

## **Oral History of Dean Broderick Fourth Interview**

This interview is being conducted on behalf of the Oral History Project of The Historical Society of the District of Columbia Circuit. The interviewer is Robert Gross, and the interviewee is Dean Katherine Shelton (“Shelley”) Broderick. The interview took place on Tuesday, March 21, 2016. This is the fourth interview.

Mr. Gross: It’s Tuesday, March 21. When we last left off, you had just been named Dean of the law school. What was on your plate in those first years?

Ms. Broderick: Happy Spring, Robbie. I would characterize this deanship as having three chapters. The first was seeking and securing ABA accreditation. The second included undertaking a major process of strategic planning that was community-wide and developing a strategic plan, arriving at consensus around it, and then implementing it very successfully. And then the third chapter has really involved a new strategic plan, which is looking inward because the world changed. It changed in legal education radically, with a 40% decline in applications. A whole new set of business plans for how law firms work and so forth, and how do we negotiate that new world.

So those would be the three chapters. Beginning with the first chapter, as I may have said in our last session, the process of applying for the deanship reluctantly helped me to think very clearly about what it would take to secure ABA accreditation. I had been so immersed in it that I knew with real clear vision what it would take and how to go about it.

Mr. Gross: I’m just trying to think of how many of these accreditation processes you’ve been through at that point. You had just done one four or five years earlier?

Ms. Broderick: Antioch Law School was constantly under scrutiny by the ABA, so American Bar Association teams of inspectors came in regularly. When we started the new school in 1988, you're required to operate your program for a year before you are eligible to launch your application for accreditation. So in 1989, on September 15 of 1989, we submitted our ABA accreditation application, and I remember that day because I vowed the prior May at my niece's graduation from Berkeley, as I looked around and saw my three fabulous nieces smoking, following my evil lead, I vowed that I would quit smoking and not be that bad role model for them. But I knew I couldn't do it until we completed the application for accreditation because I'm weak. So I vowed in May in Berkeley, California, that I would quit. I said September 15, and a friend advised that I might want to enjoy having submitted the application, and perhaps I should pick the autumnal equinox, and in fact, the last cigarette I had was on the 20<sup>th</sup> of September 1989, prior to the autumnal equinox. I met my husband that week, and it's a good thing because he's a non-smoker and very opposed to smoking. So it never would have worked out had I not made that pledge.

In any case, that's how I happen to remember applying September 15, 1989. So it's a vast process. You submit 2,000 pages worth of documents. You produce a self-study of where you are with regard to compliance. You have to demonstrate that you are in substantial compliance with every ABA standard, and there are 56 pages of them, and that you have a reliable plan for coming into full compliance with every standard within three years. The ABA

gives you five. So the standard says you have a reliable plan for coming into compliance within three years, but in fact they give you five.

So we spent that first year hiring faculty and staff, recruiting the second class, because we had recruited the first class to start in 1988. We had to recruit the second class to start. You're looking for the strongest possible class you can. We had only had to operate a first year of law school, now we had to operate a first year and a second year, so we needed additional faculty members. You're not eligible for federal financial aid until you have provisional accreditation, so we didn't have to have a financial aid operation yet. That was the single biggest problem we had, so we talked to Charlie and Hilda Mason who gave us the first \$100,000 for scholarships so that we could help the people we most wanted to educate and couldn't afford to come to law school without aid with scholarships. In any case, we had secured provisional accreditation. When you apply, they send an ABA team in. So the first team came in in 1990, and when you're provisionally approved, the ABA, in those days, sent a full team for a full inspection and required the submission of a full self-study and all 2,000 pages of documents annually until you secure full accreditation. So let's walk through this.

We had a full ABA site visit in 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005. That's seventeen. I had seventeen full ABA inspections, and there is no one on the planet who has more experience with ABA inspections and preparing for site visits than yours truly. I do that because of the pain. It was a painful period of my life.

Once you secure provisional accreditation, we had this provisional and then we moved to UDC and we had to secure it again, and as I said, my predecessor stepped down. I became Dean, and we had to go through it every year. I had been a laboring oar all of those years as Academic Dean, Clinic Director, always part of the management team, and a leader in the faculty, so I had been a real part of it. Other people took on leadership roles various years, various people stepped up to the plate, but I always worked very closely and had significant involvement in it. Now we were at UDC, as you will recall when last we left off, the District had balanced its budget in February of 1998. We secured provisional accreditation by one vote.

Mr. Gross: You were pessimistic about that, as I recall.

Ms. Broderick: I've never been pessimistic in my life, and I'd get many affidavits to demonstrate that [laughter]. I was scared. I remember being tearful and angry, but we got it. So now we had to keep it. Again, you're supposed to have three years in which to be in full compliance with all the standards. That meant being very intentional about what it's going to take to improve your bar passage. At that time, we had a very low bar passage and very small classes, so literally, your percentage of bar passage moved four points with every passer or failer. I literally had to make the argument had one person taking the California bar not had a migraine, we'd have had four points higher. It's hard to say this is the law school's failure, and I refused to say that.

Setting that course and building consensus around it, I had some good ideas about what to do, and I was handed, or brow beat, or otherwise given

many good ideas. For example, Professor Tom Mack was the chair of the Admissions Committee, and he came in and yelled at me. He had been the last Dean of Antioch. He had been a Clinic Director. He was a real leader, and he chaired and still chairs the Admissions Committee. He came in and said we're admitting everyone. Everyone wants to admit everyone and give everyone a chance, and I teach in the first year. It's not a good strategy. We're admitting people who will not pass the bar. You have to step up and exercise leadership and come up with a plan that takes us forward in the direction we have to go.

I did an analysis with others of our bar passage, and our statistics showed, having crunched the numbers on everyone who had ever come to the law school, what their entering academic indicators were for LSAT and GPA. This is a little confusing. The American Bar Association looks at what your bottom 25<sup>th</sup> percentile is, what your bottom quartile is, what your top 75<sup>th</sup> quartile is, and then what your median is for LSAT and GPA. So when I started as Dean, our bottom 25<sup>th</sup> percentile was below a 139, or a 390 on the old scale of 200 to 800, and it's an extreme rarity that someone in that neighborhood passes the bar. It's highly unusual. Our 75<sup>th</sup> percentile was a 143, which is a 430 on a 200 to 800 scale. It's very rare for those folks to pass either. We had something like three above a 500. So your bar passage rate, it was very highly likely to be poor, and it was clear to me that we were taking too many risks, and we needed to have a plan.

