OPEN LETTER TO THE TRUSTEES

The following resolution was passed unanimously by the Student Bar Association on February 10th.

It is understood by the Student Bar Association that it is the general policy of Suffolk University to require the retirement of the Deans of the respective schools within the University at age 65.

Presently Dean Simpson of the Law School has attained the retirement age, thus the University will be considering the future of the Deanship of the Law School this year.

The Student Bar Association and the students of the Law School having a common interest in the leadership of the Law School respectfully request of the Trustees the following:

1. Make a public announcement concerning the manner of selection of a new Dean.
2. The qualifications which the Trustees feel a new Dean should possess.
3. The date of selection of a new Dean.
4. The Trustees' position on student participation in the Dean selection process.

TENANT UNION BLUES

Ed. Note: The following article is reprinted from the Tenants' Newsletter put out by the Cambridge Tenants Organizing Committee. We are reprinting it to illustrate how an organization can get mired over because of bad politics and how a lawyer can mess over a movement by not understanding its problems.

The Harlow Tenants' Union was probably the biggest single union in Cambridge in 1971. Its rise was a great surprise to most of us. Harlow Properties was one of that handful of long-established real estate firms (1909) in our city which owned mostly large will preserved brick tenement buildings in the Harvard Square area. Harlow's tenants weren't used to big rent increases.

But last spring Harlow and his lawyers, Walsh and Ferraro, went to the rent control office asking for increases of a hundred dollars a month; fifty was common. CTOC got a flock of telephone calls.

When the tenants began to meet, a lot of them didn't care for CTOC as a radical group. Certain representatives of the Tenants' Assistance Project and Legal Aid attacked our position. The tenants hired a lawyer to represent them in rent control hearings. The lawyer said he could help them. People shelled out $10-$15 each for Attorney John Henn to be the Harlow Tenant Union's lawyer.

When the hearing results came in, Harlow had received every penny he had asked for in rent increases, despite a great deal of bad publicity.

Some Harlow tenants joined in the lawsuit Ackerman v. Corkery (John Ackerman of the Union versus rent boss William J. Corkery) contesting the...
2. At B.U. four issues of the Moot Court Executive Board were submitted on Feb. 4, 1972.

The granting of waivers to members of the Law Review and the Moot Court Executive Board has evoked considerable furor among members of the student body. Some of it, undoubtedly, is well-founded but much of it is the product of misinformation and misunderstanding. This article is an attempt to delineate and evaluate the waiver system and to suggest alternative methods of academic compensation for students who participate in these organizations.

At the outset we must confess that our information concerning waivers is not thorough and the evidence shows: 1) Neither the Law Review nor Moot Court Boards have written information concerning any aspect of waivers, and 2) Our efforts to acquire such information have been frustrated by a virtually impenetrable veil of secrecy which has enveloped the Law Review Editorial Board. (We have not been able to reach any member of the Moot Court Executive Board.) Therefore, we have had to rely on the information which we were able to glean from members of the Law Review who are not part of the Editorial Board.

As nearly as we can discern from our unofficial sources, members of the Law Review are privileged to publish a final examination in a third year writing, if they choose, but they are not required to do so. The volunteers who perform writing duties are reimbursed for their services, but the academic disadvantage of writing a particular course, but by the reputation of the professor teaching it, is considered by many of these students as "one who generally gives low grades". A student entitled to a waiver is exempt from any final examination in either a required course or an elective though it is doubtful that many electives are waived.

The reason seems to be that some of these students, not unlike many other students in the Law School, choose their electives solely on the basis of minimum output and more particularly on the reputation of the professor as a "good grader". This was exemplified last semester when approximately 150 students decided to take a course taught by a professor reputed to give "great grades". When they discovered, to their dismay, that a change in professors had been made, a veritable exodus ensued, leaving fewer than 30 students in the course.

Undoubtedly, there were students who had reasons for leaving which were unrelated to grades but there were others who were motivated by the reputation of the professor as a "good grader". This philosophy of electing so-called "gut" courses to maintain a high average is at best myopic and at worst contemptible. But at least that opportunity is available to all students equally. Under the present system, however, students with waivers can chop off their lowest potential grades and by means of electing certain courses can inflate their averages and thereby derive an unfair advantage over other students. Some students utilize waivers to improve their chances of acceptance to the best law schools in the country. Therefore, we will confine our discussion to this aspect of waivers, and 2) Our investigation, how­ever, has revealed that in many cases the choice of which final examinations will be waived is dictated not by the academic disadvantage of the professor, but rather by the reputation of the professor teaching it.

The academic disadvantage of writing a particular course, but by the reputation of the professor teaching it, is considered by many of these students as "one who generally gives low grades". A student entitled to a waiver is exempt from any final examination in either a required course or an elective though it is doubtful that many electives are waived.

The reason seems to be that some of these students, not unlike many other students in the Law School, choose their electives solely on the basis of minimum output and more particularly on the reputation of the professor as a "good grader". This was exemplified last semester when approximately 150 students decided to take a course taught by a professor reputed to give "great grades". When they discovered, to their dismay, that a change in professors had been made, a veritable exodus ensued, leaving fewer than 30 students in the course.

