C-M tuition set to spike

By Amanda Paar

In what is being called yet another attempt to battle state budget cuts, the Board of Trustees Financial Affairs Committee has proposed a 12 percent hike in tuition at C-M. The increase would leave C-M full-time students footing a bill of $13,652 as opposed to the current amount of $11,648.

Undergraduate tuition at Cleveland State University will also see an increase, but a state imposed 9.9 percent cap on state undergraduate tuition has shifted a heavier burden to C-M.

Despite the fact that a greater impact of the increase will be felt by C-M students, the majority of funds generated by the hike, roughly 6.6 percent, would be used to fund general operating expenses at CSU. In addition, the overall jump will create a four percent surplus, which SBA President Sasha Markovic said is extremely questionable in a time of economic downturn. The Board is set to vote on the increase in April.

CSU clarifies email privacy policy

By Eric Doeh

CSU’s computer security policy allows university personnel to read or otherwise access faculty and student email or faculty computer files, either in the normal operation and maintenance of the university’s computer facilities or when staff of the information services and technology department inadvertently or inevitably open or otherwise briefly access an email message or file.

According to Fabian Ferreri, security administrator of the information services and technology department, “unless the email were sent and stored using encryption, we, or any other email or computer administrator have the ability to look at email content. It’s the nature of the job.”

Ferreri specified however that his department looks at email content only when asked to do so by the email owner to fix a problem or when the department or university is subpoenaed to do so.

Under CSU’s security policy, access by university personnel of faculty and student email requires the permission of either the sender or the recipient of the message. The policy states, however, that all other employees, including student workers and faculty administrators are subject to access by those to whom they report.

David Getzen, assistant director for academic technology said that the law school follows CSU’s computer security policy. He said, “we neither read, nor filter email content, and we take every step to ensure electronic privacy.”

Ferreri said he agrees with Getzen. “As our policy is written, we cannot and do not filter the contents of email,” said Ferreri. Ferreri said his department does filter email attachments for viruses.

However, Ferreri acknowledged that email is not the most secure means of communication. He said that sending an email is analogous to mailing a post card.

Prof. Kevin O’Neill said, “we shouldn’t have any illusions about the privacy of email communications. Typing up and mailing a letter the old-fashioned way is a much more private means of communication.”

When CSU first adopted its computer security policy, the policy was primarily based on the ideas of Charles Cresson Wood, author and independent information security consultant. Cresson’s book, Information Security Made Easy, was the foundation of CSU’s computer security policy. The policy was later revised, and in February of 2002, the new policy was implemented.

While CSU’s security policy potentially more money might have been forthcoming to fund something else.

According to documents produced by Braun & Steidl Architects, the executive summary of the renovation project was based around a new tacit vision. This vision “commits itself to continue providing broad access to a high quality legal education while strengthening its reputation and impact regionally and nationally.”

The main objective of the renovation project is to continue the development of the East 17th Street project that began with the law library in 1997. The ultimate goal is to eventually implement a plan that would make the exterior of all the buildings in the project look fluid.

The process of the plan began with input from four separate groups: students, administration, faculty and the recipient of the message.

CU alum Steven Steinglass said he donated the money nearly two years ago. He said the school has made no effort to contact him or make him aware of any plans of potential renovations. Further, he feels he should have been contacted about the results and
Bar passage begins with individual strategy

By Steven H. Steinglass

In the February issue of the Gavel, I wrote about the committee chaired by Prof. Patricia Falk that developed a plan to assure our students' success on the Ohio Bar. In this column I want to discuss what you can do on your own to prepare for success.

First, I will repeat what I have said many times: you would not be here if we did not have complete confidence in your abilities to learn the law and pass the bar on your first opportunity.

The Dean's Column

Solutions to your biggest concerns

A number of programs that are designed to improve student performance on the bar are underway. These programs are having an impact. The 2003 graduating class had a 74 percent pass rate, the highest of any graduating class in Ohio State history. From the past-fail standard that was established in 1997, when the graduating class had a 64 percent pass rate. Moreover, the first-time pass rate on the July 2003 bar for full-time students entering in 2002 was 78 percent.