So we made a plan that we would move the bottom quartile to 140, then the next year to 141, and the next year 142, then 143, and that we would stop at

144. Why did we choose 144, which is a 440 on the old 200 to 800 scale? We chose 144 because at that time, the average African-American LSAT taker had a 144, and I was not willing, and our faculty was not willing, to say that half of the African-American takers won't be eligible to come. We had to look more deeply than that.

When the group of us originally looked at the data, the original recommendation was 146. We went back and looked at what that would do to minority enrollment, and it would decimate minority enrollment for the reasons I just stated, so we looked at what if it was 144, what would the GPA have to be in order to have a reasonable bar passage rate. Our analysis showed that if you had between a 144 and a 147, and at least a 2.6 GPA, you had a 75% chance of passing the bar, and that seemed like a reasonable risk. So that was our goal. We incrementally worked toward that goal, and then for years, that has been our standard. Now, there has always been a rule that the Admissions Committee can bring me candidates who fall outside of that parameter, and originally I think we said I could take up to five dean's admits who fell outside of that parameter. So you've got a 143 but a 3.2. Why not do that. You've a got a 155 but a 2.1, and there's a reason. You look, and maybe working full time, three kids, and it has nothing to do with intelligence. This has been kind of a working system.

Mr. Gross: Have you tracked those kids that you admit from the "dean's admit" over time?

Ms. Broderick: Of course we have.

Mr. Gross: How has it worked?

Ms. Broderick: It's complicated. I will tell you this. Last year, we took six dean's admits. One was academically dismissed, one transferred to Georgetown because the student did so well in the first year of law school that the student was accepted by Georgetown Law School, and four are in good academic standing and in fact above a 3.0.

Mr. Gross: That's wonderful.

Ms. Broderick: I'm very proud of that because it demonstrates that we have a good eye for talent and that we have very solid academic support. Now, this year, it wasn't as good. There were three dean's admits, and their first year academic performance was much weaker, so we're looking into what are the variables that come into that. I'm a deeply data-driven person. I pay very close attention to all of this, and our team is all over it, really trying to understand. Did we have a high-scoring civil procedure course, were the grades inflated somewhere, or were the grades deflated somewhere. Our grades are typically lower than other schools. There are a couple of reasons for that. If American University's average grade is a B+, and ours is a B-, is that because we're harder graders, or is that because our students are more at risk and it takes longer to get their arms around the material. What are the factors? And we look at all of that. It's complicated.

Mr. Gross: These are the kinds of reforms that you're looking at to get those bar passage rates up.

Ms. Broderick: That's right.

Mr. Gross: So admissions is one thing.

Ms. Broderick: We looked – and I by no means take the credit for this, other than being a leader and having an incredibly strong team in place – we looked at every single thing top to bottom, and we came to understand that at that period, we had a culture of a C equals J.D. So students are really not working as hard as they needed to work to be successful and just trying to graduate, and if you graduate, it's all good, without realizing you have to work really hard and get to a level of comprehension that will enable you to pass the bar. You can't learn all of it for the bar.

So we set about changing the culture top to bottom. We looked at every syllabus to make sure that every faculty member was actually currently teaching what is now tested on the bar because faculty members have to have their culture change too. Sometimes they get a little slack. The same old syllabus, change the dates, slap a new date on it, pass it out. No, no, no. We looked to see what students were taking, and the bar passers were taking bar courses. Some of the people not passing the bar were taking too many electives and not participating in the more rigorous courses because they wanted to have a better GPA thinking that would be helpful getting a job. Short sighted. Not a good plan. So we started scheduling bar courses in clusters. Students after the first year they don't want to be in the law school all day every day. They want to cram everything into two days or two-and-a-half days and be able to work the rest of the time. Well that's not necessarily a good idea. So we started clustering bar courses so that you have to take Property. We're going to cluster the other non-required but important bar courses around Property, and the next

day, cluster around Evidence, et cetera. We used to have four credits of Torts, and we realized we were not covering in required courses a big section of Torts, so we made it into a 6-credit course all year long. The same thing with Contracts, and the same thing with Civil Procedure. Not every school does that. Some schools have four credits, some have five, some have six. We felt like we wanted the stronger, more thorough coverage of the materials so people would be introduced to all of it.

We had experts come in to help us learn to draft better, stronger exam questions, both on multiple choice and on essay. We had workshops on that, and on and on. I could really bore you to death. We really took it as seriously as you possibly can. We had regular meetings with students about what it takes. We raised a bunch of money to help those students who weren't able to afford to take the bar review course to help get scholarships. We learned that Remedies is a really important course because it's a review of a lot of contract theories, which is very heavily tested. We said if you take the Remedies course in third year, we'll give you a scholarship for the bar review course.

Mr. Gross: Good incentive.

Ms. Broderick: We started an in-house bar review course to get students practicing writing essays early because it's an art. Anyway, we just took many, many intentional steps to strengthen the core, and our students' bar pass rate, it went from the lowest in the country to the 30%, and the 40%, the 50s, the 60s, and we have a 65% roughly every year for several years. In recent years, it's dipped. It's dipped because the applicant pool has dipped, and students are coming in with

lower indicators at our school and every school across the country virtually. It's dipped because, we think, there may be a millennial attitude of show up and I get a gold star as opposed to show up, work my tail off, and I get to pass the bar.

Mr. Gross: They're in for a rude awakening.

Ms. Broderick: They get a rude awakening when they don't pass the bar. This is not something you want to do twice. The opportunity class is brutal. So in any case, we set off on this path as an institution-wide commitment. We brought in a full-time, tenure-track Director of Academic Success so that if we felt that you were at risk but we thought you had the stuff, if you were given the academic support structure you needed to be successful, we brought you in for the summer for a one-month intensive course to learn briefing and how to think about cases and to take it more slowly. This is for folks who have been out of school for a while.

Mr. Gross: Before their 1A year? A transition program?

Ms. Broderick: Before their 1A year. That's right. We called it the Mason Enhancement Program of Academic Success, named after Hilda and Charlie Mason. So they had that, and then in the first semester, if they had below a certain GPA, they were required in the spring semester to take one fewer course and to take a legal reasoning course. Slow it down and really work on legal reasoning. If they were still on probation after that semester, they were required to take a fall 2L Legal Reasoning II course. We implemented a number of workshops around time management. It was a very thorough, and it continues to be. We tweak it every year. Now what we do is we decided – so there's this terrible dilemma.

