduate students. Approximately 40 percent percent of students previously borrowed more than the new federal loan limits, creating uncertainty regarding private loan availability and student financing.

Despite these challenges, the College reported strong enrollment results. JD applications increased 13 percent over the previous year and 39 percent over two years. The incoming JD class totaled 460 students, with approximately 450 expected to remain for budgeting purposes after normal attrition. Dean Sakamoto credited the Admissions and Financial Aid teams for their substantial efforts in managing the new financing environment and supporting students. She also reported that the Financial Aid team successfully navigated delays in federal guidance and processing systems while providing extensive individual student counseling.

Dean Sakamoto reported that student retention improved, with 23 students transferring out, representing approximately 6 percent of the class. She attributed the improved retention partly to faculty relationships with students and increased outreach from College leadership. Directors thanked Dean Sakamoto and her team for their work and strong enrollment results. A director asked whether employment services would expand to support the larger incoming classes. Dean Ratner confirmed that additional staffing had been added, and Dean Kimmel noted that a temporary position had been created to address increased demand.

4.3. Student Success

Dean Ratner provided an update on bar passage preparation and employment outcomes. He discussed the College's preparations for the NextGen Bar Exam, which will be administered beginning in 2028. Preparation efforts include revising program learning outcomes, training faculty on NextGen testing methods, updating formative and summative assessments, and reviewing graduation requirements and the curriculum. The Educational Effectiveness Committee is expected to complete its work on proposed learning outcome revisions by the end of the academic year.

Dean Ratner reported that the Class of 2026 completed the July bar examination, with results expected in November. Prof. Moscato projected a first-time bar passage rate of at least 80 percent, although Dean Ratner noted that increased student reliance on AI tools and decreased engagement among some lower-performing students could negatively affect results. Prof. Greer and Prof. Martin discussed challenges engaging at-risk students and emphasized the importance of improving outreach and support. Potential strategies include using recent graduates as student ambassadors and developing AI tools to provide students with reliable bar preparation guidance.

Dean Kimmel provided an employment update, noting that employment data for the Class of 2026 remains preliminary, with approximately 38 percent of employment information still outstanding. Early indications suggest employment outcomes will remain relatively strong. Dean Kimmel discussed efforts to prepare the incoming Class of 2029 for accelerated legal recruiting, including earlier career advising, resume and cover letter workshops, increased pre-arrival communication, and an introductory webinar on large law firm recruiting. She also noted that the Career Development Office is evaluating ways to expand services in response to changing employment trends and increased student enrollment. Dean Ratner thanked Dean Kimmel and her team for their continued efforts.

4.4. Experiential Programs

Dean Silverstein provided an overview of the College's clinical education, externship, and pro bono programs. She explained that the College offers eight in-house clinics, along with field placement clinics and externship opportunities with nonprofit organizations, courts, government offices, corporations, and private law firms. These programs allow students to gain practical legal experience while receiving faculty supervision and academic credit. Dean

Silverstein noted that the College's clinical program is ranked 24th nationally in the U.S. News & World Report specialty rankings.

Dean Silverstein highlighted the benefits of experiential learning for bar passage, professional development, and employment readiness. She reported that each unit of clinic or externship fieldwork increases the probability of bar passage by approximately 1.1 percent, with particularly strong benefits for students in the fourth GPA quartile. She also emphasized that these experiences help students develop practical legal skills, professional identity, and client relationship skills.

Dean Silverstein reported that approximately 340 students participate in clinics and externships annually. The in-house clinics serve approximately 210 clients each year, and students collectively provide more than $4.5 million in free legal services. Directors thanked Dean Silverstein for her presentation and expressed interest in visiting the clinic facilities and learning more about individual clinic programs.

4.5. Global Programs Update

Dean Blum provided an update on the College's Global Programs, which oversee the LLM program, JD study abroad program, inbound foreign exchange program, and visiting scholar program. He reported that the College currently maintains 37 international university partnerships, many with leading institutions in their respective countries.

Dean Blum noted that the LLM program typically enrolls approximately 30 students annually, although recruitment has been challenging due to political and economic conditions, including visa difficulties and currency fluctuations. Inbound exchange enrollment has remained relatively stable at approximately 15 students annually, while outbound study abroad participation has stabilized at approximately 10 to 15 students per year following an increase after the pandemic.

Dean Blum discussed efforts to strengthen the LLM student experience by expanding access to the College's curriculum, connecting students with alumni mentors and JD student volunteers, and organizing educational and social activities. He also described efforts to diversify international partnerships, particularly in Latin America, and focus recruitment on established partner institutions that consistently send qualified students. Directors thanked Dean Blum for his leadership and stewardship of the program during a challenging period and expressed optimism about future international enrollment.

4.6. Center Annual Reports

Dean Ratner rested on the written materials, the Center Annual Reports.

4.7. Scholarly Achievements Report

Dean Owen provided an overview of the College's research activities, institutional impact, and priorities for the upcoming academic year. He emphasized that research is a central component of the College's mission and benefits courts, policymakers, the public, and students. He highlighted examples of faculty scholarship influencing Supreme Court arguments, public policy discussions, legislative testimony, and media coverage on topics including vaccines, artificial intelligence, and constitutional law.

Owen discussed the College's research activities, including faculty publications, peer-reviewed articles, op-eds, weekly speaker series, subject-specific research programs, conferences, and internal faculty workshops. He also highlighted the annual Works in Progress Symposium and a new faculty research retreat held near Point Reyes. In addition, he recognized the contributions of the College's research centers and student-edited journals.

Looking ahead, Dean Owen identified the responsible use of artificial intelligence in research as a major priority, including faculty education and the development of appropriate guidelines. He also emphasized mentoring and supporting pre-tenure faculty and increasing the visibility of faculty scholarship to strengthen the College's institutional reputation. Directors thanked Dean Owen for his service and contributions during his fourth year as Associate Dean for Research.

