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LOUIE LAW STUDENT

Louie Levelman suddenly left Temple Law School Auditorium after the orientation program. A recent graduate of Progressive U. and now a first year law student, Louie was somewhat confused about his student's rights. He wondered into Rachael Registrar's office to inquire about them. Louie asked Rachael about Section 7 of the Official Templeton Law School Student Handbook which succinctly set down limitations as to the exercise of student's rights: to wit: "conduct unbecoming a law student." After a long pause, Rachael replied to tell the truth I never even thought about it. Maybe the Dean can help you." Levelman walked down the hall to a door that read Dean Equitus LIB 200. 200. Peeking into the dean's office, Louie saw Dean Equitus pouring over the advance sheets of the Queens' Bench Reports.

The Dean anxiously invited Louie, his first visitor of the day, into his office. Louie again inquired as to the interpretation of Section 7. The Dean, stolidly fielding Louie's question, curtly said that he and the faculty had not "set any guidelines as to what conduct unbecoming a law student" entails. But he assured Louie that the question was not vague, overly broad, arbitrary, or without any rational purpose or meaning. Louie was left little cold at the Dean's explanation. After leaving the Dean's office Louie decided for some use of his recently acquired legal research expertise and find out for himself what student's rights are, what will louie find out for the next issue?

EDITORIAL

The Staff of the SUFFOLKATE feel that there is an urgent need for radical change within Suffolk Law School, in the Boston community, and throughout the State and Country. In essence the changes are needed to humanize: to humanize our institutions, to humanize our law, to humanize ourselves. The rhetoric from our history and still present today is one of equality, morality, and the opportunity for a decent life. The reality of America is that of a world power, economically exploiting people abroad and at home. The supposed equality that never existed is being exposed. The supposed morality of our history and Government is being unvelled to expose the profiteers who are pulling the strings with merely one thought in mind, property and power for themselves. The decent life promised is becoming herder to find for the contradictions within our society and ourselves are coming into focus.

We have no clear blueprint or single doctrine for change. But we do know that the profit and power people in the law school and the society won't be the force to bring about the needed change. So we have created a newspaper not merely to be written in, or read, or thought about, but a newspaper to provide an analysis, to move people (student and faculty) to change, to change = humanize.

JD SPEAKS

An Open Letter to Students of the Law School

This year for the first time in many years, the Student Bar Association is sponsoring a newspaper for and by the students of Suffolk University Law School.

It is not without controversy and much deliberation that this paper has come to press. It is the intention of the Student Bar Association that this paper is and shall remain open to all law students within the University. This Newspaper was created by two separate votes of the Student Bar Association taken at the September 23, 1971 meeting. They were: first, a motion made by Ed Englander (Class Representative - Section 3A, evenings) "contribute $200.00 to establish a Suffolk University Law School newspaper." second, a motion made by Ron Wayland (Class Representative - Section 2B, evenings) "that there be total freedom of expression in the newspaper."

The Student Bar Association hopes that the publication of this paper will in some way cause us to become a better law school. As future attorneys, we spend three years of our lives learning how to look at the problems of men, of society, and of our country, perhaps we should spend a little time looking ourselves through the institution we are a part of.

If we graduate from this Law School leaving it a better place than it was then an effort such as, is worthwhile.

John Delsio

INTRAMURALS

Intramurals

There will be a Law School Intramural program beginning this fall in conjunction with the Undergraduate School. Final details are yet to be worked out, but the Suffolkate will keep you abreast of any new developments. If you have not already signed up with your class representative, do so as soon as possible.
There is a rumor around that we will be getting a new Dean of the Law School in January. The front runner for the job in the eyes of the Trustees, the rumor goes, is Professor Malcolm D. Donahue. There are many pressures on the Trustees to choose Professor Donahue as the new Dean, some of which may be the power and influence of his father, the Judge. There are many students, including this writer, who have grave reservations about the way in which the job of Dean is presently defined — it is a "no nothing" position. Prof. Donahue, we also feel, will not alter this tradition.

It is time for a change.

First and most important, no dean should be chosen for the Law School without extensive consultation and approval from both the faculty and the students.