The most significant thing we learned in July is that the best predictor of success on the Bar Exam is success in law school. For the last seven graduating classes, the pass rate of students who graduated in the top half of their class was 91 percent, while the rate of those in the bottom quarter of their class was less than 35 percent.

A review of bar performance also reveals that in the last few years, part-time students have not done as well as full-time students. For instance, on the July 2000 bar, 83 percent of our full-time students passed, while only 65 percent of our part-time students passed. Since part-time and full-time students are admitted based on identical criteria, we believe the disparity is best explained by the different obligations these groups face.

My own personal observation is that to pass the Bar Exam you must develop your own individual Bar Exam plan; one in which you identify the courses you need to take and give the courses the maximum effort they require throughout your law school career. This plan must also include a strategy for how you will study and a time-allocation plan for the two months prior to the bar exam.

I commend the bar review courses are necessary, but not sufficient. It is also necessary to arrange your work and vacation schedules so that, to the extent possible, the Bar Exam is scheduled for a time you can devote to it.

My best advice to you who are about to graduate and face the ordeal in Columbus? Take time off from your job, say goodbye to your friends and family. Part with all study, study and practice, practice, practice.
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KEEPS AN EYE ON SUMMER TRAVEL SAFETY

According to the U.S. Department of State, more than 2,500 American citizens are arrested abroad each year, half on narcotics charges, including possession of very small amounts of illegal substances. A drug that is legal in one country may not be legal in a neighboring nation. Besides drugs, alcohol can also cause trouble for U.S. citizens traveling abroad.

Students have been arrested for being intoxicated in public areas and for drunk driving. Some Americans go abroad assuming that local authorities will overlook such conduct. Many believe they are immune from prosecution in foreign countries because they are American citizens. The truth is that Americans are expected to obey these laws of the countries they visit, and those who break laws sometimes face severe penalties, including prison sentences.

Disorderly and reckless behavior is also to be avoided. Being arrested is not the only misfortune that can occur on a foreign vacation. Americans have suffered injury or death from automobile accidents, drownings and falls, in addition to other mishaps.

Other Americans have been sexually assaulted or robbed because they have found themselves in unfamiliar locales or are incapable of exercising prudent judgment while under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

Because standards of security, safety and supervision are not the same in many countries as they are in the U.S., many have died after falls from balconies, after falling into open ditches, by drowning in the ocean as well as in hotel pools and in water sport mishaps. Uncensored operators have been linked to assaults, and a number of Americans have been killed or injured by the improper use of jet-skis or other personal watercraft.

The Department of State warns that Americans traveling abroad should remember that reckless behavior while in another country can do more than ruin their vacation; it can land them in a foreign jail or cause them to suffer physical harm.

U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT

The annual law school rankings will be released on April 2, 2004. This list ranks law schools in one of three categories: top 100, tier 3 and tier 4. Last year, C&M was ranked in the fourth tier.

Safeguards Advisory

A law student went to the law library desk on the evening of Thursday, March 25 in order to call the police. He said he was approached by a man in the Law School atrium and asked if he could have a ride to the social security office so that he could pick up his Social Security card.

Communiqué

There will be two open meetings to learn more about the CSU’s Community Advocacy Clinic. The meetings are scheduled for April 6, from noon to 1 p.m. and from 3:30 to 5:30 p.m. in Room 208. The Community Advocacy Clinic works with real clients on real cases to enhance the community and improve neighborhoods in Cleveland.

Message from Dean Gary Williams

For the 2004-2005 academic year, there are several teaching assistant positions available for students in the top 25 percent of their class. This position would entail your work with a group of approximately 15-20 first-year students on a weekly basis to help them with their analytical skills and essay writing skills.

Privacy: Concerns of email filtering put to rest

CSU cannot and does not filter the contents of email.

Currently, at Ohio State University, the policy is that the computers and computer files of students, staff and faculty, being electronic extensions of their personal work areas, may not be inspected or tampered with without the permission of the owner, except for purposes relevant to the administration of the computer system.