5. Adjournment

Chair Clay adjourned the meeting at 1:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

John K. DiPaolo, Secretary

Report 4.1 - Bar Passage

By Provost & Academic Dean Morris Ratner, Director of Bar Passage Support Margaret Greer, Associate Director of Bar Passage Support Dan Martin, and Bar Success Analyst Stefano Moscato

UC Law SF's first-time pass rate on the July 2026 administration of the California Bar Exam was **75%**, both for May 2026 graduates and for all first-time test takers regardless of graduation year. This was approximately three percentage points below the 78% average for California ABA-accredited law schools and below what we would have predicted based on prior-year results, even though we were predicting a lower first-time pass rate this year based on course completion data for Class of 2026. For statewide aggregate data (not specific to UC Law SF), see the State Bar's **announcement**.

This was our third-lowest pass rate since 2018 and our lowest during that period for a class whose legal education was not disrupted by COVID. By comparison, last year's first-time pass rate was 86%, against a California ABA law school average of approximately 84%. Similarly, the Class of 2024 first-time pass rate of 84.3% compared favorably to a CA ABA law school rate of 81%. Since 2018, our combined average first-time pass rate for May graduates (including Class of 2026) is approximately 80%, exceeding the California ABA law school average by roughly 1.6% over that period.

It appears that previously unmeasured factors contributed to these results. In prior years, we were able to predict pass rates with considerable accuracy using a limited set of factors, including cumulative law school GPA at graduation (LGPA) and effective bar course completion. This year, however, our predictions were substantially less accurate, suggesting that additional factors may have influenced outcomes. The strongest indicator that something we are not yet measuring is upending our modeling is that – for the first time in years – LGPA and course completion data did not as accurately predict outcomes as in prior years.[1]

We are beginning the process of identifying factors that likely contributed to the decline from last year, which represents a year-over-year (YoY) deterioration of approximately 5% relative to the CA ABA-accredited law school average first-time pass rate. We are testing the following hypotheses as to which we are taking proactive steps even as we continue to assess their explanatory power:

- **AI**: Bar success faculty supporting Class of 2026 graduates this year noticed a much higher level of reliance on Artificial Intelligence (AI) platforms to synthesize doctrine and provide practice and feedback. Graduates *can* use AI to effectively support bar study, but this summer used it in ways that appeared to undermine their studies.[2]

[1] One possible cause is that the commercial bar company reporting to us on graduates' multiple-choice questions was potentially faulty. We had our doubts but could not determine the exact degree to which commercial bar company reported completion data were off.

[2] One might expect that AI usage would negative impact all law school graduates, not just UC Law SF graduates. But our experience suggests that our graduates are particularly vulnerable to disruption, whether caused by exogenous factors (e.g., COVID) or students' own choices (e.g., AI use). This relates to the point

- **LEOP Q4**: Legal Education Opportunity Program (LEOP) graduates in the fourth quartile had a 15% pass rate, significantly below the 48% non-LEOP Q4 pass rate. This drove an overall LEOP first-time pass rate of 58%, well below the success of students in this cohort in recent years.
- **Essay subjects**: Unlike most years, where MBE subjects (all of which are currently required courses at UC Law) are also tested via essay questions, this year the essay questions were predominantly not MBE-tested subjects. We are testing whether the unusual array of essay topics may have played to students' weaknesses, e.g., if they had not taken those courses prior to graduating or had not completed those portions of their bar prep courses, which generally come later in the summer.

Bar outcomes are never the result of one factor. In attempting to identify the primary causes of the YoY decline, we are examining and addressing additional contributing factors. For example, we now have sufficient data to share with students to show that outcomes are materially worse for students who select private tutors in lieu of commercial bar preparation companies. Our data show that the small number of students who primarily rely on individual bar tutors each year have a first-time pass rate in recent years that is typically 0%. This does not explain the YoY drop this year, given the small numbers of graduates each year who choose this pathway. But every percentage point or fraction of a percentage point helps with overall performance.

This report includes descriptive findings from Bar Success Analyst Stefano Moscato, survey data shared by Director of Bar Passage Support Margaret Greer regarding graduate use of AI during bar study, and preliminary comparative data compiled by Provost & Academic Dean Ratner. We are also conducting regression analyses to identify factors associated with this year's outcomes and assess potential explanations for the Class of 2026's performance; our statistician's work typically provides insight that we will explore in future reporting.

July 2027 is the last year of the current exam format. Starting July 2028, California is administering the NCBE's NextGen Uniform Bar Exam, so we will be reassessing and looking for new connections among academic program design, student/graduate choices (e.g., law school course selection, post-grad bar course completion, etc.), and bar outcomes. It will take multiple years of data collection and analysis to be able to confidently build on and adapt our current knowledge base for program design and advising/support.

I. Descriptive Data for Class of 2026

A. Preliminary Bar Outcomes Statistics for Class of 2026

Professor Moscato preliminarily reviewed the data for Class of 2026 and shared his findings, which we report below.

about needing to punch above our weight. And it also lurks in the background of the LEOP Q4 analysis, below.