Currently, our analysis shows that if you have a 2.8 or better, you're very likely to pass the bar. A 2.8 in the first year of law school. So it behooves us to help people be successful in their first year of law school. It means they've wrapped their brain around it and can perform on a test sufficiently and that holds them in good step down the road on the bar. Okay. Hmmm.

Mr. Gross: Having never been to law school, I hear the first year of law school is generally the worst.

Ms. Broderick: It's a bear. I'm still actually experiencing post-traumatic stress from my first year of law school in 1975-76. I'm trying to let go of it.

Mr. Gross: This is the talking cure. Talking this over will help you [laughter].

Ms. Broderick: So we now allow students to start early with what we call the Jump Start Program, and two groups of people take the Jump Start Program. People who are superstars and dying to get started and knock it out of the park and graduate early can do the Jump Start Program and then those who we think are potentially at risk and should start sooner and more slowly and prepare themselves for law school, get a jump start that way. So we have a group of people who take a course for credit, Criminal Law or Contracts, a first-year required course for credit over the summer. A lot of academic success strategies are built into the curriculum. There's a lab, you do a lot of writing, you meet in small groups, et cetera, and really focus. And then when you're successful on that, it builds your confidence as you start the fall. You can start the fall, and if you want, take one less course because you're ahead of the game so you can go a little more slowly through the fall. We devote more time on

fewer topics, and we think that that's going to be very successful. So we started the Jump Start Program. The faculty approved that two years ago.

Then we have a Fresh Start Program. It used to be that we never flunked anyone out until they've completed a year. The way the program used to work, if you had a GPA below a 2.0 and above a 1.85, you would have to be on probation, and you would have to drop a course, and you would have to participate in Legal Reasoning, but you wouldn't flunk out. Actually, even below that, you could stay, but you had to do those things. You had to meet with the Academic Dean, and the Academic Dean would talk to you and ask you to reflect on what went wrong, and sometimes that's personal decisions. Well you thought you'd get divorced the first year of law school. Never a good plan. Or you thought you'd build a house or have a baby or you didn't recognize how hard it was soon enough. You never went to your faculty advisor, you didn't take advantage of the writing lab, you didn't attend the time management and academic support workshops that are in place. Want to rethink that? But we didn't flunk you out because the lightbulb does go on at different times for different people, and we wanted to give you the option to stick with it and redouble your efforts. Well our thinking has somewhat changed. We now know you're in real trouble if you're below a 2.3, and so 1.85 to 2.3, you have to do these extra measures. But below that, you have to start over. So you're out in the spring semester. And it's heartbreaking. Actually this year, every faculty member got their grades in for the first year by the first day of classes so that those who would have to leave would not have

their financial aid dispersed and now they have a ton of student debt and they're not here. And you sit out, and then you come back in the summer if you want and you have a fresh start. You can start over. We don't charge you for that course. Start over. Maybe life happened and you figured some things out, and maybe you've taken some steps so that you're not working as many hours or you've helped your family to understand that you are and have to be the center of the universe right now. You cannot do some of the things you're accustomed to doing. We've done pretty well with Fresh Start. We've done it now for two years, and for the most part, it seems to be effective. So if you come back and you start over, now you're getting that 2.8, you're much more likely to pass the bar.

Mr. Gross: And you've seen people do that?

Ms. Broderick: We've only done it two years so they haven't taken the bar yet, but their grades have significantly improved. As horrible as first-year law school is everywhere because you're taking courses that may or may not be the most exciting, it's not the civil rights curriculum, it's contracts. It's civil procedure, which is a mystery to many of us to this day. It's hard. And to do it twice, you have to want it badly. And to do it twice, you need to put your pedal to the metal.

Mr. Gross: So the support programs that you're describing, it's not like these all came in the early 2000s. You've been building up these over time. So they kind of began in response to the accreditation kind of push, and since then, you've been tweaking it to have as much academic student success as possible.

Ms. Broderick: That's right. We pay a lot of attention to it every year, and we've had terrific people working on it, putting their shoulder to the wheel. It's really academic support across the curriculum. So it can't just be admission. If you take stronger people, they'll all pass. No. That's just not true. Our analysis shows that some of the worse grades are some of the higher LSATs. You have to want it badly and work very, very hard. We are about to really work on changing the culture again. We've surveyed students on how many hours they spend preparing for each hour of class, and it's not a high enough number. It has a lot to do with grades not being what they should be. Students get the wrong idea. The teachers are nice, they're not mean like they were in my day, they don't scare you to death. They try to work with you and students just kind of, not everybody gets how seriously they have to take this and how much work it takes.

Mr. Gross: So in terms of that first chapter, you're putting all these pieces into place.

Ms. Broderick: A lot of time, and meeting with faculty members to try to devise strategies to help our students to be more successful, and a lot of important input from terrific, really caring faculty members. People embraced it. They gave it everything they had. It was a very cohesive group of people. At the same time, there are a lot of people who come to the law school who are academic stars and who don't need or care about all of these academic support structures and who want to come to the law school because of the outstanding clinical programs. So it's challenging teaching when you have such a wide range of academic

experience and capacity in the classroom. So it's a challenge, which makes it kind of cool.

One of the things that really excites people and gets them engaged is the actual opportunity to work with clients. In the very first year, we had a program called Community Service, and as I've told you, the students come and they take Law and Justice and then they do forty hours of community service, actually in the Public Defender Service or at the ACLU or at the Office of the Attorney General or at the Children's Law Center. That fires them up. Every year I have a lunch, I invite all the people who have a 3.0 or above to lunch, and they become Dean's fellows and they get a scholarship for the second year because they've demonstrated their capacity. I call them together, and I say you're going to be the leaders. You're going to be the president of the SBA, the editor of the Law Review. We want to hear from you, and we want to help you realize your dreams. So what brought you here, what kind of law do you want to practice? How can we help you with a summer public interest fellowship on the pathway that you plan to follow toward your career? So if you want to be a criminal defense lawyer, as you should, maybe you want to do that forty hours at the Public Defender Service, and then that first summer, we raise funds to support a summer public interest fellowship. We pay for you to work for them for free. Then the next year, you're in the Criminal Clinic, and the next year after that, you're in the Juvenile Clinic, helping people in the delinquency people, and meanwhile you've done an externship in the Maryland Public Defender or doing legislative work around criminal issues or whatever it might

be. You might be in the family law pathway, and so that's a whole different set of placements, courses, clinics, externships, community service that you might take, and we can help guide you.