At the University of Michigan, email and computer access are considered private to the fullest extent permitted by law. However, in the normal course of business, by virtue of their professional roles, university personnel may have special access privileges to email and computer files.

CSU’s computer security policy was designed to prevent illegal use of the computer facilities. CSU has no interest in the contents of messages, whether they are personal or professional.

The CSU computer security policy was designed by a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Committee, of which we are a part. The policy was designed to prevent illegal use of the computer facilities. CSU has no interest in the contents of messages, whether they are personal or professional.
Bar battle begins with “write” approach

CMLAA vice president urges that bar prep begin before graduation

By Karin Mika
LEGAL WRITING PROFESSOR

Work...only one of many 1L options

C-M students obsess about passing the bar, and rightly so. For several years, C-M has ranked seventh in bar passage rates among Ohio’s nine law schools, and CSU is breathing heavily down C-M’s neck to rectify this and establish parity with the two Ohio public law schools most similar to C-M, the University of Akron and the University of Toledo.

C-M students are very used to doing such things as study abroad, take a long trip or even do something that the student wants to do opposed to being obligated to do. In terms of taking extra classes, it would obviously be beneficial to take a class or two in order to minimize the pressure of trying to fit requirements into the remaining years of law school. Many students could devote some time to working during the summer while still fitting in a class or two. That would be an ideal compromise for the student who would like to work while still finishing off credits during the summer.

For my part, I wish I had taken advantage of other opportunities (such as studying abroad) when I was younger. It seemed as though I was always working while trying to fit in a few more credits. I know there’s a lot of pressure to get work experience, but in my own case, the work experience I did get played little or no role in what I actually wound up doing for a living. Now I’m kept hoping my children like me well enough to invite me on their field trips!

In a particularly memorable experience, I had a student a few years back who agonized over a decision about whether to study abroad after her first year or attempt to find work in the legal field. Ultimately, she decided to study abroad and had the best summer of her life. When she returned, she went on to become the editor of the law review and, after graduation, got the job of her dreams working for a judge.

Too often in life, especially these days, we are called upon to have some precognition about today’s decisions will affect what happens to us 20 years from now. And, unfortunately, sometimes a decision today will affect what happens to us 20 years from now; however, as is usually the case, balance is the key. As part of that balance, we sometimes have to consider what makes us happiest or most comfortable today.
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Bar battle begins with “write” approach

CMLAA vice president urges that bar prep begin before graduation

By Vincent Lombardo ’81

the years, here are five tips on how to pass the bar on the first try:

1. Take law school seriously.

Students who flunk the bar have the same problem as students who get “C” or worse at C-M: they are not doing the work. Most students studying for the bar obsess over the Multistate Bar Exam (MBE), yet most students who flunk the bar do poorly on the essays and the Multistate Performance Test (MPT), which constitute 60 percent of the grade.

Students who flunk the bar have the same problem as students who get “C” or worse at C-M: they are not doing the work. Most students studying for the bar obsess over the Multistate Bar Exam (MBE), yet most students who flunk the bar do poorly on the essays and the Multistate Performance Test (MPT), which constitute 60 percent of the grade.

2. Take the professor, not the course.

If the professor does not “teach to the test” or is simply not a good teacher, then why take the course? You will not learn anything, and will instead teach yourself the course with a study aid.

3. Learn to write like a lawyer.

I believe students flunk the bar not because they do not know the law but because they do not apply the law. Most states studying for the bar obsess over the Multistate Bar Exam (MBE), yet most students who flunk the bar do poorly on the essays and the Multistate Performance Test (MPT), which constitute 60 percent of the grade.

4. Study like crazy for six weeks.

You must take at least six weeks off to study for the bar, and you must study like crazy during those six weeks.

Many students say that they cannot afford to take six weeks off. You must plan for this as a first year student. Save your money, take a bar loan, borrow the money from a relative – do whatever you need to take the six weeks off.