1. Pass Data by GPA Quartile and Plus Factors

Professor Moscato assembled these tables showing overall and cohort-specific pass rates, including bar prep course completion, and breaking the data down by GPA band:

Table 1: Pass Data Overall and by Cohort

Student Type	GPA	Take	Pass	Pass %	Course Compl.
All	3.251	290	218	**75%**	81%
non-LEOP	3.269	240	189	**79%**	83%
LEOP	3.162	50	29	**58%**	74%
non-DRP all	3.268	214	165	**77%**	83%
non-DRP + non-LEOP	3.280	186	147	**79%**	84%
non-DRP + LEOP	3.189	28	18	**64%**	80%
DRP all	3.201	76	53	**70%**	76%
DRP + non-LEOP	3.230	54	42	**78%**	80%
DRP + LEOP	3.128	22	11	**50%**	67%

Table 2 Pass Rates by GPA Band

GPA Band	Student Type	Take	Pass	Pass %	Course Compl.
Q1 (3.449)	All	74	73	**99%**	87%
	non-DRP + non-LEOP	50	49	**98%**	86%
	non-DRP + LEOP	6	6	**100%**	93%
	DRP + non-LEOP	14	14	**100%**	88%
	DRP + LEOP	4	4	**100%**	89%
Q2 (3.231)	All	73	64	**88%**	84%
	non-DRP + non-LEOP	48	41	**85%**	85%
	non-DRP + LEOP	6	5	**83%**	81%
	DRP + non-LEOP	14	14	**100%**	88%
	DRP + LEOP	5	4	**80%**	73%
Q3 (3.035)	All	73	54	**74%**	83%
	non-DRP + non-LEOP	53	39	**74%**	86%
	non-DRP + LEOP	7	5	**71%**	86%
	DRP + non-LEOP	11	8	**73%**	69%
	DRP + LEOP	2	2	**100%**	88%
Q4 (below 3.035)	All	70	27	**39%**	70%
	non-DRP + non-LEOP	35	18	**51%**	76%
	non-DRP + LEOP	9	2	**22%**	66%
	DRP + non-LEOP	15	6	**40%**	70%
	DRP + LEOP	11	1	**9%**	52%
Top 60% (3.130 & up)	All	175	160	**91%**	86%
	non-DRP + non-LEOP	120	109	**91%**	85%

GPA Band	Student Type	Take	Pass	Pass %	Course Compl.
	non-DRP + LEOP	13	12	**92%**	87%
	DRP + non-LEOP	33	31	**94%**	87%
	DRP + LEOP	9	8	**89%**	80%
B26-40% (3.035-3.129)	All	45	31	**69%**	83%
	non-DRP + non-LEOP	31	20	**65%**	87%
	non-DRP + LEOP	6	4	**67%**	84%
	DRP + non-LEOP	6	5	**83%**	62%
	DRP + LEOP	2	2	**100%**	88%
B11-25% (2.875-3.034)	All	43	20	**47%**	70%
	non-DRP + non-LEOP	23	14	**61%**	77%
	non-DRP + LEOP	5	2	**40%**	73%
	DRP + non-LEOP	6	3	**50%**	64%
	DRP + LEOP	9	1	**11%**	53%
B10 (below 2.875)	All	27	7	**26%**	69%
	non-DRP + non-LEOP	12	4	**33%**	73%
	non-DRP + LEOP	4	0	**0%**	58%
	DRP + non-LEOP	9	3	**33%**	73%
	DRP + LEOP	2	0	**0%**	45%

We see significant drops in performance at the bottom 40% mark (mid-way into Q3), the bottom 25% mark (Q4), and, especially, at the bottom 10% of the graduating class by LGPA. DRP status does not appear to be a driver of outcomes for most students, continuing a two-year trend that may be connected to UC Law SF's recent efforts to support students seeking accommodations on the bar exam.

2. YoY Course Completion and Quartile Performance Data

Professor Moscato reported the following preliminary and purely descriptive data:

This year's group of unsuccessful grads appeared to have been slightly better prepared than last year's:

- Course completion: 64.2% 2025, 67.5% 2026.
- Effective completion:[3] 72.2% 2025, 75.2% 2026.

More "well-prepared" grads failed this year than last:

- In 2025, 96% pass rate for those who exceeded the "400 hour" goal; this year, it's 87%.
- In 2025, 94% pass rate for those who exceeded 85% course completion; this year, it's 86%.

[3] Professor Moscato defines "effective course completion" as follows: "Effective course completion" adds to the bar course data the estimated time spent doing supplemental MBE sets and BEST essays. 100% effective course completion should be a little over 400 hours, which we identify for graduates as the completion rate at which prior-year graduates have a very high first-time pass rate.

Those who were *not* well-prepared did better this year than last: We saw a 43% pass rate in 2025 for those who did not reach 300 hours effective course completion; this year, it's 59%.[4]

Every GPA band did worse YoY:

- Q1 100% 2025, 99% 2026.
- Q2 95% 2025, 88% 2026.
- Q3 89% 2025, 74% 2026.
- Q4 58% 2025, 39% 2026.

Barbri takers did a bit better (32 out of 40, 80%) than Themis (75.3%), but the Barbri group was academically stronger (3.29 vs. 3.25 cumulative LGPA), which probably explains the variation.

The biggest YoY declines were in the bottom half of the class by LGPA. Q3 experienced a YoY decline of 15%. Q4 experienced a YoY decline of 19%. As discussed below, the biggest single decline in the data we have reviewed so far was in LEOP Q4, which experienced a YoY decline of 48%, a good portion of which is explained by lower YoY preparedness levels.

3. LEOP Q4

Bar Success Analyst Moscato reports that LEOP had an overall 58% pass rate and outperformed non-LEOP grads in Q3, but had extremely poor outcomes in Q4. LEOP Q1's first-time pass rate was 100% (10/10), Q2 82% (9/11), Q3 78% (7/9), and Q4 15% (3/20). Professor Moscato added:

> Last year, LEOP Q4 outperformed the rest of Q4…. Not surprisingly, that cohort was very well prepared: 79% course completion & 93% effective completion vs. 73% & 85% for non-LEOP. This year, the non-LEOP Q4 group basically mirrored last year's: 74% course completion & 83% effective completion, leading to a 48% pass rate. But LEOP Q4 did much worse: 58% course completion & 64% effective completion, leading to a 15% pass rate. If that LEOP Q4 cohort had matched last year's performance, our overall pass rate would have been just over the 78% CA ABA average—and we'd probably be far less concerned about the YoY change.