We assign you to a faculty advisor in your pathway. So if you know you want to be a criminal lawyer, I or one of the other people in the criminal law arena, might be your faculty advisor and help set you up and guide you going forward. If you want to be an immigration lawyer, it may be that you will have Christina Campbell or Lindsay Harris, who run our Immigration and Human Rights Clinic, they might be your faculty advisor, and they'll help you get a place at CARECEN or at CARE. You get the idea.

Mr. Gross: In terms of where you were seeking the full accreditation, the visiting teams keep coming in, and so at what point does that ....?

Ms. Broderick: You get provisional, you have three years, but they give you five. So in 1998, we got provisional. But remember, we had just barely moved to UDC, no working elevators or escalators, and there were no cleaning contracts. The five years were up in 2003, and we applied in 2003. Our bar passage rate had gone up ten points a year for the last few years, we were building the faculty. We were just soaring, and we were fluent in the accreditation standards having had a lot of practice. So we were really humming along in full compliance. We applied in 2003. The accreditation committee voted yes. I was as happy as a human being can be. This happened in Florida, and I remember flying back with the then-president of the University and the chair of our Foundation Board

and getting a call and just being euphoric. The ACLU honored us at their luncheon because of who we are and what we stand for.

Six months later, we went the final step to go before the council of the section on accreditation, and we were denied. It was the most heartbreaking moment in the world. We were denied because, while our bar passage trajectory was straight up, another school was denied by the accreditation committee and appealed saying their bar passage rate was in fact stronger than ours. The problem was their trajectory was straight down. The accreditation committee wisely said you're going in the wrong direction, you're doing everything right, we're going to have different results for you two. It's not about the bar passage rate. The other school sued, and the ABA caved. That's just what happened. Again, the rule was that you have to be in full compliance with a reliable plan for coming into full compliance within three years, but they give you five. In extraordinary circumstances, they can give you an additional two years, and they chose to say because of the bankruptcy of the District of Columbia, there were extraordinary circumstances and we'll give you another two years. People couldn't even look me in the eye. They felt so bad, so guilty, for doing this to us. It was devastating. The front page of *The Washington Times* said, "Broderick Failing" in banner headline. One of my best friends, Abbe Smith, who runs the Prettyman program at Georgetown, called up. It was a hideous picture where it looked like I had some sort of henna hair. She said I'm writing a letter to the editor, "Broderick, not a redhead." Which was sort of comforting, but not very. "Broderick Failing." It was the most heartbreaking

for our students and for the whole community. It just was a stab in the back.  
But we labored on, and two years later applied.

Mr. Gross: They wanted two years later for your rates not only the trajectory to be higher, you could keep on the same trajectory, they just wanted you to come back with the actual rate higher?

Ms. Broderick: Exactly.

Mr. Gross: So in some sense, if all things were equal, you were heading in a better direction. You would meet that standard two years later. Is that what happened?

Ms. Broderick: Absolutely. We were in full compliance, but we were still in full compliance two years later. It was just such a waste of time. I want you to remember, you're developing 2,000 pages of material. You're going through a six-person site visit. You're spending a fortune flying these teams in from all over the country and feeding them.

So anyway, 2005, in August, the final accreditation was voted by the House of Delegates. My position was, and I've said this many times, now that we've got the ABA boot off our neck, we can turn our attention to ending poverty and inequality. To celebrate this achievement, we convened a two-day symposium on developing local and national strategies for ending poverty and inequality. We had some of the most important legal thinkers and actors come together to work on this project. I secured a grant to pay for someone to help us manage this effort. Jess Rosenbaum, an absolutely fabulous young lawyer, came to help us. We brought in Peter Edelman, who is now head of the Access

to Justice Commission, and countless others. Alan Houseman, and we had the heads of the NAACP, Legal Defense Fund, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, and the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights. We had the president of Legal Services Corporation and of the National Legal Aid and Defender. We had those five leaders of the civil and criminal legal services world here at the law school. It was a very compelling time. It really brought people together to be thinking about how we move forward in these areas.

Mr. Gross: So then that closed that chapter in a very successful way. Did anything come out of that conference?

Ms. Broderick: We'd been very, very influential in developing strategies and structures in the District of Columbia across a host of disciplines, so yes.

So Chapter Two. In 2006, I could not get anyone to even attend a meeting. People were so burned out and just so exhausted from that ridiculous amount of work. Seriously, I couldn't do anything. But in 2007, we needed a new organizing principle. We had been working so long and so hard on accreditation, we needed to sort of learn how to think about how to march forward. Where do we go from here really was the question. So I talked to a number of people about strategic planning facilitators. Who could come in and help us develop our strategic plan, facilitate a process by which by consensus we determined what we wanted to do going forward? I hired some people who had worked with the Leadership Conference, and they came in and met with the faculty, and the faculty liked them very much. They were enormously helpful. We didn't want to call it a strategic planning committee because that seemed so

powerful, so we called it the internal facilitation team, and it was administrators and faculty members, and there were seven of us, and an alum. We developed surveys for faculty, staff, students, and alumni. We developed interview questions for each of those groups. We did focus groups. We had a retreat. We convened working groups to come up with ideas. And part of it, you know when you have one goal and one goal only, and you're going to be successful, you put away, put aside, the hard questions otherwise, and it was time to deal with some of the hard questions. We went from being Antioch to being the D.C. School of Law, and now we're UDC, actually the UDC – David Clarke School of Law. We went from being this clinical law school with a really diverse student body, now we're the public law school, and that means we should be accessible and worthy of educating people who don't want to be necessarily public interest lawyers. What if you're just somebody who wants an affordable legal education? What does that mean for our curriculum? What does that mean for how we are?

Mr. Gross: Would that be in line with students who want to go to a more traditional route to go to a law firm, or would these still be students who would do the same kind of public interest law?

Ms. Broderick: If you graduate from law school, you don't sign something. So what does it look like? And it was interesting. We had a very powerful convening, coming together over a couple of days, and there were tears. I remember someone saying we're at UDC, which is an HBCU. I remember an alum who was part of

this process saying I didn't even know we were an HBCU, and I remember saying actually, when you graduated in 1999, we weren't an HBCU.