For the six weeks, you cannot be distracted; you must focus exclusively on the bar. Say goodbye to your family and friends and resign yourself to being an absent spouse, parent, child or friend for six weeks. For six weeks, it is all about you. Live with any guilt. You will be a better spouse, parent, child or friend despite any temporary inconveniences or discomfort you may cause anyone.

5. Failure is not an option.

As hard as it is to believe, some students consider taking the bar for the first time only a dry run, a great learning experience. If they fail it the first time, they take it again. They do not study hard or focus that much – and, of course, they test it the first time.

Besides, the failure rate for repeats is even higher than first time takers, so why stick the odds against yourself? If you take the bar planning to flunk, then you will flunk. But if you take it intending to pass, then you will pass.

Vincent Lombardo ’81 is the Vice-President of the C-M Alumni Association.
FIP survey garners mixed results in tight market

By Maggie Fishell
STAFF WRITER

The Fall Interview Program (FIP), organized by the office of career planning, provides students with the opportunity to bid on jobs and meet with prospective employers.

This past fall, approximately 90 employers participated in the annual event. According to Jayne Geneva, 174 students participated in the 2003 FIP. Students placed 1,783 bids and 618 first interviews were given. The number of students who actually participated in the job search is augmented by students who sent their resumes directly to prospective employers.

The reported results of the 2003 FIP are as follows: three 1L’s received offers and all three accepted; 52 2L’s received offers and 30 accepted; 37 3L’s received offers and 30 accepted. Those students offered interviews and positions varied widely by the students’ class ranks. In both the 2L and 3L category, students in the top five percent through those individuals in the top 75th percent received interviews.

According to Jason Smith, 2L, specifically citing the summer position to Chris Adkins, Fallon, Paisley, & Howley L.L.P., a top-ten Cleveland law firm in terms of size, recently cut 42 jobs, including 13 attorneys and three partners, a 13 percent reduction in workforce. The cuts were announced after the 2003 FIP. Many firms’ representatives indicated that the number of summer associate positions available for this summer are down approximately 50 percent from the previous two years, said Smith.

Another indication of the weak economy is recent cutbacks in the current workforce at large Cleveland firms. Benessch, Friedland, Coplan, and Aromoff L.L.P., a top-ten Cleveland law firm, recently rescinded an offer for a current 3L student who recently accepted an offer for a summer position to Chris Adkins, Fallon, Paisley, & Howley L.L.P. According to Jayne Geneva, director of the office of career planning, the only way of knowing how many second interviews students offered interviews and positions varied widely by the students’ class ranks. In both the 2L and 3L category, students in the top five percent through those individuals in the top 75th percent received interviews.

There were job offers to students who actually participated in the job search. About 90% of the class of 2003 has a job, according to Geneva. C-M students are able to acquire jobs throughout the nation because of networking, but job offers are not handed out on a silver platter, said Geneva. Just like everything else in law school, hard work is required.

Another factor possibly contributing to weak revenues and the economy in general is the lack of available work. Weston, Hard, Fallon, Paisley, & Howley L.L.P. recently rescinded an offer for a summer position to Chris Adkins, 2L, specifically citing the Pontzer decision. Geneva acknowledges each year she hears concerns that the FIP is “unfair,” but she firmly believes the statistics prove that is not the case. Geneva points out for public knowledge; it’s sort of a trade secret that schools keep close to the vest,” said Geneva.

Geneva is quick to point out that the statistics prove that the down economy has limited the number of spots available, said Jason Smith, 2L. In fact, many firms’ representatives indicated that the number of summer associate positions available for this summer are down approximately 50 percent from the previous two years, said Smith.

Another indication of the weak economy is recent cutbacks in the current workforce at large Cleveland firms. Benessch, Friedland, Coplan, and Aromoff L.L.P., a top-ten Cleveland law firm, recently rescinded an offer for a current 3L student who recently accepted an offer for a summer position to Chris Adkins, Fallon, Paisley, & Howley L.L.P. According to Jayne Geneva, director of the office of career planning, the only way of knowing how many second interviews students offered interviews and positions varied widely by the students’ class ranks. In both the 2L and 3L category, students in the top five percent through those individuals in the top 75th percent received interviews.

