Cleveland, Ohio is one of 40 law associations, has issued a statement students of the Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity merit problems facing law students and solution.

Bruce Ellis Gaynor, 25, of East Cleveland Board of Education. Gaynor lives with his wife, Elizabeth, student at the Cleveland State University College of Law, is Editor-in-Chief of the Cleveland State Law Review and a member of the Executive Committee of the National Conference of Law Reviews. He is Reps. Controller for the Schools Neighborhood Youth Corps (SNYC), a poverty program of the Cleveland Board of Education. Gaynor lives with his wife, Elizabeth, and son, Adam, at 1812 Colonnade Road.

ANATOMY OF A FACULTY MEETING

The patient lies defenseless and silent as the professionals break the tradition of bleeding the body and placing leaches on the open wound. Friday, October first, the traditional leach was forever banished from the operating room. A new method has been developed—another "Symbol of Progress." DEAN’S PROPOSAL

Dean Christensen opened the discussion of his first faculty meeting with a report on what has become students membership and voting rights on all committees. Some faculty members wanted to qualify this proposal. "Let the student be heard; it is the order of the day." Professor Auerbach. "It is only a token gesture," said Dean Christensen, but the disagreement and argument continued. ANN ALDRICH’S MOTION

Professor Ann Aldrich was recognized by the chair, Dean Christensen. Her reaction to the discussion was unhampered as she made a monumental motion: "I move that there be a student, with full voting rights, appointed to the special and standing committees of the faculty." The motion was quickly seconded by nine other faculty members. Professor Goshien was recognized by the chair and his official duties were carried out by the faculty secretary, Walter Greenwood.

DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION

Distinguished Professor Oleck attempted to close discussion, debate and argued by calling the question. His rationale was that the question of student voting power has been discussed many times before. A vote was taken and a 10 to 11 majority kept the motion open to further discussion.

"We can’t keep saying ‘tomorrow.’" Professor Werber. "We must act now." Professor Dyke.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Are you a graduating law student without a future? Let’s face it, if you’re unsure as to where the law is taking you, see Alex Jamieson. Mr. Jamieson is director of placement services at C.S.U. law school. During the summer the placement department set up several appointments with prospective employers.

The placement office is now making appointments for interviews and the students are welcome to come into the office and sign up for an interview. But placement is looking at students in their last year of law school. For possible employment after graduation with larger law firms and many government agencies, it is imperative that applications be made during October & November.

This fall Mr. Jamieson has received several good responses from over 500 letters he sent out to law firms and government agencies. Special emphasis must be given to the fact that larger law firms have a strong policy of taking graduates who have been interns during their last year of law school.

The following is a schedule of interviews that are available to the law students merely by signing up. Only 79 percent of the day school law school graduates took advantage of the Placement Service; 80 percent were placed with firms or government agencies.

CLINICAL ED. GIVEN BOOST

In a concerted effort to involve The Cleveland State University and Case Western Reserve University law students in Cleveland's legal community, Samuel T. Gaines, 34, President of the Cleveland Bar Association, has issued a statement expressing his desire to give law students an "appropriate perspective" of the Bar. Gaines' move is the first in the history of the CBA where a president has recognized problems facing law students and expressed hope to use the Bar to make "material contribution" toward its solution.

Gaines also touched on the new clinical thrust in legal education, commenting, "a yearning, frequently vocalized by law school students, for clinical training as a part of the curriculum has engendered a reaction among some that such a trend will hamper substantial and difficult intellectual training in law school. The issue has lead to sharp controversy to those traditionally oriented. But, he noted optimistically that the conflicts 'are reconcilable.'"

In addition to problems in legal education, students will have an opportunity to attend Bar meetings and work on committees.

CBA Executive Director Peter Roper stated that he and President Gaines will be establishing meetings at the law school to meet personally with students and explain the structure of the CBA. They will further give students an opportunity to sign up for participation on various committees.

Freedom Of The Press is based on a principle which the whole world must practice if it are to have peace, and that is the principle of tolerance of being able to stand criticism and realizing that nobody has the infallible truth.

Henry Cabot Lodge
Dear Dean Christensen:

My experience of the educational program in this law school during the terms involves a rather mechanical both pleasant and intellectually from defect nor beyond improvement.

The Gavel would favor the popular election of all officers. This process would involve a Constitutional amendment and would not be feasible with the election only one month away. However, it would still be possible, and we believe beneficial, to hold a preferential referendum for these offices. While results would not be binding, they would demonstrate the student body feeling as to who should be their leaders. While, as the courts are apt to say, "It is not binding authority. It is certainly persuasive authority."

1. It is the most democratic process. It gives the electorate an opportunity to choose their leaders.

2. It gives more interest in the election. With more offices available there will be more candidates, more activity, more enthusiasm. Last year 42 per cent of the electorate voted; this is a disappointing figure, yet it is a higher percentage than ever before. Clearly, the present election procedures do not stimulate interest, and thus, are passed up by the majority of the students. With more responsibility and a bigger voice, there may be a larger turnout.