Second, to change the manner in which the job is presently defined, the following is offered. The responsibilities of the dean should be split into two positions: dean and chancellor. The dean would take care of financial matters, raise money, etc. — do all those mysterious things that deans do. The chancellor would be more in touch with the learning process. He would work with faculty and students on improving the program offered.

There are also some specific suggestions as to people for the job. Prof. John Fenton would make an excellent, hard working dean. Prof. Charles Kindregan has shown a deep interest in students and, in an improved program, he would make an excellent chancellor.

In any event, there should be a major change in the responsibilities which the dean takes. And of equal importance, no dean or chancellor should be chosen without the approval of both students and faculty.

All figures have been rounded off to the nearest dollar. Expenses are 1 column and as indicated, a confusion concerning dates of deposits is due to our inability to understand the accounting procedure. A failure on SBA's part to give us a figure, please go to the SBA office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September '70</td>
<td>MTF (2)</td>
<td>$577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law Review</td>
<td>$571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucia Hicks</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3BA supplies</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diamond Union StampCo.</td>
<td>$39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law Day Posters</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Amer. Press</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>$18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law Wives</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.E. Adding</td>
<td>$180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social, 65 Beaconon</td>
<td>$117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Law Day Deposit</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Stamos (Speaker)</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTF</td>
<td>$16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christmas Party</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>$105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>$105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christmas Party</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Class Contests</td>
<td>$27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 71</td>
<td>$105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diamond Union StampCo.</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also some specific suggestions as to people for the job. Prof. John Fenton would make an excellent, hard working dean. Prof. Charles Kindregan has shown a deep interest in students and, in an improved program, he would make an excellent chancellor.

In any event, there should be a major change in the responsibilities which the dean takes. And of equal importance, no dean or chancellor should be chosen without the approval of both students and faculty.

There is also a need for the Law School to have a better understanding of its relationship with the student body so that they can determine "their money." And, as a group discussion, a guest lecture on how to spend "their money" and all such suggestions should be given to your SBA rep.

**This paper needs help from the editorial staff so that the physical and communicational gap between divisions may be bridged.**
It seems a student would benefit from a legal research system if the law school does not allow for a subject matter of his or her choice. Thus, the student should confront the faculty with the aim of improving the quality of education at Suffolk Law School.

Well done for giving credit to the Voluntary Defenders.

The following are two referendums which will soon be given to the students. They are being published here to give the students an opportunity to think about the issues before voting.

**LAW DAY ALTERNATIVES**

1. **SHOULD THERE BE AN ELECTION OF BLACK AND WOMEN STUDENTS?**

All second and third-year courses would be classified as electives. The faculty would offer a selection of courses to advise students in their course selection.

2. **SHOULD THERE BE AN ANNUAL EVALUATION OF COURSE CONTENT AND PRESENTATION?**

It is difficult for professors to always respond to the academic needs of a student. Therefore, we propose that students annually evaluate the contents and presentation of their courses. These evaluations are to be confidentially submitted by a Student-Faculty Committee with the aim of improving the quality of education at Suffolk Law School.

3. **SHOULD THERE BE AN ANNUAL ELECTION OF BLACK AND WOMEN STUDENTS?**

Under this proposal the law school would establish admissions policy which would increase the enrollment of blacks and women students.

4. **SHOULD THERE BE A CHANGE IN THE CLASS-RANKING SYSTEM?**

There has been a noticeable difference in achievement among the academic divisions, past and present. A class rank by section is proposed to equalize these differences. Such a system could also operate to extend an equal opportunity for students to participate in Law Review; the standard being based on section rank rather than overall class rank.

5. **SHOULD STUDENTS BE ALLOWED TO PARTICIPATE IN REVIEW OF ACADEMICALLY DEFICIENT STUDENTS?**

Presently an academically deficient student who applies for re-admission is interviewed by a panel of three faculty members, who submit their findings and opinions to the general faculty. The general faculty relies heavily on the recommendations of the interviewing panel when voting on a student's petition for re-admission. Therefore, we propose that one student be included on each of these panels so that the petitioning student's academic future may be influenced by his peers.