***

This reporting is preliminary and subject to change. In partnership with our statistician, we need to undertake regression analyses to more rigorously evaluate Class of 2026 outcomes. We will report on that more rigorous analysis in early 2027.

[4] This needs to be rigorously analyzed taking LGPA into account. If higher LGPA students were less prepared, that could explain some of the discrepancies YoY.

B. Preliminary Comparative Data

Historically, our bar outcomes have generally tracked our entering student credentials relative to other California ABA law schools. Our goal each year, however, is to outperform the results those credentials would predict, and in recent years we have largely succeeded. Our exceptionally robust academic skills development and bar support programs have helped make that possible. This year, however, our 2026 graduates do not appear to have outperformed expectations, based on informal reporting from some of our peer schools about their pass rates. But we do not yet have official pass data for peer ABA schools, so the following table is incomplete. Once we have official pass data, we will update this table.

Table 3: CA ABA Law School Comparison Data

Law School	UGPA (2023 509 Report)	LSAT (2023 509 Report)	Admission Metric Rank (Est.)[5]	July 2026 First-Time Pass Rate
Stanford	3.83/3.95/3.99	171/173/175	1	TBD
UC Berkeley	3.77/3.87/3.97	168/170/173	2	TBD
UCLA	3.72/3.92/3.98	165/170/171	3	TBD
USC	3.77/3.88/3.96	165/169/169	4	TBD
UC Irvine	3.49/3.72/3.84	164/167/169	5	TBD
UC Davis	3.49/3.69/3.82	159/165/167	6	TBD
Pepperdine	3.48/3.86/3.93	159/164/166	7	TBD
USD	3.52/3.80/3.89	157/161/163	8	TBD
Loyola	3.51/3.71/3.83	157/161/163	9	TBD
Chapman	3.30/3.67/3.77	153/161/162	10	TBD
UC Law SF	**3.40/3.59/3.74**	**157/160/162**	**11**	**75%**
Santa Clara	3.31/3.55/3.72	155/159/162	12	TBD
Southwestern	3.17/3.44/3.63	152/155/158	13	TBD
McGeorge	2.94/3.40/3.63	152/155/158	14	TBD
USF	3.09/3.46/3.67	151/153/156	15	TBD
Cal Western	3.11/3.38/3.57	150/153/156	16	TBD
Western State	2.91/3.16/3.38	150/152/154	17	TBD

Though imperfect, and though commentators have explained that LSAT scores today are "inflated" and are thus less predictive of bar success than in prior years, entering metrics still roughly correlate with bar outcomes in most years. We should be able to see in the coming weeks when the State Bar releases law school results whether this trend holds for the July 2026 administration.

But just looking at Table 3, some insights are apparent. UC Law SF's bar pass rate was below the 78% CA ABA average, but so are UC Law SF's entering metrics for Class of 2026.

[5] The estimated metric ranking for CA ABA-accredited law schools' entering classes focuses on LSAT, using UGPA as a tie breaker when LSAT scores are identical or nearly so.

Five law schools – Stanford, Berkeley, UCLA, USC, and UC Irvine – have 25th percentile admission metrics that exceed our 75th percentile. Our closest metric peers (schools that admit similarly credentialed students) are Santa Clara, which is just below us, and Chapman, which enrolls slightly higher metric students at the median, but takes more admission risks and has a longer LSAT tail in its 25th percentile. UC Davis, Pepperdine, USD, and Loyola all enrolled higher metric classes than UC Law SF did in FA23 (Class of 2026). Again, we will report peer school outcomes to identify schools that – based on metrics – appear to have underperformed or overperformed on the July 2026 administration.

II. AI

Student use of AI has become a barrier to learning throughout higher education, pre-graduation. UC Law SF has recently adopted guidance for students to help them determine how to use AI in ways that support and do not undermine their learning. See this page[6] developed by Associate Dean of Teaching Jennifer Freeland, which we shared with all current students last week, our first written and comprehensive guide to effectively using AI as a study aid.

This past summer, our graduates reported using AI in ways that did not support their learning. Among other things:

1. Graduates used AI to synthesize bar study materials instead of synthesizing materials on their own. The process of synthesis is key to learning.
2. Some graduates may have overestimated their competence levels based on overly generous AI feedback.[7]

Director of Bar Passage Support Greer is surveying graduates who failed the July 2026 exam, specifically asking about AI use. So far, the survey responses track what we observed during the summer bar study period. Over half of the 25 respondents referenced using AI to synthesize material and generate feedback.

Some responses to Professor Greer's survey suggest that graduates may have studied the law they needed to know using imprecise language, essentially asking AI to convert legal terminology to common vernacular. One graduate wrote: "Sometimes I would ask Claude to explain a rule to me like I was 12 if I was having a hard time understanding it or remembering it." Another wrote that they used AI to "simplify complex rules." Because the bar graders look for use of correct legal terminology, one theory we'll explore is whether students, in asking AI to convert legal terms and concepts into more easily understood language effectively memorized the wrong language and law.

---

[6] *See* https://sharknet.uclawsf.edu/site/0ac215ee-cb35-5a22-8c7f-fc2220357d59/page/d5d80cf1-1eda-4706-b260-5264e422f2d8.

[7] Professor Greer reports that Themis used an AI grading platform this summer for some of the essays. We heard mixed results from grads. Some reported receiving feedback/scores that lined up with BEST grading. Others received scores that were inflated and inaccurate.