3. The inner workings of the SBA give these officers much power. The Vice President succeeds the President, and he can then perform all the President's functions. Yet, he is not elected by the student body. If such a succession seems unlikely, be advised that President Hirth was elected Vice President by the SBA, and succeeded to President by the resignation of Mr. Phillips. The position of Treasurer, with all the financial responsibilities it entails, is quite important. Furthermore, these three officials can vote, along with the senators, on any issue. This is a privilege, it should be noted, denied even the President.

4. Finally, the SBA itself has been, of late, the subject of much criticism. A recent Gavel editorial described it as "antiquated, sophomoric and never will be". Most students do not follow the Bar activities; rarely does a non-Senator show up at a Bar meeting. It is doubtful that 25 percent of the law school community could be conducted jointly by the officers of the SBA. By giving a larger voice to the student body, students may become more aware of the Bar's activities.

The above reasons are certainly not exhaustive, they are the basic reasons why The Gavel urges some mechanism whereby the whole student population can select all of the major officers of the SBA. In the November election, the position of the student appears to be a preferential referendum. Only then can the SBA be by the people as well as for and of the people.

Letters To The Editor

Dear Dean Christenson:

My experience of the educational program in this law school during the past three years has been generally both pleasant and intellectually rewarding, but certainly not free from defect nor improvement.

I invite you to consider the proposal outlined below which, in its simplest terms, involves a rather mechanical change in administrative procedure, but which, I suggest, would tend to both improve the quality of student dissatisfaction and simultaneously create a natural channel for more effective evaluation and improvement of the program of instruction by the faculty.

The proposal is: Let examinations be conducted jointly by the faculty as a whole through boards of faculty members assigned on a continuously shifting basis to pose and grade examinations for courses they are not then teaching.

The analogy between this plan and the conduct of bar examinations is obvious, but largely irrelevant. Such schemes have been recommended for undergraduate courses as a means of minimizing apparent conflicts of interest between student and teacher, but because of arts and sciences faculty specialization they have usually been thought to require examiners from outside the institution, which gives rise to many problems. The more homogeneous range of competence of law school faculty relative to the curriculum should render outside examiners unnecessary here, and probably undesirable.

Most students would welcome the greater uniformity of grading which this plan would automatically produce and they would appreciate it especially for multi-section courses, even if scheduling problems or non-uniformity examinations. Of course, complaints also teaching might be in some cases replace complaints about grading, but is that not a more important area upon which to demand attention focused? And under this plan the students would have a larger voice in the teaching effectiveness which will naturally command respect without resort to initiatives on their part which are frequently unpleasant to all parties.

(See Letters p.4)
The advocates of the students pulled heavily in favor of student rights. The motion to table Professor Ruben, The Dean firmly stated that, "The student members of all committees will have full voting powers, completely unqualified and unconditional." A roll call vote was called and the outcome was 16 to 5; the motion passed.

The faculty passed a motion October first which placed one student on each of the dean's eleven standing committees and nine special committees. Each student has been given full voting power by the 16 to 5 decision of the faculty. The students will be appointed by the Student Bar Association and final approval of the appointments will be made by Dean Christensen.

The Gavel strongly suggests that a "No" vote may be seen as a vote against student recognition and a direct attack against the integrity of the student body. Therefore, all five "No" voting faculty members have been given full voting power by the 16 to 5 decision of the faculty.
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This plan would also provide an additional institutionalized avenue for exercise of the faculty's concern with the overall content and quality of instruction. And that collective involvement would entail a minimum of restriction of individual teaching philosophies and extra-faculty interference. The separation of examining from teaching would incidentally provide a mechanism for more nearly equalizing faculty workloads.

Numerous administrative and pedagogical difficulties probably lurk in this plan. But if any substantial benefits can be anticipated from its adoption, as I think they can, then I feel confident that it can be made to function without superhuman effort or undue sacrifice of traditional prerogatives.

The precise mechanics of the operation of such a plan are open to considerable variation and adjustment. It might be introduced on an experimental basis for a limited number of courses. The membership of the examining boards for the various courses could be chosen by the dean or by a faculty committee, but perhaps the best method would be selection by lot from those qualified by the number of assignments to any individual weighted by the number of examination papers involved and by his other obligations. Where special circumstances indicate its desirability, participation by outsiders could be invited. And even if the plan were generally adopted, instructor grading could be retained in special courses such as patent law. Nor would it be contrary to the spirit of this proposal to allocate a portion of the grade to the instructor to reflect the classroom performance of each student.

I doubt that this plan is original as applied to law schools, but I am not aware of any recent local discussion or consideration of it and I think that its adoption now would contribute significantly to the solution of a number of problems of great concern at the present time to everyone interested in Cleveland-Marshall College of Law.

Sincerely yours,
James B. Wilkens