Undoubtedly, there were students who had reasons for leaving which were unrelated to grades but there were others who were motivated by the reputation of the professor as a "good grader". This philosophy of electing so-called "gut" courses to maintain a high average is at best myopic and at worst contemptible. But at least that opportunity is available to all students equally. Under the present system, however, students with waivers can chop off their lowest potential grades and by means of electing certain courses can inflate their averages and thereby derive an unfair advantage over other students. Some students utilize waivers to improve their chances of acceptance to the best law schools in the country. Therefore, we will confine our discussion to this aspect of waivers, and 2) Our investigation, however, has revealed that in many cases the choice of which final examinations will be waived is dictated not by the academic disadvantage of the professor, but rather by the reputation of the professor teaching it.
The Community Law Program was organized by several students over a two month period in December and January. The program is completely funded by the Student Bar Association and all classroom space has been generously donated by Suffolk University. Five courses are being offered: Low Income Consumer, Defending the G.I., Criminal Trial Tactics, Prison System, and Tenant Problems. All courses are scheduled for ten weeks, meeting weekly for two hours.

There are many reasons for the start of this program. Several of them are: to provide law students and others with practical working skills in a particular area of the law; to explore legal and social problems of current interest and concern in the community; to bring to the community a greater awareness of what can and cannot be solved through the present judicial system. Another obvious reason is the lack of similarly designed courses now available at Suffolk.

Approximate figures for enrollment are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Non-Suffolk Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Consumer</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison System</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defending the G.I.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Problems</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Tactics</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trial Tactics is exclusively for Suffolk students. Nearly 1/2 of the enrollment for the remaining four courses are students not from Suffolk. The fact that so many have registered for a course offering no credit, (in addition to their regular school hours or jobs) shows the interest people have in such subject matters.

Each course has two student coordinators. The role of the coordinators is to insure that communication between students and instructors is effective and to enable the students to have some real control over the content of the course. Also, to handle small matters like xeroxing and distributing materials. Hopefully, all students will know their coordinators and either express their views to them or to the instructor directly. Above all, the wall which exists in most Suffolk law classes between student and teacher must be avoided.

Some problems have already arisen and many are sure to follow. One problem is teaching law students and non-law students at the same time. It has been suggested that the law students take the non-law students around the library and acquaint them with all those mysterious books that lawyers hide in. And perhaps the law student might benefit from a non-legal viewpoint.

A criticism of the program is that it is called the Community Law Program, yet most classes are offered at a time (4-6 p.m.) when most "community" people cannot attend. This is a valid complaint, but it was unavoidable because of classrooms and the desire to make classes available to both day and evening students.

Another criticism is that the courses are "slanted" towards one point of view. The coordinators feel that because the law is slanted towards the privileged, the courses will be slanted towards the underprivileged.

This is the first attempt at such a program and naturally problems will arise. It is hoped that the enthusiasm of student and instructor and the communication between them will remove most of these difficulties.

Bill Bennett

Ed. Note: A large number of people (approximately 75) have read the figures in the accompanying articles and compiled.

Each issue of the Suffolkate has contained information concerning the Curriculum Committee with reference to its objectives and proposals. Throughout the Fall Semester our proposals were continually altered in an effort to improve the curriculum and to reflect areas of student concern. In finalizing our recommendations, we feel both these interests have been served. Members of the faculty and President Fulham received copies of the Curriculum Report during the Christmas vacation. On January 4, at a meeting of the faculty, Dean Simpson referred each of the proposals to the appropriate faculty committee.

We are providing a list of the proposals as they appear in the Report of the SBA Curriculum Committee.

Proposals:

1. All Elective Curriculum.
2. Two Hour Free Period.
3. Optional Pass-Fail for Second and Third Year Students.
4. Elimination of the Class Ranking System.
5. Minority Admissions System.
7. Student Faculty Discussion Sessions.

If you have any questions, copies of the full text of the Curriculum Report are available in the office of the SBA.

In response to our report, Professor Leman has urged the formation of a special student-faculty committee to study some of the issues raised in the report and also to examine other problems which face the Law School. After its initial investigatory period, the committee will hold open hearings at which any law student will be able to express his views.

[Continued Page 8, Column 2.]
EDITORIAL

THIS ISSUE OF THE SUFFOLKATE IS THE LARGEST IN ITS BRIEF HISTORY; THE ARTICLES, FOR THE MOST PART, CONTAIN MUCH VALUABLE INFORMATION FOR THE ENTIRE STUDENT BODY.

WHEN THE SUFFOLKATE BEGAN LAST SEMESTER, THE STUDENTS INVOLVED WANTED THE PAPER TO BE MORE THAN A SOURCE OF SCHOOL INFORMATION, MORE THAN A SCHOOL NEWSPAPER. JUST EXACTLY WHAT THE SUFFOLKATE WAS TO BE, IN PRECISE TERMS, WAS NOT CLEAR; YET, ALL THE PEOPLE WORKING FOR THE NEWSPAPER AGREED ON AN OVERALL GOAL. EVERYONE INVOLVED FELT STRONGLY THAT THE SUFFOLKATE WAS TO BE A MEDIUM FOR POLITICAL CHANGE. IMPLIED IN THIS WAS THE FURTHER IDEA THAT THE PAPER WOULD SERVE AS A MEDIUM TO ENCOURAGE POLITICAL CHANGE ON A MUCH HIGHER LEVEL THAN SIMPLY IN OUR LAW SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT.