We are proactively advising Class of 2027 about correct use of AI by, among other things: (1) providing general guidance to all law students (see above), (2) using Critical Studies courses that nearly all students take to help them understand the benefits and harms of AI use, and (3) centering advising on AI during post-graduation supplemental bar programming.

III. LEOP

As noted above, LEOP graduates in the fourth quartile by law school GPA at graduation (Q4) had a 15% pass rate on the July 2026 administration compared to a 57% pass rate last year. Much of this decline was the predictable result of lower post-graduate commercial bar course completion levels. But that just begs a question: why did LEOP Q4 graduates struggle to study effectively for the bar exam this summer to a greater degree than in prior years? We are still investigating that question and brainstorming ways to engage Class of 2027 graduates in this cohort. Options we are exploring include:

- Extending the pre-graduation faculty mentor program into the post-graduation summer bar study period.
- Hiring more recent LEOP graduate coaches to provide 1-1 support, which could help us overcome the lack of engagement and distrust of institutional guidance that seems to pervade Q4 overall.
- Seeking support from the Assistant Dean for LEOP to engage and cultivate trust in this cohort with OASIS personnel assigned to support it.

LEOP Q4 has historically been more vulnerable to annual changes in conditions that disproportionately affect first-time bar passage. For example, this cohort did particularly poorly in the COVID years. We therefore hope that this year's results are an anomaly, but we are adding targeted support on the assumption that they are not.

IV. Essay Questions

This year, essay topics included legal ethics and evidence,[8] which all students are required to take, plus California community property, remedies, and business associations, which are not required courses. Prior studies have not demonstrated a link between taking a particular bar course and bar passage. Instead, our studies have consistently shown that what matters is the total number of bar courses taken. Still, the fact that so many non-MBE subjects were tested in the written portion of the exam this year provides an opportunity to reassess that factor.

V. Support for February Re-Takers

In the meantime, our bar support team continues to devote substantial resources and individualized assistance to graduates who did not pass the July 2026 examination. Director of Bar Passage Support Margaret Greer's prior reporting explains the array of bar support we provide to repeaters within two years of graduation, including individual

[8] The evidence question prompt called for a response pertaining to the California rules.

one-on-one advising to debrief the July 2026 exam and develop a plan for February 2027; free access to AdaptiBar; personalized feedback on 10+ essay and PT answers via the BEST Essay Program; group sessions, with additional personalized feedback, to attempt and debrief essay and PT questions; free mental-health support via Carbon Health; a special training session by a bar success expert on multiple-choice questions; and faculty/alumni-graduate mentorship.

Report 4.2 - Employment

By Assistant Dean for Career Development Office Amy Kimmel

I. Class of 2026 Employment (Year Over Year Data)

The Career Development Office (CDO) captures employment data for the graduation class at the start of every month on our graduate tracking sheet. Our graduate tracking sheet includes anyone who has not given us all the information required for reporting so it is possible that a graduate's status may change in the coming months.

- November 2, 2026: 88/319[1] (28% are unemployed and/or we do not have complete data on their employment status)
- November 4, 2025: 87/354 (25% are unemployed and/or we do not have complete data on their employment status)
- November 5, 2024: 120/366 (33% are unemployed and/or we do not have complete data on their employment status)
- November 1, 2023: 114/345 (33%are unemployed and/or we do not have complete data on their employment status)
- November 1, 2022: 107/309 (34% are unemployed and/or we do not have complete data on their employment status)

II. Big Law Recruiting

As discussed, Big Law hiring is proceeding at an accelerated timeline again this recruiting season. To best serve our students, we updated and enhanced our fall programming. We added two workshops "Introduction to Big Law/Private Sector Recruiting" and "Introduction to Public Interest/Public Sector Recruiting" on consecutive weeks at the end of September/beginning of October. We again offered two Employer Showcase events in October which are large scale networking events featuring Big Law firms and other employers. Additionally, we offered a workshop dedicated to Big Law recruiting to all students and a LEOP focused event on balancing job applications with finals. All these events were very well attended and received. Our office opened 1L one-on-one appointments with our office earlier (September 1 rather than October 1) and saw almost 200 1Ls in the first month. We hit record numbers of students matched with an alumni mentor through our Alumni Mentor Program.

We will be offering an OCI program in late January for Big Law employers hiring for Summer 2028. This is in addition to our ad hoc Spring OCI program offered to all employers throughout the spring semester[2], as well as our annual Public Interest Public Sector Day in early February (featuring over 100 non-profit and government employers).

[1] We expect this to be the final number of total students in this reporting cohort.

[2] Spring OCI occurs throughout the semester. There are no set dates, rather employers can simply pick an interview date that works best for them and we organize the application period around that date.

BigLaw recruiting has been declining in the past few years, and this trend is expected to continue. Meanwhile, class sizes at law schools nationally are increasing. These trends, in addition to the use of AI, are poised to have significant impacts on the number of grads hired into Big Law and entry level hiring more broadly.[3] We continue to focus resources on highlighting other career paths (particularly at smaller and mid-size firms) as well as providing events and resources that explore how graduates can build a career and reach their goals without beginning in BigLaw.

[3] NALP reports that employment metrics are likely at their near-term peaks for the Classes of 2024 and 2025. Economic uncertainty and AI may keep law firm summer program class sizes small for Classes of 2027 and 2028.

Report 4.3 - Accreditation

By Provost & Academic Dean Morris Ratner

This report provides an update regarding the recent accreditation site visit by the Western Association of Colleges Senior College and University Commission (WASC).

The WASC site visit team concluded its work on Friday, October 16. They started by thanking the UC Law SF community and especially Director of Accreditation and Assessment Andrea Bing for supporting their work. In their exit meeting, they offered seven commendations and six recommendations.