Eleanor Holmes Norton got through the TAG program, Tuition Assistance Grant, our member of Congress, developed a program where there would be federal funds available to the graduates at every D.C. high school to go to public schools across the country. You get \$10,000 a year for up to five years. If you graduate from a D.C. high school and you go to a public school anywhere in the country, that's the TAG program. My daughter went to a public school and was a beneficiary of the TAG program. She felt so guilty about why we were identifying and funding the leadership of the next generation and paying them to go away to public schools elsewhere instead of investing in our own local university. Why in the world would we do that? She, in order to get more funds for UDC, had us legislatively designated an HBCU, a historically black college or university. Historically black colleges and universities receive Title III funding, and that got UDC \$5 million a year.

Mr. Gross: I never knew that story.

Ms. Broderick: Few people do. So yes, we're an HBCU, but it's kind of odd to become a historically black college or university. Having said that, the law school was founded by an interracial couple deeply committed to having an open door and having a population of law students that looks like America and had always had among the most diverse student bodies in the country. UDC was never very diverse. UDC was itself an amalgam of three schools. D.C. Teacher's College, which itself was an amalgam of the Black Teachers College and the White

Teachers College until the Miner and Wilson Teachers. So it had a white school and black school, and they combined to be one teachers college and they merged with UDC. Washington Technical Institute and also Federal City College. Matilda Miner. So one of those four predecessor schools, or if you count the law school, five, was actually an HBCU, so it was kind of a boot strap argument that here's how we get to you can be designated an HBCU. But it was never an HBCU for decades until about the year 2000 when it was legislatively designated an HBCU.

So now we're an HBCU, and that means certain things. HBCUs are where the most successful African-American students go. The most doctors went to HBCUs. It's known for having a wrap-around support system that helps you get where you want to go and realize your dreams. Well that resonated with us. That was a really important part of our culture, but what we came to thrash out was that we are an urban land grant, the only urban land grant in the country. We are public. We are an HBCU, and we are dedicated to training public interest, public service, and public policy lawyers through an aggressive and outstanding and pervasive program of clinical legal education. We're all of those things, so we really talked about can you be five things like that? Can you be all of those things? And where we came out was that we all by consensus believe in each of those things and embrace them. One or another of us may have a stronger affinity to the HBCU piece or to the public interest piece or to the public piece, but we all agree that we are all of those things and work toward all of those things. So it's an imperfect balance. We revisit the

discussion regularly. Some wish we'd visit it much more often and change and just be one or the other. It's interesting, I've heard faculty say I don't want to market us an access school. I'm African-American, I would never had wanted to go to a school marketing itself as an access school. I want to go to law school, and I want to have access, but I don't want to have to be seen as that place you go when you can't go anyplace else. And we're not that. We take some at-risk students, but we have a plan for them, and that's a very rigorous and supportive environment to help them be successful.

Anyway, I'm ranting.

Mr. Gross: No, no. What does it mean to hold a mission that sometimes works coherently together and sometimes is in tension with one another? So those meetings came out of the strategic planning process. Were there discussions about facilities or these kinds of things? Did that enter into the strategic planning?

Ms. Broderick: An excellent question. So, we looked at a host of different things. When you secure full accreditation they come back three years later for a site visit and then you go to a regular seven-year cycle. Knowing they were going to be back in three years, we knew that we needed to still be thinking about our progress and our position in each of the accreditation standard areas, so we really worked on it from each of those categories. There were nine categories, and they are admission, faculty, curriculum, library and facilities, technology, budget, et cetera. And so we really tried to see what we wanted to do in each of those areas.

We came up with a number of initiatives, but the four most critical ones were that we wanted to set a part-time program because we believed that we should be accessible to people who had to work and had kids and had mortgage payments, but wanted to go to law school, and a part-time program was the only way to do that.

We decided that we wanted an LLM program. At that time, we were growing, we wanted to expand the capacity of our clinical programs. We wanted all of our faculty members to be treated equally, which means summers are a time when you can reflect and do scholarship, but if you've got a big case load of cases, you can't. If we had clinical instructors in the LLM program, they could be in charge of the cases primarily in the summer. There are twelve months students. We came up with a plan to start an LLM program, and it's called Clinical Legal Education: Social Justice and Systems Change. Because we really wanted to change broken systems and to be agents of that change through the law school and through a clinical program. So, we wanted a part time program, we wanted an LLM program, we wanted to recapture our long lost Antioch immigration clinic. We wanted to start an immigration human rights clinic. We had launched something a few years before called CILP, the Center for Immigration Law and Policy, and we wanted to morph that into a clinical program. And then we wanted our own building. We were still in this jerry-rigged, ridiculous partially on that floor and in another building and in the basement.

Mr. Gross: The library was there too, right? Everything was there?

Ms. Broderick: Yes. So we were between two different buildings. It was crazy. And over the next seven years, we accomplished all of those things. We hired a consultant to come in and help us develop a part-time program. It turned out the University of Hawaii is a public school of just about exactly our size, and they had just designed a new curriculum for it. Their dean is a good friend of mine, and I called him up and he was more than happy, he and his staff, were more than happy to help us develop ours, we hired a consultant to help us put that together and the faculty worked through all of the components, the curriculum and the budget and so forth. Financial aid, clinical program.

We wanted to start the LLM program. You have to get ABA accreditation, so we put together the application. We submitted it, we got it through the university's approval process, we got it to the ABA. They came in and did a site visit and approved it. We hired a consultant, developed the LLM program, put that together, came to consensus around it, approved it internally, got the university approval, got the ABA approval, acquiescence. We convened all of the immigration clinical and operations and legal services provider operations in town and had a day-long session to sort of see where the unmet needs and how can we work collaboratively with the others doing this work and developed a plan for an immigration human rights clinic, and secured the funding for it, and launched that. And then I worked very, very diligently to try to shake loose a building.

My vision, which I told everyone who would stop still long enough to hear it, was that we locate downtown near the court systems and that we co-locate

with other legal services providers with whom we could share the library and community meeting space and where our students would be able to walk down the hall to their internships and summer public interest fellowships, and could work collaboratively to end poverty and inequality with other legal services providers, where they would naturally morph into their post-graduate jobs.

Mr. Gross: Had you felt that there had been a loss, because you were, briefly, at least at Metro Center. So then when you then moved out to Van Ness, did you feel farther away from the action?