SINCE THE INCEPTION OF THE PAPER THE LAW SCHOOL HAS GONE THROUGH A PERIOD OF STUDENT ACTIVITY UNPARALLELED IN ITS HISTORY. STUDENT ACTIVITY IS VERY IMPORTANT BECAUSE IT ALLOWS US TO UNDERSTAND HOW THE LAW SCHOOL FUNCTIONS. HOWEVER, THIS UNDERSTANDING OF THE LAW SCHOOL STRUCTURE IS OF VERY LITTLE LASTING VALUE IF WE FAIL TO FOCUS IN ON HOW OUR LAW SCHOOL RELATES TO OUR SOCIETY AS A WHOLE. THE CONFLICTING FORCES IN THIS LAW SCHOOL (STUDENTS-FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION) ARE REPRESENTATIVE OF CERTAIN SIMILAR FORCES IN OUR SOCIETY (WORKERS-WHITE COLLAR WORKERS-RULING ELITE).

THE SUFFOLKATE HAS NOT ADEQUATELY FOCUSED IN ON THE CHARACTERISTICS AND RELATIONSHIPS THAT TYPIFY THESE GROUPS. IT IS HERE THAT THE SUFFOLKATE HAS BEEN UNSUCCESSFUL. WE HOPE TO ACCOMPLISH THESE GOALS IN FUTURE EDITIONS.

workers

Ed Englander
Dennis Derrick
Jim & Nancy Biceglia
Bill Grant
Gene Gillin
Jayne Tyrrell
Bill Bennett
Francine Vidockler
Bill DeVore
Lenny Polletta
Bill Simon
Frank Forrester
Carole Megarry
Bob Heppe
Jerry Howe
R. Groomer

note

Letters to the Editor [even though we don't have one] should be typed in columns 30 characters wide. This is true for any material submitted for publication since it expedites our planning and layout tremendously. We reserve the right to edit any material. Letters or articles may be given to any member of the staff or dropped off at the S.B.A. office.

Northeast Law Women's Conference

Report on the Northeast Law Women's Conference

Seventy or eighty women from Northeastern law schools convened at Rutgers University Law School for a two day conference December 10th and 11th, 1971. Suffolk's SBA provided funds for five women to attend. The conference was both informational and experiential, oriented both towards the problems of women in society at large and women in law.

Dr. Pauli Murray, a black feminist lawyer well known for her work in civil rights throughout the past thirty years, addressed the group on her observations and experiences. She was asked by a black woman her opinion on the problem of sexism as it relates to the total black experience with racism. (It is often said that black women reject the women's movement as middle class, since they feel they should more properly devote their energies to stabilizing the black family structure, and restoring black men to positions of responsibility in the family and black society.) Dr. Murray responded that in her opinion it would be impossible for black people to recover from and overcome the racist experience without dealing with sexism, since black women (and men) had been afflicted severely by both. She did not hold the opinion that the women's movement was a luxury to be indulged in by essentially spoiled middle class women.

Also speaking was Jeanette Spencer, a black ex-convict, now working for the Fortune Society. She presented women's prisons as having in general better conditions than men's; the problems of violence, homosexuality and loathsome psychological surroundings do not plague women prisoners to the same extent. Women's prison problems tend rather to paternalistic attitudes by the administration and lack of meaningful therapy or rehabilitation.

[Continued Page 7, Column 1]
Within the next two weeks, the Law students at Suffolk University will have the opportunity to join a student-interest organization known as Mass. P.I.R.G. East.

P.I.R.G. (Public Interest Research Group) is a student-organized, student-funded operation which was initiated by consumer advocate Ralph Nader. Mr. Nader has recently appeared in the Boston area in an effort to publicize his student group. Meanwhile, Nader's assistants are organizing the P.I.R.G. group in eastern Massachusetts. Similar groups are now operative in Minnesota and Oregon, and twenty-one other states are beginning the organizational process.

Basically the structure of the P.I.R.G. groups involves the establishment of local chapters (each participating school comprising a chapter) which are primarily responsible for electing a Board of Directors from the chapter representatives. The Board of Directors then elects an Executive Board which is responsible for hiring a professional staff. This staff is comprised of attorneys and other professionals.

Mass. P.I.R.G. East is being established to deal with the myriad of problems facing the eastern Massachusetts community. The projects which are undertaken will reflect the needs of the community as determined by the public and the students.

In order for Suffolk University Law School to establish a P.I.R.G. chapter, over 50% of the students must sign a petition indicating their support of the organization. Should the students and the Trustees ratify the formation of a P.I.R.G. chapter at Suffolk, each Law student will be assessed an additional $4 on his S.B.A. fee. The money would be used to pay the professional staff. Students not wishing to contribute would be entitled to a refund.