According to Jason Smith, 2L, specifically citing the summer position to Chris Adkins, Fallon, Paisley, & Howley L.L.P., a top-ten Cleveland law firm in terms of size, recently cut 42 jobs, including 13 attorneys and three partners, a 13 percent reduction in workforce. The cuts were announced after the 2003 FIP. Many firms’ representatives indicated that the number of summer associate positions available for this summer are down approximately 50 percent from the previous two years, said Smith.

Another indication of the weak economy is recent cutbacks in the current workforce at large Cleveland firms. Benessch, Friedland, Coplan, and Aromoff L.L.P., a top-ten Cleveland law firm, recently rescinded an offer for a current 3L student who recently accepted an offer for a summer position to Chris Adkins, Fallon, Paisley, & Howley L.L.P. According to Jayne Geneva, director of the office of career planning, the only way of knowing how many second interviews students offered interviews and positions varied widely by the students’ class ranks. In both the 2L and 3L category, students in the top five percent through those individuals in the top 75th percent received interviews.

According to Jason Smith, 2L, specifically citing the summer position to Chris Adkins, Fallon, Paisley, & Howley L.L.P., a top-ten Cleveland law firm in terms of size, recently cut 42 jobs, including 13 attorneys and three partners, a 13 percent reduction in workforce. The cuts were announced after the 2003 FIP. Many firms’ representatives indicated that the number of summer associate positions available for this summer are down approximately 50 percent from the previous two years, said Smith.

Another indication of the weak economy is recent cutbacks in the current workforce at large Cleveland firms. Benessch, Friedland, Coplan, and Aromoff L.L.P., a top-ten Cleveland law firm, recently rescinded an offer for a current 3L student who recently accepted an offer for a summer position to Chris Adkins, Fallon, Paisley, & Howley L.L.P. According to Jayne Geneva, director of the office of career planning, the only way of knowing how many second interviews students offered interviews and positions varied widely by the students’ class ranks. In both the 2L and 3L category, students in the top five percent through those individuals in the top 75th percent received interviews.
Administration stands idly by

In a recent email addressed to the C-M student body, a faculty member raised concerns over the selection process of commencement speakers. Central to this concern was the idea that the current process neglects to consider the desires of the students, who should be the sole focus of graduation day. This is, as the email’s author suggests, not a novel notion. This notion should be extended beyond this limited instance of commencement and further aid in what should be a common understanding that the C-M experience is about the students. Students’ concerns, even those that don’t stand to bolster L-M’s outside reputation, are real. Sometimes as students, we get the feeling that this whole process is not about us, that we are a burden rather than the reason for C-M’s existence. In one ear, students hear about the prestigious alumni C-M has “developed” while, in the other ear, they are told “that’s your problem not mine.” One has to question whether these two images are consistent. The road from admission to graduation is an unfamiliar one for students. If things work out after all, it’s a path we only travel once. The staff, on the other hand, knows the system and all of its components. We are told they are “here to help.” Then why lately have students again and again encountered the perception that they are in a constant state of conflict with the staff? Why is it not a problem that students were prevented from asking more than one question about a final exam because their professor doesn’t get paid like he did when she worked in a big firm? Why is it ok for an entire staff in one office to tell students they don’t have time to answer crucial questions about a student’s future while games of solitaire are mockingly glowing on each of their computer terminals?

Has it always been acceptable to tell a student you refuse to write a letter of recommendation for them over the summer because your job does not mandate student interaction during the summer term? Students come to C-M to learn, among other skills, how to be the best possible advocates on behalf of our clients. We are told we have a duty to pursue our client’s case “zealously” even if we do not necessarily agree with our client’s actions. But when the Board of Trustees met last week to consider yet another substantial tuition hike which does not even stand to benefit C-M, who from the administration was there to advocate for us, the students? Who from the administration was there to ensure that we, the students, had zealous representation in the face of more payouts, which in the past have produced only a reduction in student services? Who from the administration even bothered to tell us the matter was going to be considered? No one. This omission sends the message that no matter how badly we are taken advantage of, they know we still sign the checks because we have to get our degree.