Ms. Broderick: Losses and gains. So being part of a university is a wonderful thing. There are speakers and there's a swimming pool and there's a giant library and you can take movies out. There are colleagues who have other disciplines. There were people who speak literature. It's a wonderful thing. There's a cafeteria. There's a parking garage. There's a building owned by the city, and it's a wonderful thing. But in fact it's extremely expensive to live in upper Northwest. It's a huge commute or housing expense for our students and our clients. There are very few poor people living in upper Northwest Washington. Very few poor people. So to get to us is hugely and unreasonably burdensome on our clients. And so it made the most sense to be down near the courthouse because that's where our clients are, that's where people have their internships, et cetera.

We had a new president come in, Allen Sessoms. I was on the search committee. We interviewed a number of people, and when each candidate came in, they went around the room and shook our hands, and I said what I always

say, “Hi, I’m Shelley Broderick. I’m the proud Dean of the UDC David A. Clarke School of Law, your tax dollars at work.” He said, “Oh, I know who you are, and if I come to UDC, it will be because the law school has demonstrated that it’s possible to be successful at UDC.” As you can image, my heart went pitter-patter.

Mr. Gross: Music to my ears.

Ms. Broderick: Yes. I like this man. He came in, and he started off by saying, “Look, I am going to direct our budget toward our centers of excellence and build around them, and the law school is one of them. You submit your budget to me of what you need to be successful, and I will support it.”

At that time we had the lowest-paid law faculty in the country and horribly-paid administrators, and I wanted to get us to somewhere in the neighborhood of market rates so that we could attract and retain top talent. Not that we didn’t have good people, but it was an issue for everyone. And we wanted a building. He tried like hell to make those things happen. He was not able to change the budget initially for the salaries, although he tried. But what happened when we started the part-time program and we increased our tuition revenue, we were permitted to use the new revenue to enhance the faculty salaries. So the faculty salaries went up to within 5% of market rate for public schools. We’re still waiting for that to happen on the administrative salaries, unfortunately. I remain the lowest-paid law school dean in America, and it’s just going on nineteen years.

Mr. Gross: Not funny.

Ms. Broderick: It's sort of funny.

Mr. Gross: Sort of funny.

Ms. Broderick: I mean, I'd hate to be the second-lowest paid.

Mr. Gross: That's true, at least you can claim a claim to fame.

Ms. Broderick: A building became a very core important matter for him. He identified a building in NoMa, North Massachusetts Avenue, that was a brand new high-rise. It looked as if we were poised on the brink of leasing this incredibly fancy, brand-new building where we'd be on the top floor with this breathtaking view of the whole District of Columbia, and it was actually very odd. It felt wrong because it was so fancy. It did not feel like a very community-oriented place. But I believe that the perfect is the enemy of the good, and we did everything in our power to work out how we could make this building work for us.

In the meantime, I had spent a couple of years working with Jonathan Smith who then led the Legal Aid Society. He and I had gone looking at another law school that is co-located, Touro, in New York, is located with some other legal services providers. I met with a board committee of the Legal Aid Society to talk about what it would take to co-locate. It was a wonderful idea. I think we would have really had some takers who could have shared rent and shared the cost and made it work.

Allen Sessoms was hell-bent to stand up the community college and he spent all the building money on that. He stood up the community college, and that was the right call. It was just the right call. And one day, his head of facilities and real estate called me in and said, "What would you think about the

law school staying on campus but moving into the current business school?” which was offline, having asbestos removed and coming into compliance with ADA, Americans with Disabilities Act requirements. I said, “Is the dean of the business school going to find me in an alley and beat me to death because I’m not seeing how she’s going to be good with this.” No. This is going to be our call. The question is...” I said, “Look, I believe that the perfect is the enemy of the good, and a building for the law school at a time when we’re growing, we cannot take any larger class, we have no signature place for our wonderful legal clinics, our clients can’t find us. Yes, I’ll take any building you can give me, but swear to me that you will find the solution to where the business school will be so that you announce both at once.” They didn’t do that. The business school went berserk, and I don’t blame them. We had hearings, we had weeping and gnashing of teeth, mean things were said, and I was right there with them. But it was good because they made a very solid case, and they actually did get wonderful space in the building we had been in, completely redone. In some ways, we were relegated two blocks away into this space where they had still not been able to renovate all of it. They’ve renovated now two floors. This summer they’re going to renovate two more floors. They’re going to start that process in the next year, and eventually it’ll be done.

Mr. Gross: How many floors are there?

Ms. Broderick: Six.

Mr. Gross: So they’re only a third of the way.

Ms. Broderick: The business school actually got up and running nicely. They really had been abused. When their building had to be taken offline, they were moved into leased space in Tulstadt, where you had to have an ID to get in. They couldn't teach any of their classes there. They had to come back on campus to teach classes, up and down the hill. Students couldn't meet with them. It was terrible. It was just awful, and it went on for two years. And then, just as they were poised to move back in, the university had a chance to lease it to Wilson High School for a year while Wilson High School was redone. And all of a sudden, they were relegated back to Tulstadt for a third year, and Wilson High School took over. You can only imagine 1,500 kids in this building. And then, finally, after three years, just as they're poised to come back, the law school gets the building.

Mr. Gross: Your third move. There aren't many law school deans who have had to do that.

Ms. Broderick: No. We convened a whole team to do the planning. My husband was not well at that time. He had been diagnosed with brain cancer, and I made the commitment to him that I would spend July in Maine. I called it working with a view. I worked on the initial plans for the move.

Mr. Gross: This was what year? 2010?

Ms. Broderick: He was diagnosed ten years ago now, so he was diagnosed in 2007, but this was 2010 that we were actually doing the planning for the move. I remember sitting in my car, because we had no cell phone coverage, sitting in my car with these giant set of plans and having big conference call meetings to work through

where the library would be and where the classrooms would be. It went on for many, many months, but part of that was from Maine in my car.

Anyway, we developed how we wanted it, and we wanted to have Admission on the first floor so the community could walk in and learn about the law school. We wanted to have our clinics, actually, on the first floor. We wanted it to be open to the community. So we did this whole plan, and the idea was that we would move in as is. Literally the day after Wilson High School vacated, we would move in, and we would move into the lower level, first, second, and third floors while they built out four and five. Or maybe lower level, first and second it was. We moved into these partitioned-off offices. We moved in, we didn't yet have keys, there was no security system set up, none of the cameras had been working, and Wilson left with the code or something. It was weeks with the faculty demanding we have security guards. Sorry, we don't have any money for that. There's no police force for that. And by the way, it's pretty safe up here in tony upper Northwest.