Bill De Vore
Dear Editor,

In the past few weeks there has been much debate over the fact that Law Review members receive " waivers". Up to this point, much has been said against the waiver. Very few facts have been written explaining what it is, how it is used and whether it exists. The purpose of this article is actually threefold: first, it seems apparent that few students at Suffolk understand the operation of our school's Law Review. Thus, an attempt will be made to synopsize the practices and procedure of the Review. Second, the waiver has been attacked for verbosity by students who are totally unfamiliar with the manner in which the system operates. It is, therefore, necessary to inform the student body with regard to the procedure of the waiver process. Third, it is necessary to clearly present the consensus of the Law Review Editorial Board, as to why it is in favor of the waiver system or a reasonable alternative be retained.

At the very outset it is necessary to note that this article purveys solely to Law Review. No attempt will be made here to explain or justify the "waiver process" for any other activity of the Law School. This is important for a number of reasons. It is important to note that the publication of the Law Review is one of the primary vehicles by which the Law School attains recognition from the local Bench and Bar. Also, it is perhaps the chief vehicle through which the Law School receives national recognition. The necessity of this recognition should be apparent to every member of the student body. The Law Review was not established to be an instrument by which individual students could vent their egos. The Review was established as a vehicle by which the student could present material which would be of concern to the legal community. In the six years since its inception, the Review has distinguished itself among legal journals throughout the United States. This is exemplified by the fact that it has been cited by the U.S. Supreme Court and by numerous state supreme courts. This is mentioned not to extoll the virtues of the Review, but rather to install a sense of pride within the student body.

The Suffolk Law Review is received by nearly every major law school in the United States. There is also a private subscription rate consisting of some 1000 jurists and lawyers. A great majority of these subscribers practice within the Boston Metropolitan Area. There should be no need to expound upon the importance of this. The more local practitioners exposed to a quality product, the more likely are the chances that the school will ultimately be accorded recognition as an institution which produces highly qualified members of the Bar. It follows that the student will be the definitive beneficiary of this recognition in the form of readily available jobs.

The Law Review does not promote the names of the past, present or future Editorial Board or staff members; rather it promotes Suffolk Law School.

LAW REVIEW OPERATION

The Law Review consists of an Editorial Board of eleven members and a staff of forty-three members. The Editor-in-Chief is ultimately responsible for deciding what is to be published in each issue. The Managing Editor is primarily responsible for the day-to-day operation and administration of the publication.

In addition to these editors there are nine other editors, each responsible for various technical and literary duties. It is the purpose of the Editorial Board to insure that the Law Review is published. The Law Review staff is responsible for, inter alia, contributing articles to The Review. As an aside, it should be noted that any student in the Law School may submit an article to the Law Review for publication. If it is deemed to be of publishable quality, the Editorial Board will prepare it for publication. In addition to contributing articles, the Law Review staff is responsible for site checking every article for accuracy and for proofreading every article at least twelve times before it is finally published.

Perhaps, it would be beneficial at this point to give a brief discussion of how students are selected as staff members of Law Review. Members are selected after completion of first year studies. Membership is determined in two ways. First, the Editorial Board receives the names of the top seventy-five students in the first year class. Second, each of these candidates is sent an invitation to compete for a position on the Law Review staff. The competition consists of the writing of a case comment on a recent Circuit Court of Appeals decision. When all competition articles are received, the Editorial Board then interviews each candidate to determine such things as motivation and dedication. Finally, staff members are selected based upon a vote of the Editorial Board. Each candidate is evaluated in the most equitable manner. Some of the major considerations include, legal writing ability, quality of research, motivation and dedication.

Each staff member of the Review is required to submit at least two articles of publishable quality per year. (Some write three or four.) In addition to this writing requirement, each staff member is required to perform all the necessary functions which contribute to a final publication. This requires a great amount of time.

Time is probably the one factor which substantiates the need for a waiver system. An attempt will be made to outline briefly the amount of time which must be spent in order to publish the Law Review.

Editor-in-Chief - The newly elected Editor-in-Chief's duties commence upon the final publication of the Review in June. It is necessary for the Editor-in-Chief to spend an average of five hours per day, five days a week throughout the entire summer in Law Review work. When school commences the Editor-in-Chief must read and edit every article that goes into every issue. Whenever a deadline is imminent, the Editor-in-Chief must read and edit every article at least five days a week.

Managing Editor - As mentioned above, the Managing Editor is responsible for the administration of the Law Review staff. His duties include, inter alia, preparing the budget, assuring that all cite-checking and proofreading is accomplished, assuring that the manuscripts get to the printer on time, and all other duties required to meet publication. This requires an enormous amount of time. Managing Editor spends an average of 9-10 hours a day, five days a week, at the Law Review Office. Here again, it is necessary for the Managing Editor to be available on weekends.

Note Editors - The Note Editors are responsible for the selection of topics which are timely and deserving of the attention of the legal
community. This can be demanding and time consuming as it is necessary to ensure that the various legal scholarship has not been exhausted in the specific area of concern. In the course of the summer recess and the academic year each note editor may be involved in the preparation, editing and finalization of up to 15 student publications of considerable length. The exact breakdown of the workload involved in the aforementioned editorial process is difficult, but it obviously represents a significant investment of time and this does not take into account the everyday ministerial activities in which an editor may be involved.