This is not to suggest that this apathy is reflected in all of C-M’s professors and staff. To the contrary, there are many more professors and members of the C-M staff who dedicate so much of themselves to ensure that students have the best educational experience possible. Jessica Mathewson, Michaline Carrig, Dean Gary Williams, Israel Payton, Joan Shirokey and a long list of others make the C-M experience possible. Jessica Mathewson, Michaline Carrig, Dean Gary Williams, Israel Payton, Joan Shirokey and a long list of professors and staff are shining examples on C-M’s staff of this selfless effort to ensure each student’s success.

Each of these individuals, in addition to so many more, look beyond their own interests to recognize that a student’s needs need and depend on them to get through this journey. They recognize that when we ask them to be our advocate or guide we are not trying to be their burden, but that we truly need their help. These individuals are the models that we hope others will take notice to ensure that students remain the focus of the C-M experience.

Remembering students first

In the past, students who had an option of attending Case or C-M often chose the later. In the near future, C-M may be unable to attract these higher caliber students and be unable to persuade them to attend the “school of value,” C-M. If the education is offered at C-M, the rent is a mere five to ten thousand dollars. Case may transform into the school of value. While C-M students are probably just as prepared and just as qualified as graduates from Case, they are not the perception from the outside. Case is a top 100 law school. C-M is a bottom tier law school. According to the new plan, charging of tuition at Case will significantly improve the image the school already has, while C-M’s image will remain stay as it always has. Why is it not a problem for students coming from Case, whether a fair belief or not. So, while it currently may not be best to choose Case over C-M, in the near future, this may be the case. Isn’t it worth it to come out with only slightly more debt if it means you have a better chance of both passing the bar and obtaining a high-paying job. A job paying 100,000 dollars per year will make up for that higher debt figure within the first couple of years.

Perhaps more disturbing than the proposed increase itself is the administrations’ apathy towards the tuition boost. Before the Board of Trustees’ summer meeting, in which the proposed increases was discussed, no C-M administrator informed the C-M student body. These meetings are open to the public and a voice of concern might have been helpful.

While having no representation from the general student body (aside from representatives from SBA, out about the meeting less than one day before) is reason for concern, perhaps more disappointing is that no C-M administrators were present to take up our cause. Shouldn’t someone represent us when this important decision was being discussed? The various demands should realize that large tuition increases are a concern of most, if not all, C-M students. While they may not be successful in combating such a tuition increase, they should attend at least and participate in the debate. Such participation must be too much to ask.
By Josh Doleah
COLUMBIA

On March 9, the Ohio State School Board approved a 22-page portion of a 547-page model lesson plan that would make teachers address evidence that calls into question Charles Darwin’s theory of evolution. The model lesson plan is a blueprint of subjects taught in tenth grade biology classes. The name of the newly drafted, 22-page lesson is “Critical Analysis of Evolution.” It sounds rather benign, but the lesson plan has stirred a national debate on creationism, prompting the ACLU to threaten suit against the school board.

Proponents of the lesson plan call it an intelligent design theory, or creation science. This theory explains how gaps exist in Darwin’s theory as a possible proponent of the possibility of a guiding power at work in the creation of our existence. Some people believe that the scientific evidence behind this theory of creation is just as persuasive as any other. Opponents of creation science and its implementation in the Ohio high school curriculum an unconstitutional mix of church and state.

In Edwards v. Aguillard, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional the Establishment Clause, a Louisiana law that forced all public school teachers to teach creation science in conjunction with any attempt to teach evolution, similar in substance to the Ohio state school board plan. The law was unconstitutional, but the Court was careful to maintain that “teaching a variety of scientific theories about the origins of humankind to schoolchildren might be validly done with the clear secular intent of enhancing the effectiveness of science instruction.”