We went out to the GSA warehouse and got truckloads full of used furniture from various government agencies to fill the new building. There we were in August in Washington, D.C., sweating like pigs, moving. But we did a lovely plan, and we all moved in. It was bumpy. It wasn't easy, but we settled in, and they built out floors four and five into gorgeous space. It was a lovely space.

The next year we moved again into four and five while they renovated, or were supposed to renovate the rest of it, only they ran out of money. The city

cut the capital budget, so they didn't do any more. So now we were on floors four and five for the most part. We put Admissions on the first floor in a nice space but not renovated. This year, they're finally going to do the next phase. They did then renovate the garage, so we have a garage in the building, and they'll renovate the library, move the library into the lower level, also known as the basement, and the third floor clinical floor will be built out, and it will be gorgeous.

Mr. Gross: That's wonderful. So that's sort of a successful strategic plan.

Ms. Broderick: I would have to say so.

Mr. Gross: Did the accreditation, they came back then, number three?

Ms. Broderick: They came back. The biggest issue was the building. We didn't have a good, decent facility, so that satisfied them. They were very happy with the new building. They came back for the part-time program visit and then they acquiesced, and the LLM program, and those are up and running and very successful. Imperfect, like everything in life, but wonderful, and some amazing people have come through. We're tweaking and working on improving it and so forth.

Mr. Gross: So that's the second chapter.

Ms. Broderick: That's the second chapter.

Mr. Gross: You said there are three.

Ms. Broderick: So then the world changed. The crash hit in 2008.

Mr. Gross: It's interesting because all of this is happening at the same time, so the new building is being built, but as you're moving forward, the reality is finances are shifting at your feet and the admissions pool lowers.

Ms. Broderick: It plummets nationally. We made the decision we really have to look inward. Admission is totally different now. We're seeking millennials, and it's all done virtually, and it's a very different world. Last year we adopted a new strategic plan, and it calls for micro-targeting admissions recruiting. So who are our most desired applicants? Well, we want graduates of HBCUs, UDC, and other area schools. We want activists who want to change the world and end poverty and inequality, put a shoulder to that wheel and be part of our clinical program. We want people for whom a public education is right. Veterans. We think there's a huge market for people on Capitol Hill who want to stay in public policy.

You can go to Georgetown. It costs \$57,000 a year, or you can go to our law school and it costs \$12,000 a year for a D.C. resident. If you're going to go to a big firm and have a lot of money to pay that back, that makes sense. But it doesn't necessarily make sense unless you have well-off parents or spouses. It's an economic question in a way that it wasn't in the past, so we've developed a host of micro-targeted recruitment efforts on Capitol Hill, Veterans, UDC. We're Firebird friendly. We have a poster of all the currently enrolled UDC grads, and it's the most delicious poster. Every age and ethnicity, race, gender. It's wonderful. Gay, straight. How cool is this? Send us your top talent.

What else? We wanted to look at our clinical programs. How do we get out of our silos in each individual clinic and make sure that our students get the breadth and depth of access and opportunity to work across these areas where they're going to practice. If you look and you know that nearly half of your students go into private practice at small firms, it behooves you to graduate them practice-ready. Do we have all of the knowledge about technology in the curriculum that we should have?

Mr. Gross: In terms of practice areas, you mean?

Ms. Broderick: E-Discovery. Law practice has just changed. We need to make sure we're replenishing the faculty with people who come out of current practice with those techniques and that we bring in people who can help train us to make sure we're preparing our students for what they're going to do. You can't start an appellate clinic and a veterans clinic and an elder law clinic and a this and that. How do we build the capacity to serve those populations within our existing clinics or reimagine our clinics in a way where there's opportunity across the clinics? How do we do that? I don't know, but I know we're going to find that out.

Mr. Gross: So that began last year?

Ms. Broderick: Yes. We had a very robust set of conversations about where we're going. We need to do a better job with retention. Law schools have totally changed with transfers. It used to be one or two students transferred a year, now there's a robust group. Georgetown took 100 fewer law students three years ago in order to keep the same LSAT and GPA and keep their *U.S. News & World Report*

rankings. Then they took 122 transfers, wiping out the Law Reviews in the region, at all the law schools in the region, 122. Now, is it smart for these kids to transfer to Georgetown? Well, they have that big fancy name, but they're not on Law Review, they have a lot of student debt, and it's unclear whether that's going to be a wise decision. It will be for some. Some of our students transfer because they really want to go into international law, they want ten electives, and we can't offer that. But some are trading up for the name, and it may or may not be a wise decision.

We've got to figure out how to retain more students and let them know what the benefits are and that kind of thing. We want to make sure we reduce student debt. Students are not wise. They come to law school, they get student loans, and you see students who don't come from any money at all sitting at Starbucks, and you're thinking why are you spending that kind of money on coffee. So we're talking about doing videos that do the math. If you have four Starbucks a week over three years of law school, at an average cost of X, this is how much it's going to cost you to pay that back on your student loans.

Mr. Gross: Probably a semester's tuition.

Ms. Broderick: If you go to the Barristers Ball and you buy a new gown, shoes, hair, makeup, and all of that, how much is that going to cost? Maybe you should, while in law school, live like a law student so that when you're a lawyer, you can live like a lawyer.

Mr. Gross: You should trademark that.

Ms. Broderick: It's not mine, but I've acquired it, and I think it's just exactly right.

Mr. Gross: Do you want to say something about the relationship with Cuba, because that was a big deal.

Ms. Broderick: There are some new initiatives.

Mr. Gross: We're coming to the present almost. We'll circle back. So you were saying about some of these newer initiatives that are quite recent.

Ms. Broderick: As part of the strategic plan, we wanted to look with fresh eyes at some of the possibilities that will make us very attractive to applicants, and we wanted to build our capacity in countless ways. Some years ago, about seven or eight years ago, Eldon "Took" Crowell, of Crowell & Moring, died. Crowell & Moring partnered with us to launch something called the Took Crowell Institute for At-Risk Youth. It funded two clinical fellows a year. It was \$100,000 a year for six years, and it allowed us to add two of these LLM candidates in the Juvenile Clinic every year to expand our capacity to serve at-risk youth.