Technical Editors - The Technical Editors have responsibility to insure that every article published by the Review is technically accurate in form. This includes checking the validity of every statement of law and fact and ensuring that each statement is buttressed by a primary authority. As the other editors, the Technical Editors read each article at least twice after it has gone through the editorial process prior to the expiration. The average hours expended at this responsibility are 7-8 hours a day, not including weekends.

All other Editorial Board members are available every day, five days a week. The Law Review staff is also required to be available for technical work five days per week. This in addition to the time required to be spent in researching and writing articles for publication.

WAIVER PROCESS

This Editorial Board is not fully aware of how or when the "waiver process" originated. However, it is aware of how it operates relative to this year's Editorial Board and Staff.

A waiver, in the sense that it relates to Law Review, does not allow any individual staff member the ability to take less than the required number of credit hours per semester. Each Editorial Board and Staff member must take all required courses. [Continued Page 9, Column 2]

WOMEN'S CONFERENCE

Continued from Page 9, Column 3.

The Fortune Society, founded originally by and for men ex-convicts, opposes the continued maintenance of prisons and supports reha rehabilitation within the community.

Probably the most interesting reactions of the women attending this conference resulted from a panel of women attorneys. On that panel were: the director of the Rutgers Law placement office, a Republican committee woman engaged in private practice, a New Jersey defender, a securities lawyer-business teacher, and several students. The panel discussion began with the members explaining their experiences as women breaking into "establishment" types of law. The dissent grew in the listeners, and was finally verbalized by a Yale woman, who commented that while all this was very interesting, she did not feel that there was any long-term benefit likely to accrue to women of society by women's struggling to enter the very oppressive, competitive, and monetarily oriented segment of American law which had so long ignored them. In response, the securities lawyer said that she resented the implication that a woman's proper place in law was in the sphere devoted to doing good for society rather than following her natural competitive inclinations, if she happened to have them. This led to expression of anger by many women law students involved in the movement at those women who do not contribute to the movement, but who derive its benefits; as, those women who are hired because a firm decides it is necessary to have a woman on its staff due to the rising consciousness brought about by the movement. Compromises were attempted, and it was suggested that women were needed in all aspects of law, and that those holding positions in the business and financial elements of law could serve by their presence and influence to combat sexism in the legal profession and American life in general, even though their sisters working in fields of anti-discrimination, prison and abortion reform, etc., might be dealing with the problem more directly.

As for the Rutgers' women, alleged by those sympathetic to the women's movement to be the most together group of women law students in the Northeast, they seem to be not so militant as they are united, and not so much radical feminists as they are a group well-attuned to the position of women in society in general, and in the legal profession in particular. Their levels of militancy and areas of commitment vary widely. Because of this, they stand as an excellent example of the strength women may draw from one another even lacking complete accord on ultimate goals.

Carole Megarry

Gene Gillin

people's note

On Thursday evening, February 10th, the representatives of the Student Bar Association sat down to discuss the problems of the Law School. One of the problems they must confront is, of course, always money. If this is so, it would have helped if they had eliminated the steak dinner which they enjoyed while solving our problems. The dinner was paid for by all of the students in the Law School since its payment came from our Student Bar Fees. This note is written to inform the students that we have a well-fed group of student representatives.

(P.S. It should be noted that only Bill Grant and Lenny Polletta refused to take part; and that some steak-eaters were not Student Reps.)

Robert Moscow

Grades Due By March 1st

Procedures have been streamlined in an effort to make grades available more quickly according to the Law School's Registrar, Prof. Pote. The introduction of I.B.M. cards during first semester is one mechanism which should speed processing once all grades have been submitted to the office.

Several professors have indicated in class that a target date of Feb. 18 has been set for the submission of marks. Once this has been accomplished, the processing time by the Registrar's Office should require no longer than 48 hours. Miss Pote cautioned, however, that if even one set of marks is missing because of illness or other circumstances beyond control, the whole schedule can be set back. The key is computer time which must be reserved since Suffolk buys time since the school does not have its own facilities. This can mean a delay of as much as a week due to problems of rescheduling.

Miss Pote went on to explain that professors are aware of student anticipation, but cautioned that professors rarely can read books a day and treat each one fairly and consistently. A period of weeks rather than one or two, is the usual length of time before grades are returned. This is approximately two weeks faster than last year.

Grades are available for viewing by all of the students in the Law School's Registrar, Prof. Pote. The introduction of I.B.M. cards during first semester is one mechanism which should speed processing once all grades have been submitted to the office.
HELP!

The SUFFOLKATE needs you.
The job of assembling a paper this size requires a substantial amount of time. We're looking for reporters, typists or anyone else who would like to try their hand at working with the newspaper. All decisions are reached by a consensus of the people who work on the paper.

Our meeting times are posted on a mailbox outside the SBA office. Stop by and see what's happening. Previous experience, although frowned upon (since we don't have any), will not be held against you.

The SUFFOLKATE needs you.

Mailbox

Dave Nicholson, a Suffolk Law first year, has a question for the SUFFOLKATE. Who really corrects all of the exams? And further goes on to query, "Is it the professor this, her, etc. self, in which case the anxious student is faced with the prospect of some maniac making slash marks on papers, or is it a battery of "exam correctors", picking up a grand while we sleep? When and if you are able to answer this question, I would appreciate a reply.

All power to the people and (optional) pass the M-79's.