The question of what constitutes an acceptable theory of secular creationism is relatively jettisoned. It is line drawing. When a school board decides what theories to teach, its choice is guided by public acceptance of the theories. A theory by definition is not fact. A theory becomes persuasive when the public accept it, therefore, who should decide the issue of what is an acceptable secular theory, an anti-majioritarian court or the elected representatives of the state?

Ideas are malleable by its very nature. People who think that shape it, not the Court; especially when the theory at issue is in the murky waters where science and religion converge. The mere fact that a scientific theory’s impetus is faith-based does not make the theory religious. The Court decided that it would be the final arbiter of what constitutes an acceptable definition of “scientific creationism.” In doing so, it has squelched a debate among scholars that could further our knowledge about the creation of the world.

The whole point of allowing, or even forcing the expression of contrary viewpoints, is to foster debate that will lead to truth. Sheltering people from ideas for fear that they might achieve a choice that the minority believes is unwise or deplorable is antithetical to the idea of free speech and the First Amendment.

The new Ohio curriculum is not forcing a restriction of the evolution debate, but rather it is forcing an expansion of it. The Ohio school board has simply limited the discretion of a teacher in choosing how she should approach the subject. Allowing or even forcing teachers to cover scientific creationism prevents teachers from speaking religious rhetoric. A guideline for teachers outlining how they should approach creationism helps ensure that they are treating the idea in a secular manner, as defined by science and as defined by the Court.

The threat of lawsuits and disciplinary action should deter teachers from over-stepping the boundaries set by the legislature and the Establishment Clause. Hopefully, the Court will decide that there is an acceptable way for legislators to define creationism as a secular, scientific theory. This way, our children can choose what to believe instead of being told what to believe. This way we will know the truth.

Darwin vs. God
Ohio plan ensures students will develop their own informed belief on evolution

O hio plan ensures students will develop their own informed belief on evolution.

Open Mike

By Michael Luby

GAYLORD

The home stretch is rounding the bend. Spring break is over and the warm weather has brought on a new season to head out. It should be a time of joy, at least for some students. As graduation nears, however, there appears to be controversy on the home front. A few people seem to be a little upset about the commencement speaker.

What’s the fuss about? Probably the most ensuring consideration is evidenced by blue-collar, hard-working, Cleveland-raised students and Pat McCarran, the scheduled speaker for the 2004 graduation ceremony and former Managing Partner of Jones Day, is Ivy League bred.

I have to admit, he’s a great guy, but he might not have much in common with our graduates. It’s a little late now, but maybe we need to students will have a say. Why not start this month?

Up next, Jon Stewart, and yes, he is a great choice. A graduate of William & Mary, The Daily Show host, is a regular distraction from the left or the right. Rather than emphasizing politics to one side, he has been quoted as wanting to stop the political repetition of previous trend leaders. Have too often forced ordinary citizens to believe them. The fake news show Stewart manages appeals to audiences directly at C-M. Why Jon? Why not? He has no limits. Rather than focusing on the legal powerhouse of Cleveland, he gives something applicable to the real world.

Next, Colman McCarthy. McCarthy, a Washington Post journalist, teaches at Georgetown University Law Center and runs the Center for Teaching Peace in Washington D.C. He’s a little bit partial for social justice, not seen in such effectiveness since Mr. Martin Luther King, Jr. I think stage favorite Colman, I might be partial, but he’s a lot more likely to say something controversial than say how long it should take to make partner, why Colman? He spends every year going over to 20 colleges and universities giving speeches and talking about the importance of peace. He might even teach us a thing or two.

Need another possible candidate. What about Mike White? Yes, I said Mike White. All he did take Cleveland and put it on the map, in a good way. The Christian Science Monitor quoted White as saying about Cleveland, “We’re a scraper city.... [W]e don’t know the meaning of failure.” That alone should make him a quality candidate for C-M’s 2005 commencement speaker. Just a few suggestions. And yes, some at a higher academic degree. That’s the point. A.J. doesn’t make you a better speaker. It anything it just makes you more jaded.
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