At the time we received that funding, one of our legendary professors, Joe Tulman, who has a national reputation for outstanding juvenile justice, who's won the national ABA award, the Livingston Hall Juvenile Justice Award, he's spoken all over the country for years, very renowned. He wanted to have the Institute fund him to do trainings around the country to change how we do juvenile justice. A vast majority of people in the juvenile system have unmet special education needs. What if we met those needs early on and kept kids out of jail, out of detention, and got them the education they needed to allow them to be productive citizens, and let's spread the word that we've done that in D.C. We have more hearings in D.C. than the rest of the country because of his

pioneering work. Let's get kids out of facilities and into the community with the supports they need to be successful. He wanted to take that word around the country. He was kind of tired of teaching year after year, he liked a break. I said, "Joe, how does that help our students? You doing training around the country is good, but how is that good for D.C., and you're a professor at the public school?" I actually over time was persuaded that we should have a national impact in policy development and implementation and that if we create institutes where there's funding available to do that, we can make sure that we're doing both.

So we brought in a wonderful new clinic director, Jonathan Smith, who for a year was one of the leaders in the strategic planning process and who was really eloquent and able to help the faculty think differently about some things. It was lovely to have those fresh eyes. One of the things was the notion of getting out of the silos and working across the clinics and another was to develop institutes. The strategic plan calls for developing institutes, but we don't quite know what that looks like. Ariel Levinson-Waldman approached me with something called Tzedek. In L.A. Jewish philanthropists fund legal services, direct legal services, and have grown the pie financially of money available to provide more legal services to people in poverty, which moves the needle on ending poverty. What a good idea. He has launched Tzedek to do that here and is using a couple of our offices in the building which are soon to be renovated. Nobody else was using them. And our students have the chance to go work with Tzedek for their community service hours, for their summer

public interest fellowships, and they're doing three things: direct legal services, but also education. So they're educating students in the community college, in the flagship and the law school about consumer debt and how to avoid it and what to do if you get into it. They're developing know your rights materials around consumer debt, which is a huge problem, particularly for students, and they're also doing policy, legislative work. So these dovetail very nicely with everything that we do. There may be faculty who want to work on legislative projects and have Tzedek as a client. They're going to do a symposium annually, and we may want to work with them to develop symposia. We're test-driving it.

I've been approached about a racial justice institute. What might that look like? Well, keep your eye peeled on this channel. I don't know what it will look like. It's whatever we figure out. The faculty will decide. So that's an institute's piece.

I am hell-bent to bring the community to the campus, and we have countless public forums, symposia, book readings, and events to bring the community to the campus to learn about what we're doing and to work with us. One of the things we did is two or three Cuba Five programs. There were these Cubans who were locked up for treason in this country and a lot of people felt they were wrongly locked up and should be released, and we did some programs around that. We had Danny Glover, the legendary actor, come for some of those programs. Then the thaw with Cuba happened in 2014, and I read in the paper that Tim Rieser was the Senate staffer who made that happen,

and he's at Antioch Law School alum. I didn't know, but I called him up and said you have to come over here and tell us the story, and he said okay. Two hundred people came. The room was packed with students and people from the community and people from what became Cuban embassy. It was called the Cuban Interests Section, and they asked to meet with me afterward. They said, would you like to develop a relationship with the University of Havana, and I said yes, and they said we think you should probably do it sooner rather than later while President Obama is in place. And I said I'm actually packed. I'll meet you at the airport right now. In no time, the president of the University was thrilled and felt that he should come with. A faculty member, one of our spectacular faculty members, a guy named Rafael Cox Alamore, is a Marshall fellow Ph.D. from Oxford in the Caribbean region. He's a historian. He knows more about José Martí than they do. He came with us, and then Mary Cheh, council member from Ward 3. She's a dear friend, paid her own way, and came with. The four of us went and spent several days in intensive lectures by the faculty at the University of Havana Law School learning about legal education in Cuba, about the new constitution, and how we might develop a relationship.

I signed the first MOU of any law school with the Cuba, the University of Havana, and we formed a faculty committee to decide how we would proceed. Last year, three faculty members and sixteen students went to Cuba over Christmas intersession and attended classes and got to be there and part of all of that. This year, just over spring break, twelve students and four faculty members went to Cuba to learn about housing law. They have no mortgages

there. They have a right to housing. What does that look like? It's actually most people living with their parents, and a huge segment of the population has come to the United States because of housing and the lack thereof. But they have a right to housing, and how might we learn from them and how might we collaborate going forward.

Mr. Gross: That's fascinating.

Ms. Broderick: It has been a fascinating opportunity.

Mr. Gross: Do they speak in Spanish? Are the lectures all in Spanish?

Ms. Broderick: Some are in Spanish, some are in English, Rafael, or we've hired translators. I invited the deans of the Cuba Law School, a woman dean and her associate dean came the first time in this country, spent a week. I took them to the White House and the Supreme Court. It happened that Judge Rick Urbina, from the Federal District Court, a Hispanic judge, was having his portrait unveiling. He is an enormously popular dear old friend of mine, and I called him up and said I'm coming to your portrait unveiling but I'd like to bring the dean of the University of Havana law school and her associate dean. Sonia Sotomayor was there, Attorney General Eric Holder was there, and these deans thought that everyone in the United States speaks Spanish because every Spanish-speaking judge in any court in the nation's capitol packed that courtroom. I had a reception with Spanish-speaking alumni here at my house, faculty came, and alumni came, and it was just a glorious visit. They loved it. And of course every law school in American is trying to beat our territory but they're not succeeding.

Mr. Gross: Very cool.

Ms. Broderick: The third initiative I'll speak to. This is the kind of being open to possibilities and being somewhat entrepreneurial. For somebody who hated business classes, it turns out I'm pretty entrepreneurial. I got a call two summers ago from Brandon Todd, a Ward 4 councilmember who said he was running on increasing services for seniors, and he wanted to fund a legal clinic for elder law, and I said no. It's inappropriate for the government to drive curriculum choices, but you can give us money to enhance our capacity to do what we already do. We serve a lot of seniors and a lot of juniors, but enhancing our capacity to serve seniors across the clinics and across the District of Columbia is something that is very attractive to us. So funding has come for that, and now we're staffing up, hiring, and building that capacity and what that will look like will be decided by the faculty, and I can't wait to see what it looks like. Our general practice clinic is about 85% elder law already, so growing that and so forth, it's good for the District, it's good for the law school, it's great for our students and our clients.