David A. Nicholson

CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

Continued from Page 3, Column 3.

Members of the SBA Curriculum Committee will meet with the Faculty Curriculum Committee report. Hopefully, this meeting will take place shortly after Feb. 18, at which time professors have been asked to submit their grades.

We cannot overemphasize the need for continued student support for the proposals. If you are in favor of the proposals, communicate your views to members of the faculty and specifically members of the Faculty Curriculum Committee.

Members of the Committee are:

Prof. Donahue, Chairman
Prof. Anton
Prof. Sargent
Prof. Judge
Prof. Elias

By Bill DeVore & Fran Mirkin, Members SBA Curriculum Com.

TENANT UNION BLUES

Continued from Page 1, Column 3.

"Fair Net Operating Income formula under which rents are raised in Cambridge. This suit is still in the courts.

Harlow tenants got what they took as assurance by Superior Court Judge Hale that no one would be evicted for refusing to pay Corkery's rent increases pending outcome of the suit.

The first batch of eviction notices came in September, including a blind teacher in her fifties and Union leader Kathy Huntley. Tenants began circulating a pledge to help pay for the seal.

There's been an upsurge in early evictions in the past few weeks, which has been good news in Cambridge. This suit is still in the courts.

Last week many other Harlow tenants got eviction notices for not paying their increases on a day's notice. The suit is still in the courts.

What about the Harlow tenants' lawyer? John Henn? It was reported to us that Henn took as assurance by Superior Court Judge Hale that no one would be evicted for refusing to pay Corkery's rent increases pending outcome of the suit.

All power to the people and (optional) pass the M-79's.

David A. Nicholson

Nuts and bolts...

Ivan Banks, where are you?

We were sitting in the Moot Court Room the other day thinking about how nice it will look when the new brown Law School seal is dedicated later this month. (The SBA kicked in $500 to help pay for the seal.)

Then we looked up to the ceiling and noticed the bare fluorescent tubes and wondered if anyone ever thought to replace the missing diffuser. One of the other fixtures in the room doesn't light at all.

Fluorescent tubes, by the way, should be changed at least once a year. The efficiency of the light produced by each tube falls off dramatically after a certain number of hours. This explains why most businesses have periodic relamping programs based on the number of hours of service of each fixture.

Since Suffolk goes almost twenty-four hours a day with cleaning, etc. the yearly figure mentioned earlier is probably way off.

Has anyone ever thought to tighten up the desks in Classrooms 311 or 14? Then there's the aura called 218 by the students. Since the inauguration of President Pulham the desks in Room 14 have been in disarray since they were all moved in conjunction with the academic procession. Maybe the original plan is still kicking around somewhere.

2. Any interested student should submit his or her name immediately to his SBA representative or the SBA office.

The deadline for applications is February 24, 1972 at 6:00 p.m.

4. All applicants will be required to come before the SBA at February 24th at 6:00 p.m. for a personal interview.

6. The SBA will nominate a slate of eight students to the Committee. The Dean will then select four students from this slate to sit on the Committee.

Ed Englander

Faculty Student Committee

Continued from Page 1, Column 2.

Professor Lemelman has taken on the job as Chairman. He has a lot of good ideas for the committee once it is formed, but currently faces the problem of how students should be chosen for the Committee.

The Committee will consist of four Faculty members and four Law students. The Faculty members are: Professor Lemelman, Chairman; Professors Kindregan, Vacco and Pote. The four students will be appointed to the committee in accord with the following guidelines:

1. The four positions will be open to all Law students in good standing.

2. The first batch of eviction notices came in September, including a blind teacher in her fifties and Union leader Kathy Huntley. Tenants began circulating a pledge to help pay for the seal.}

We cannot overemphasize the need for continued student support for the proposals. If you are in favor of the proposals, communicate your views to members of the faculty and specifically members of the Faculty Curriculum Committee.
I. Overview

In the beginning of the year, the staff was admonished that they must not cut classes in the hopes that they would subsequently receive a waiver. No Law Review member is guaranteed a waiver.

A waiver is recommended at the end of each semester only if it has been determined that an individual has contributed so much time to Law Review that he has jeopardized himself in a particularly demanding time. Not every member who requests a waiver is granted a waiver. There were fifty-four members of Law Review at the end of last semester. There were forty-seven waivers recommended. This means that seven members did not receive a "waiver".

At the end of the semester, if a staff member believes that he has jeopardized himself in a course, he may submit a letter to the Editorial Board requesting a "waiver". The Editorial Board then meets and evaluates each letter submitted in conjunction with our records of each applicant. If the Editorial Board determines that the individual concerned has contributed such time to the Review that he has jeopardized himself in a course, then it will recommend a "waiver". This recommendation is then forwarded to the Law Review Faculty Advisor for approval.

The maximum number of hours any individual on Law Review could possibly "waive" is 3 per semester. No full year courses may be waived. The maximum number of hours any individual can waive in one year is 7. A selected number of third-year students were granted an additional one credit waiver in a pass-fail course this year.