The WASC site visit team offered the following commendations (based on my notes of their oral exist meeting comments):

1. UC Law SF's collegial and adaptable culture fostered by our small size, focus on legal education, etc. (WASC noted that "colleagues unite around common goals and take the initiative to drive improvement.")
2. The College's commitment to safety and community service in the Tenderloin, including our partnership with Urban Alchemy, development of property assets, and build-out of the Academic Village.
3. Collective leadership approach to decision-making and crisis management.
4. Exceptional student outcomes regarding bar passage and employment.
5. Proactive leadership integrating AI into legal education and the law school's determination to position itself at the forefront of this emerging field.
6. Effective advocacy with the State.
7. Engagement with alumni who are proud of the College's progress and see the curriculum as producing effective entry-level lawyers.

The WASC site visit team offered the following recommendations, which will presumably be explained in their written report and findings:

1. Further develop and implement a coordinated transition plan to preserve knowledge and culture, clarify responsibilities, and ensure continuity of operations.
2. Commence development of a new comprehensive strategic plan (CFR 4.8).
3. Strengthen institutional research via systematic data collection, curation, visualization, and self-service access to support IR (CFR 3.10, 4.2, and 4.4).
4. Collect and use direct evidence of student learning in the assessment of program learning outcomes (CFR 2.7 and 2.9).
5. Evaluate staffing needs and faculty workload to align with institutional priorities and ensure equity internally and compared to peer institutions (CFR 3.1 and 3.2).
6. Accelerate deployment of authorized AI tools for administration purposes (CFR 3.6).

The site visit team will draft a report reflecting its analysis and findings. UC Law SF will have a chance to review for factual errors. The final report will then go to WASC, and we

will have the opportunity to write an official response. Accreditation is on calendar for February 2027.

Report 4.4 – Policy Updates

By Provost & Academic Dean Morris Ratner

Chancellor & Dean David Faigman recently approved minor updates to the base compensation policies for Ladder Faculty, Long-Term Contract Faculty, and Lecturers. Changes include the following:

- Updated references to the law school's name (from "UC Hastings" to "UC Law SF").
- Updated references to our revised Faculty Rules.
- Edits to conform to practice the language on the target allocation of merit compensation pool funds across ranks, i.e., making it clearer that funds are normally allocated across ranks (Ladder Faculty, Long-Term Contract Faculty, and Lecturers) in reasonable proportion to each rank's share of the compensation pool based on total compensation within each rank.

The relevant policies are attached.

BASE COMPENSATION
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
[June 12, 2019][1]

Section I: Authority and Scope

A. Pursuant to Board of Directors Standing Order 100.4(d), the Chancellor & Dean is authorized to determine compensation of employees, including faculty. With regards to faculty, that authority is subject to Board reporting and review, pursuant to Board of Directors By-Laws 8.1(a) and 8.2(h).
B. This policy addresses base compensation. For tenured or tenure-track (ladder) faculty members, "base compensation" is a fixed amount that is derived from the rates contained in the faculty salary scales issued by the Chancellor & Dean's Office. For faculty serving in formal administrative roles (e.g., as deans or as center or program directors), base pay also includes compensation associated with the administrative appointment, which is designated as either full-time or part-time.
C. A separate "Additional Compensation Policy" addresses summer research stipends, grants, and other compensation.

Section II: Pre-Tenure and Tenure Steps

A. "Faculty" are defined by the operative Faculty Rules. This policy applies to tenured or tenure-track faculty, which includes "distinguished," "regular" and "In-House Clinic" faculty members as defined in the Faculty Rules.
B. An entry-level pre-tenure faculty member's base compensation is the Associate Professor, Step 1 rate. The Chancellor & Dean has discretion to start entry-level, pre-tenure faculty at Step 2.
C. Pre-tenure faculty who have the equivalent of at least three years, pre-tenure and on a tenure track, either as a result of working at UC Hastings or as a result of service credit recognized in their hire letter from another institution if hired as a lateral, are at Step 2 at the start of their fourth pre-tenure year.
D. In the first year of tenure, each tenured faculty member are automatically moved to Step 3, if they are not already hired at or above that rate as a lateral. A newly appointed lateral tenured faculty member will start at least at Step 3. A current faculty member who is elevated to distinguished faculty status will presumptively and automatically increase two steps or to Step 11, whichever is lower; however, in exceptional cases, the Chancellor & Dean has discretion to increase base compensation by up to three full steps.
E. After a tenured faculty member reaches Step 3, additional step increases are the result of merit adjustments and are not automatic, except for distinguished faculty appointment step increases mentioned in the preceding section.

[1] Amended April 21, 2021, July 7, 2022, and September 7, 2026.

Section III: Step and Other Increases to Base Salary

A. Pre-tenure faculty are not eligible for base compensation increases except as indicated in Section II, above, or as part of a General Salary Adjustment (GSA).
B. Tenured faculty are eligible for two types of base salary increases:
    1. GSA; and
    2. Merit Increases, including off scale increases of fractions of a step.

Section IIIA: General Salary Adjustment (GSA)

A. The amount of the GSA increase is determined by the Chancellor & Dean and approved by the Board.
B. GSAs are not merit-based, and are applied consistently across an entire employee class, within the parameters established by the Board.

Section IIIB: Merit Increases

A. Eligibility and Funding;
    1. Merit increases are based on academic attainment and performance as determined pursuant to the standards and procedures set forth herein; they are not automatic.
    2. Merit increases may be made only within the limitations of available funds as determined by the Chancellor & Dean upon the recommendation of the Provost & Academic Dean.
    3. Over time, and subject to variations in the cost of living, approximately half of the money available to adjust faculty salaries should be allocated to merit pay awards, as between GSAs and merit adjustments
    4. Over time, merit pools will be allocated across ranks (Ladder Faculty, Long-Term Contract Faculty, and Lecturers) in reasonable proportion to each rank's share of the compensation pool based on total compensation within each rank.