6. **SHOULD THERE BE AN ANNUAL EVALUATION OF COURSE CONTENT AND PRESENTATION?**

It is difficult for professors to always respond to the academic needs of a student. Therefore, we propose that students annually evaluate the contents and presentation of their courses. These evaluations are to be confidentially submitted by a Student-Faculty Committee with the aim of improving the quality of education at Suffolk Law School.

7. **SHOULD THERE BE A PROBLEMATIC APPROACH TO LAW RESEARCH RELATED TO THE Moot Court Program?**

It seems a student would benefit more from a legal research program which integrated the subject matter of his or her Moot Court record. The present program does not allow for a smooth transition between research and legal writing.

If the Moot Court program was thoroughly researched before the second semester, the student could concentrate his or her efforts on methods of legal writing and techniques of oral presentation.
In the past, curriculum reform has been moderate at best. The attitude of those drafting the proposals has been self-defeating. They felt that only "semi-non-controversial" issues should be presented to the faculty and administration; that is, to present only those proposals which the faculty and administration were psychologically ready to accept. Of course, this was a reasonable strategy since to propose "radical" reform along with the "semi-non-controversial" proposals would certainly alienate the decision-makers from considering any change. As one would expect, this "half a loaf is better than none" approach to curriculum reform has been semi-non-controversially successful.

The following is a comparison of Curriculum Committee proposals and faculty-administration disposition vis-a-vis the proposals.

**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE PROPOSALS 1969-70**

1. Offer Constitutional Law as a full year course for first year students.
2. Combine Future Interests, Trusts, and Wills into one 5 hour, two semester course with two hours the first semester and three hours the second semester.
3. Make Taxation an elective course.
4. Make Administrative Law an elective course.

**FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION DISPOSITION**

1. Same
2. Same
3. Same
4. Same
5. Same
6. Excluded
7. Excluded
8. Excluded
9. Excluded
10. Excluded

**ORIGINAL C. C. PROPOSALS**

1. Course credit for clinical programs.
2. A problematic approach to legal research integrated with the Boot Court program.
3. Credit for law summer school and cross-registration with neighboring law schools. Aim: To augment the Suffolk course offerings.
4. Another free hour for the entire school to be used for running meetings of various organizations and committees.
5. An all-elective curriculum after the first year.
6. A Black and Female admissions policy which would increase their representation in the enrollment.
7. Annual course evaluation by students.
8. Open course selection with over-registration handled by a lottery system with preference given to upper-classmen.
9. Pass-Fail academic evaluation in lieu of grades to be chosen at the option of the student.
10. Peer participation in the academic review of deficient students.
11. Class rank based on a student's academic standing in his or her particular section.

**FINAL C. C. PROPOSALS 1970-71**

1. Course credit for clinical programs.
2. Problematic approach to legal research.
3. Credit for law summer school and cross-registration...
4. Another free hour for entire school.
5. An all-elective curriculum in the alternative.
6. Peer participation in the academic review of deficient students.
7. Annual course evaluation by students.
8. Open course selection with over-registration handled by a lottery system with preference given to upper-classmen.
9. Pass-Fail academic evaluation in lieu of grades to be chosen at the option of the student.
10. Class rank based on a student's academic standing in his or her particular section.

**FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION DISPOSITION**

1. 3rd year students may now receive 2 credits per semester for participation in the Voluntary Defender program.
2. Credit for participation in local legal aid agencies has been temporarily denied.
3. Prof. Hollingsworth is in the process of setting up a civil legal aid clinic at Suffolk. When this program is funded, students will receive course credit for their participation. However, funding is a major obstacle.
4. The Legal Research courses are oriented more toward problem solving but it has not been integrated into the Boot Court program.
5. Approved
6. Nothing Changed
7. Even the in the alternatives were mix.
8. No student pressure, there is little hope that the administration will unilaterally effect the necessary changes. If this school is to emerge from the dark ages of legal education, there must be a student nucleus actively attempting to up-date the curriculum. If you can spare any time please contact Kathy or any member of this paper.

Kathy Gallagher
Co-Chairman
Curriculum Committee 1970-71