II. Justification of Waiver Process

As mentioned earlier, Law Review demands an extraordinary amount of time. In order to prepare a legal periodical worthy of publication under the name of Suffolk University Law School, it is necessary to spend countless hours researching, writing, editing, and preparing material. In order to obtain the highest quality work from all staff members, it is necessary to provide some form of consideration to the individuals who must spend their free time on Law Review work. If an individual devotes so much time to Law Review, his studies are likely to suffer. Given the fact that the Law Review is a service for the school and the legal community, the individual concerned should be compensated in some way. If a staff member was not allowed the flexibility of a "waiver", more time would have to be spent on studies and less on Law Review.

It is hoped that this article will shed some light on the "waiver". The process, as originally devised, and as currently operated is not meant to be inequitable. Its main purpose is to allow those staff members who have devoted so much time to Law Review the flexibility which is necessary to meet and overcome academic difficulties. There is no attempt made by any member to "pad" his average. In most instances, the course that is waived is the one which demands the most preparation.

Additionally, the facts show that even with a "waiver" in the majority of cases, the class ranks of the Review members suffer. For this discussion, only the statistics of the class of 1972 will be used. Of the top 25 students after the first year, 10 were selected for Review. Of these 10, only 3 improved in class ranking, one stayed the same, and six fell in rank. Of the persons who attained a rank in the top 25 for the first time during the second year, only 4 were Review members while 10 students not on Review made this group. Of the top 25 for the second year, only 4 had been Review members the previous year. The members of the Review do not improve their rank and, in fact, do not have a very good representation among the "high rankers" in their class.

It is thus apparent that there is no support for the theory that Law Review members with "waivers" are the ones who continue to improve their class standing.

It is hoped that this brief discussion will answer some of the queries posed relative to Law Review and the "waiver process". There has never been any intention on the part of anyone to take advantage of the system.
SBA REPORT

The following is a report received from S.B.A. listing its major activities for the First Semester.

SBA CHARTER - The Charter of the SBA had not been changed or updated in any manner since its origination in 1959. The major changes include the equalization of representation between the day and evening divisions, both in numbers of officers and class representatives. In addition, the right to vote for President and Chairman was expanded to include all students not graduating from their respective division. Copies of the new Charter are available in the SBA Office.

SUFFOLKATE - The establishment and funding of the Suffolkate was one of SBA's first projects this year. Undoubtedly discussion of the Suffolkate has taken up more time at SBA meetings than any other single issue.

The paper is providing a forum for students' views and filling the void in the Law School communications gap.

LAW DAY - A plan for a new Law Day entailing more emphasis on the law and less on the social aspects has been established. This plan includes the abolition of the past years practice of SBA heavily underwriting the cost of the event.

SBA SPORTS PROGRAM - Bob Damiano was appointed Director of SBA sports and a successful series of inter-section touchy tackle football games was played by such great teams as the "Zeros", the "Cardiac Smoke Boys", and "Jingles Boys". Look for new SBA hockey league this Winter.

SBA MEETING WITH UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT - The SBA met with Suffolk University President Thomas Fulham during the Fall to extensively discuss Law School problems. A.A.L.S.'s (American Association of Law Schools) accreditation for Suffolk University Law School was discussed at length. President Fulham assured SBA that A.A.L.S. accreditation for S.U.L.S. was one of his first objectives as the new University President. Minority admissions and curriculum were also discussed.

SBA LEGAL AID COMMITTEE - The committee has been investigating the establishment of an SBA funded legal aid office located within Boston or Quincy.

BEVERLY LEGAL AID - About 30 students from S.U.L.S. are currently working out of the Beverly Legal Aid Office. SBA has contributed $500 this year and more last year to assist.

NEW LOUNGE FOR LAW STUDENTS - SBA discussed the possibility of a Law Student Lounge somewhere in the Donoghue Building when it becomes totally occupied by the Law School.

FILM: TRIAL OF A BLACK PANTHER - The film of this trial was shown during fall semester and will be shown again during Spring term.

SBA COCKTAIL PARTY - A small bash was held on Oct. 22nd. Note future SBA cocktail parties will have Free beer so watch for announcements.

NEW LIBRARY HOURS - Due to increased demand on the students' part for use of library facilities, the SBA requested longer hours of library operation, which were granted.

SBA-FACULTY DINNER - On November 18, 1971 the SBA and the faculty met. The purpose of this meeting was to give the students and faculty a chance to discuss the problems of the school at some length. It was a success and will be repeated again in February.

WOMEN'S LAW CONFERENCE - SBA sent eight women to the Women's Law Conference at Rutgers. A full report is on the SBA bulletin board.

JOHN LABANARA SCHOLARSHIP FUND - SBA donated $200 to the John Labanara Scholarship Fund in memory of John Labanara, S.U.L.S., 1971, who was murdered last October 20, the same day he received notice of his passing the Massachusetts Bar Exam.

COMMUNITY LAW PROGRAM - This program, entailing the teaching of five different courses in the practical application of the law, is a first in legal education. The program was organized by Ed Englander. It is totally funded and supported by SBA. See your SBA representative or come to SBA office for details.

ASSISTANT FOR CLINICAL PROGRAM - Due to the increased interest and participation in the clinical programs, there is need for additional administrative assistance. SBA petitioned the Trustees to create a new job position for an assistant to the clinical programs. This was done in December and the position will soon be hopefully filled.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE - The committee made an extensive study of the S.U.L.S. curriculum of other Boston area Law Schools. The committee wrote an extensive report and sent it to all members of the faculty and administration. Action on this report is now pending.