B. Procedures:
    1. Notice, Application, and Burden:
        a. In years where merit increase funds are available, the Chancellor & Dean shall make this known to faculty at the time of requesting their annual report and shall invite them to include in their annual report an indication of whether they want to be considered for a merit increase.
        b. This does not preclude the Chancellor & Dean from rewarding a faculty member with a merit increase even if they have not requested it.
        c. Otherwise, the burden should be on the faculty member to ask for consideration and to make a convincing case for such an award.
    2. Relevant Time Period:
        a. The period of evaluation shall be since the last merit increase or since the person’s advancement to tenured status, whichever is later.
    3. Process:

a. The Provost & Academic Dean shall review the annual reports every year, consulting with the Associate Dean for Research as appropriate on matters of scholarship. Based on that review, the Provost & Academic Dean shall make merit adjustment recommendations to the Chancellor & Dean on a confidential basis.
b. After reviewing that record, the Chancellor & Dean will make final decisions on which individual faculty members should receive merit pay step increases.
c. The Chancellor & Dean's decisions are not subject to further review on the merits and are not circulated to faculty as a matter of course, except in the aggregate.
d. Merit increases will not be made outside of this process, except under extraordinary circumstances.

C. Standards:
1. The standards to be applied to award merit pay are the same as the ones the faculty follows in its hiring and tenure decisions, which includes giving scholarship and teaching higher rank than service, though extraordinary service may be recognized.
2. However, those standards set a floor, and faculty eligible for merit awards will be evaluated in comparison to each other.
3. Distinguished Faculty are eligible for a merit increase, but they will be held to a higher standard than other tenured faculty once they reach Step 11.

D. Amounts:
1. A merit increase may range from a fraction of a step to multiple steps.
2. Normally, a merit increase will be a half step or a step, depending on the funding amount and the number of eligible persons.
3. In exceptional circumstances, a merit adjustment can be more than a full step.

E. Reporting:
1. An aggregate summary of merit increases shall be distributed to faculty after merit adjustments have been awarded.

BASE COMPENSATION
Long-Term Contract Faculty
[June 12, 2019][1]

Section I: Authority and Scope

A. Pursuant to Board of Directors Standing Order 100.4(d), the Chancellor & Dean is authorized to determine compensation of employees, including faculty. With regards to faculty, that authority is subject to Board reporting and review, pursuant to Board of Directors By-Laws 8.1(a) and 8.2(h).
B. This policy addresses base compensation. For Long-Term Contract Faculty ("LTCF"), "base compensation" is a fixed amount that is derived from the rates contained in the faculty salary scales issued by the Chancellor & Dean's Office. For faculty serving in formal administrative roles (e.g., as deans or as center or program directors), additional compensation is subject to negotiation and is not included in this policy, but it is considered covered compensation for purposes of UCRP.
C. A separate "Additional Compensation Policy" addresses summer research stipends, grants, and other compensation.

Section II: Steps

A. "Faculty" are defined by the operative Faculty Rules. This policy applies to LTCF as defined in the Faculty Rules.
B. An entry-level LTCF member's base compensation is presumptively the Step 1 rate. The Chancellor & Dean and Provost & Academic Dean have discretion to start entry-level LTCF at Step 2.
C. LTCF will have an automatic step increase to Step 2 at the start of the second of two three-year contracts, and to Step 3 at the commencement of the first seven-year presumptively renewable contract.
D. LTCF who are above Step 2 at the start of a second three-year contract or who are above Step 3 at the start of the first seven-year contract do not get automatically adjusted upward by one step.
E. These are the only "automatic" step increases contemplated by this policy. All other step increases will be made pursuant to the merit compensation provisions of Section IIIB, below.
F. The Provost & Academic Dean has discretion to recognize lateral LTC faculty member pre-hiring clinical teaching experience by starting a new LTC faculty member at Step 2 on the first of two three-year contracts. An LTC faculty member who starts at Step 2 does not have an automatic step increase on renewal of the first of two three-year contracts.

[1] Amended April 21, 2021 and September 7, 2026.

Section III: Step and Other Increases to Base Salary

A. LTCF on the first of two three-year contracts are not eligible for base compensation increases except as indicated in Section II, above, or as part of a General Salary Adjustment (GSA).
B. LTCF on the second of two three-year contracts or on presumptively renewable seven-year contracts are eligible for two types of base salary increases in addition to those described in Section II, above:
    1. GSA; and
    2. Merit Increases, including off scale increases of fractions of a step.

Section IIIA: General Salary Adjustment (GSA)

A. The amount of the GSA increase is determined by the Chancellor & Dean and approved by the Board.
B. GSAs are not merit-based, and are applied consistently across an entire employee class, within the parameters established by the Board.

Section IIIB: Merit Increases

A. Eligibility and Funding;
    1. Merit increases are based on performance as determined pursuant to the standards and procedures set forth herein; they are not automatic.
    2. Merit increases may be made only within the limitations of available funds as determined by the Chancellor & Dean.
    3. Over time, and subject to variations in the cost of living, approximately half of the money available to adjust faculty salaries should be allocated to merit pay awards, as between GSAs and merit adjustments.
    4. Over time, merit pools will be allocated across ranks (Ladder Faculty, Long-Term Contract Faculty, and Lecturers) in reasonable proportion to each rank's share of the compensation pool based on total compensation within each rank.

B. Procedures:
    1. Notice, Application, and Burden:
        a. In years where merit increase funds are available, the Chancellor & Dean shall make this known to faculty at the time of requesting their annual report and shall invite them to include in their annual report an indication of whether they want to be considered for a merit increase.
        b. This does not preclude the Chancellor & Dean from rewarding a faculty member with a merit increase even if they have not requested it.
        c. Otherwise, the burden should be on the faculty member to ask for consideration and to make a convincing case for such an award.
    2. Relevant Time Period:

a. The period of evaluation shall be since the last merit increase or since the person's advancement to a second three-year contract, whichever is later.

