

**CHAIRPERSON**

Solomon Oliver, Jr.  
Cleveland, OH

**CHAIRPERSON-ELECT**

Joan S. Howland  
Minneapolis, MN

**VICE CHAIRPERSON**

Rebecca White Berch  
Phoenix, AZ

**SECRETARY**

Raymond C. Pierce  
Raleigh, NC

**PAST CHAIRPERSON**

Kent D. Syverud  
St. Louis, MO

**SECTION DELEGATES TO THE  
HOUSE OF DELEGATES**

Ruth V. McGregor  
Phoenix, AZ

Pauline A. Schneider  
Washington, DC

**BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
LIAISON**

Thomas R. Curtin  
Morristown, NJ

**YOUNG LAWYERS DIVISION  
LIAISON**

Daniel R. Thies  
Chicago, IL

**COUNCIL MEMBERS**

Jane H. Aiken  
Washington, DC

Leo A. Brooks, Sr.  
Fort Belvoir, VA

Paulette Brown  
Madison, NJ

Edwin J. Butterfoss  
Saint Paul, MN

Michael J. Davis  
Lawrence, KS

Roger J. Dennis  
Philadelphia, PA

Tracy Allen Giles  
Roanoke, VA

James M. Klein  
Charleston, SC

Irene Lehne  
Havertown, PA

(Law Student Division Member)

Gregory Murphy  
Billings, MT

Cynthia Nance  
Fayetteville, AR

Jequita H. Napoli  
Norman, OK

Maureen O'Rourke  
Boston, MA

Antonio Garcia-Padilla  
San Juan, PR

Morgan T. Sammons  
San Francisco, CA

Edward N. Tucker  
Baltimore, MD

September 3, 2014 (re-sent October 8, 2014)

Mr. Michael Hammond  
116 Little John Drive  
McMurray, Pennsylvania 15317

Re: Complaint against Texas A&M University School of Law

Dear Mr. Hammond:

I write to update you regarding the complaint that you filed on July 25, 2014, concerning Texas A&M University School of Law.

As previously indicated, the complaint process outlined in Rules 42 [formerly Rule 24(e)] is designed to bring to the attention of the Council, the Accreditation Committee, and the Managing Director facts and allegations that may indicate that an approved law school is operating its program of legal education out of compliance with the Standards. Rule 43(b)(2) [formerly Rule 24(c)(ii)] states that the complaint must provide the Standards and Interpretations alleged to have been violated and the time frame in which the lack of compliance is alleged to have occurred.

The Council of the Section on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar is not available to serve as a mediation or dispute-resolution process for persons with complaints about the policies or actions of an approved law school. The Council will not intervene with an approved law school on behalf of an individual with a complaint against or concern regarding action taken by a law school that adversely affects that individual.

Thus, even if a school violates a Standard, the end result might be a directive to the school to change its policies or procedures to come into compliance, but it would not be an order for relief in an individual case. Often, the best avenue for the complainant is to pursue the remedial procedures and appeals that are provided by the law school and university policies, or other mechanisms for individual relief.

After a thorough review of your complaint and appendices thereto, I have concluded that the facts that you set forth fail to allege a violation by the Law School of the *ABA Standards for Approval of Law Schools*. As specified in Rule 44(a)(2) [formerly Rule 24(e)(ii)], upon such a determination the matter is closed. As provided in Rule 46 [formerly Rule 24(f)], there is no appeal to any body of a conclusion by the Managing Director that a complaint does not raise issues under the Standards.

Regards,



Stephanie Giggetts  
Assistant Consultant

cc: Barry A. Currier, Managing Director  
Caroline Akers Peterson  
Brent Gleason  
R. Matthew Graham  
Warren Norred  
David W. Wynne

Section of Legal Education  
and Admissions to the Bar

Office of the Managing Director

321 N. Clark Street  
Chicago, IL 60654-7598  
(312) 988-6738

legaled@americanbar.org  
www.americanbar.org/legaled

Mollie L. Hines  
Chuck Hill  
Cameron Lenahan  
Chad Lampe  
Joseph Farah  
Angela Downes