CRITIQUE COMMITTEE - This committee has been meeting in an attempt to establish a permanent system whereby students could critique faculty and courses. The goal is to have the results compiled and interpreted by a computer and then made available to students and faculty.

LAW SCHOOL SEAL - SBA donated $100 to the Hakim Legal Defense Fund.

SUFFOLKATE - The establishment of an SBA sponsored Legal Aid Office is totally funded and supported by SBA. See your SBA representative or come to SBA office for details.

BEVERLY LEGAL AID - About 30 students from S.U.L.S. are currently working out of the Beverly Legal Aid Office. SBA has contributed $500 this year and more last year to assist.

NEW LOUNGE FOR LAW STUDENTS - SBA discussed the possibility of a Law Student Lounge somewhere in the Donoghue Building when it becomes totally occupied by the Law School.

FILM: TRIAL OF A BLACK PANTHER - The film of this trial was shown during fall semester and will be shown again during Spring term.

SBA COCKTAIL PARTY - A small bash was held on Oct. 22nd. Note future SBA cocktail parties will have Free beer so watch for announcements.

NEW LIBRARY HOURS - Due to increased demand on the students' part for use of library facilities, the SBA requested longer hours of library operation, which were granted.

SBA-FACULTY DINNER - On November 18, 1971 the SBA and the faculty met. The purpose of this meeting was to give the students and faculty a chance to discuss the problems of the school at some length. It was a success and will be repeated again in February.

WOMEN'S LAW CONFERENCE - SBA sent eight women to the Women's Law Conference at Rutgers. A full report is on the SBA bulletin board.

JOHN LABANARA SCHOLARSHIP FUND - SBA donated $200 to the John Labanara Scholarship Fund in memory of John Labanara, S.U.L.S., 1971, who was murdered last October 20, the same day he received notice of his passing the Massachusetts Bar Exam.

COMMUNITY LAW PROGRAM - This program, entailing the teaching of five different courses in the practical application of the law, is a first in legal education. The program was organized by Ed Englander. It is totally funded and supported by SBA. See your SBA representative or come to SBA office for details.

ASSISTANT FOR CLINICAL PROGRAM - Due to the increased interest and participation in the clinical programs, there is need for additional administrative assistance. SBA petitioned the Trustees to create a new job position for an assistant to the clinical programs. This was done in December and the position will soon be hopefully filled.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE - The committee made an extensive study of the S.U.L.S. curriculum of other Boston area Law Schools. The committee wrote an extensive report and sent it to all members of the faculty and administration. Action on this report is now pending.

CRITIQUE COMMITTEE - This committee has been meeting in an attempt to establish a permanent system whereby students could critique faculty and courses. The goal is to have the results compiled and interpreted by a computer and then made available to students and faculty.

LAW SCHOOL SEAL - SBA donated $100 to the Hakim Legal Defense Fund.

SUFFOLKATE - The establishment of an SBA sponsored Legal Aid Office is totally funded and supported by SBA. See your SBA representative or come to SBA office for details.

BEVERLY LEGAL AID - About 30 students from S.U.L.S. are currently working out of the Beverly Legal Aid Office. SBA has contributed $500 this year and more last year to assist.

NEW LOUNGE FOR LAW STUDENTS - SBA discussed the possibility of a Law Student Lounge somewhere in the Donoghue Building when it becomes totally occupied by the Law School.

FILM: TRIAL OF A BLACK PANTHER - The film of this trial was shown during fall semester and will be shown again during Spring term.

SBA COCKTAIL PARTY - A small bash was held on Oct. 22nd. Note future SBA cocktail parties will have Free beer so watch for announcements.

NEW LIBRARY HOURS - Due to increased demand on the students' part for use of library facilities, the SBA requested longer hours of library operation, which were granted.

SBA-FACULTY DINNER - On November 18, 1971 the SBA and the faculty met. The purpose of this meeting was to give the students and faculty a chance to discuss the problems of the school at some length. It was a success and will be repeated again in February.

WOMEN'S LAW CONFERENCE - SBA sent eight women to the Women's Law Conference at Rutgers. A full report is on the SBA bulletin board.

JOHN LABANARA SCHOLARSHIP FUND - SBA donated $200 to the John Labanara Scholarship Fund in memory of John Labanara, S.U.L.S., 1971, who was murdered last October 20, the same day he received notice of his passing the Massachusetts Bar Exam.

COMMUNITY LAW PROGRAM - This program, entailing the teaching of five different courses in the practical application of the law, is a first in legal education. The program was organized by Ed Englander. It is totally funded and supported by SBA. See your SBA representative or come to SBA office for details.

ASSISTANT FOR CLINICAL PROGRAM - Due to the increased interest and participation in the clinical programs, there is need for additional administrative assistance. SBA petitioned the Trustees to create a new job position for an assistant to the clinical programs. This was done in December and the position will soon be hopefully filled.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE - The committee made an extensive study of the S.U.L.S. curriculum of other Boston area Law Schools. The committee wrote an extensive report and sent it to all members of the faculty and administration. Action on this report is now pending.
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