3. Process:
   a. The Provost & Academic Dean shall review the annual reports every year and shall make merit adjustment recommendations to the Chancellor & Dean on a confidential basis.
   b. After reviewing that record, the Chancellor & Dean will make final decisions on which individual faculty members should receive merit pay step increases.
   c. The Chancellor & Dean's decisions are not subject to further review on the merits and are not circulated to faculty as a matter of course, except in the aggregate.
   d. Merit increases will not be made outside of this process except under extraordinary circumstances.

C. Standard:
   1. The standards to be applied to award merit pay are the same as the ones the faculty follows in its hiring and contract renewal decisions for LTCF under the Faculty Rules, including teaching and modeling of excellent lawyering practice, contribution to the profession, public service, and contributions to the College community.
   2. Contributions to the College community may include, among other things, contributions to the methods and substance of clinical teaching, professional skills teaching, or legal education, as well as the provision of vital or novel services to clients or communities.

D. Amounts:
   1. A merit increase may range from a fraction of a step to multiple steps.
   2. Normally, a merit increase will be a half step or a step, depending on the funding amount and the number of eligible persons.
   3. In exceptional circumstances, a merit adjustment can be more than a full step.

E. Reporting:
   1. An aggregate summary of merit increases shall be distributed to faculty after merit adjustments have been awarded.

BASE COMPENSATION
Lecturers [Effective April 21, 2021][1]

Section I: Authority and Scope

A. Pursuant to Board of Directors Standing Order 100.4(d), the Chancellor & Dean is authorized to determine compensation of employees, including faculty. With regards to faculty, that authority is subject to Board reporting and review, pursuant to Board of Directors By-Laws 8.1(a) and 8.2(h).
B. This policy addresses base compensation. For Lecturers, "base compensation" is a fixed amount that is derived from the rates contained in the faculty salary scales for different categories of Lecturers issued by the Chancellor & Dean's Office and based on the College's assessment of the relevant market. For faculty serving in formal administrative roles (e.g., as deans or as center or program directors), base pay also includes compensation associated with the administrative appointment, which is designated as either full-time or part-time. Lecturers' base compensation is memorialized in contracts that are not presumptively renewable, but that may be renewed.
C. A separate "Additional Compensation Policy" addresses summer teaching compensation, grant stipends, and other compensation.

Section II: Steps

A. "Faculty" are defined by the operative Faculty Rules. This policy applies to Lecturers as defined in the Faculty Rules.
B. An entry-level Lecturer's base compensation is the Step 1 rate.
C. Full-time Lecturers who are on scale (at the Step dictated based on years of service as Lecturers at the College) will have an automatic step increase every three years until they reach Step 6, after which step increases are achieved via merit adjustments described below.
D. These are the only "automatic" step increases contemplated by this policy. The Lecturer salary scales go beyond Step 6. Step increases beyond Step 6 will be made pursuant to the merit compensation provisions of Section III, below, and will not be made automatically as a function of years of service as a Lecturer.
E. The Provost & Academic Dean has discretion to recognize Lecturers' pre-hiring teaching experience by starting a new Lecturer at Step 2. In exceptional circumstances, the Chancellor & Dean may approve starting a new Lecturer above Step 2, but such circumstances will rarely be found to exist.

Section III: Step and Other Increases to Base Salary

A. Lecturers who have served fewer than three consecutive years are not eligible for base compensation increases except as part of a General Salary Adjustment (GSA).

[1] As amended September 7, 2026.

B. Lecturers who have served at least three years are eligible for two types of base salary increases in addition to those described in Section II, above:
    1. GSA; and
    2. Merit Increases, including off scale increases of fractions of a step.

Section IIIA: General Salary Adjustment (GSA)

A. The amount of the GSA increase is determined by the Chancellor & Dean and approved by the Board.
B. GSAs are not merit-based, and are applied consistently across an entire employee class, within the parameters established by the Board.

Section IIIB: Merit Increases

A. Eligibility and Funding;
    1. Merit increases are based on performance as determined pursuant to the standards and procedures set forth herein; they are not automatic.
    2. Merit increases may be made only within the limitations of available funds for this faculty rank as determined by the Chancellor & Dean.

B. Procedures:
    1. Determination of merit years:
        a. The Chancellor & Dean has discretion to create a merit pool and to determine its size.
        b. No application is needed, though Lecturers' annual reports will be among the documents considered in connection with merit determinations.
    2. Relevant Time Period:
        a. The period of evaluation shall be since the last merit increase or since the person's advancement to a second three-year contract, whichever is later.
    3. Process:
        a. In years in which merit pools are available, the Provost & Academic Dean will notify lecturers so that they have an opportunity to seek and justify a merit award, e.g., in their annual reports.
        b. The Provost & Academic Dean shall review the annual reports every year and shall make merit adjustment recommendations to the Chancellor & Dean on a confidential basis.
        c. After reviewing that record, the Chancellor & Dean will make final decisions on which individual faculty members should receive merit pay step increases.
        d. The Chancellor & Dean's decisions are not subject to further review on the merits and are not circulated to faculty as a matter of course, except in the aggregate.
        e. Merit increases will not be made outside of this process.

C. Standard:

1. Merit determinations are made on the basis of Lecturers' teaching load and excellence, and on the basis of service contributions to the College.

D. Amounts:
   1. A merit increase may range from a fraction of a step to multiple steps.
   2. Normally, a merit increase will be between 0.25 and 1.0 steps.
   3. In exceptional circumstances, a merit adjustment can be more than a full step.