



CSU
College of Law Library

Cleveland State University
EngagedScholarship@CSU

1970s

The Gavel

1-24-1972

1972 Vol. 20 No. 12

Cleveland-Marshall College of Law

Follow this and additional works at: https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/lawpublications_gavel1970s
How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Recommended Citation

Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, "1972 Vol. 20 No. 12" (1972). 1970s. 47.
https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/lawpublications_gavel1970s/47

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the The Gavel at EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in 1970s by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.



THE BIRTH OF THE UNHOLY ELEVEN

by The Majority 11

It is moved that there be created a law faculty Steering Committee of five members, elected by the faculty, to serve for the calendar year 1972 with the following powers, functions and duties:

1) To schedule regular meetings of the law school faculty and establish the agenda therefor; to call special meetings of the faculty at the request of the dean or of any three members of the equal power faculty,

2) To select the membership of all faculty committees after

consultation with the dean and individual members of the faculty with respect to preferences,

3) To represent and be spokesman for the faculty in matters of institutional and educational policy, subject to the approval of the faculty,

4) To perform those functions for the law school faculty which the University Faculty Academic Steering Committee performs for the University Council.



*"The Senatorial Bozos
have taken over
the chariot."
—212 BC*

The Student Newspaper of The Cleveland State University College of Law • Cleveland, Ohio
Volume 20 • No. 12 • January 24, 1972

"SEVEN DAYS IN JANUARY" DAY FOUR - ET TU, BRUTE?

by The Dean, Craig Christensen

To the Students and Faculty of the College of Law:
On Friday evening I submitted my resignation as Dean of the College of Law to President Enarson. I did so, with the utmost sadness and regret, for two reasons: first, because the office of dean, as that term is traditionally understood at law schools throughout the nation, would cease to exist upon the implementation of the so-called "Steering Committee" resolution; and second, because control of the law faculty had finally been sized by a cabal of persons desperately frightened and insecure at the aspirations for building a great law school which have been shared by me and those who have supported me these past months.

The President has asked me to reconsider and with-

draw my resignation. I am gratified by his confidence and by the expressions of support I have received in the interim since last Friday from numerous students and members of the faculty whose judgment I respect and whose friendship I cherish. However, I have concluded that so long as the two circumstances which led to my resignation continue to obtain, it would be futile for me to remain in office. Should those circumstances somehow reverse themselves, I have told the President I would reconsider my decision. However, I will make no threats or promises to achieve that end.

I await the verdict of the members of the Law College community.

Craig W. Christensen
Dean



DEAN CRAIG W. CHRISTENSEN

DAY FOUR-MONDAY I HAVE COME TO PRAISE . . .

by The President, Harold Enarson

Dear Colleagues:
I have analyzed the likely consequences of the motion passed (by the vote of 11-10) by the Law College faculty on January 14, 1972. In my judgment it is not in the best interests of the Law College and its students or of the University, of which law is an integral part. The motion cannot be permitted to take effect.

TOKENISM

Briefly, the motion establishes a so-



PRES. HAROLD L. ENARSON

called "Law Faculty Steering Committee" purportedly analogous to the Steering Committee of the University-wide Faculty Council. It is not at all analogous. In the overall administration of the University, the President is not displaced from rightful participation in educational policy-making. He is not reduced to a token role in the shaping of the agenda. His choice of persons to handle major administrative assignments is not dictated by faculty.

It hardly needs arguing that the Board of Trustees would not tolerate for one moment any such crippling of the executive authority and responsibility of the President. Yet this is precisely what the authors of the motion propose with respect to the Law College. They want a puppet, not a Dean. This is unacceptable to me; it is unacceptable to the Trustees. It is contrary to every canon of good administrative practice. It transmutes the gold of faculty participation into the dross of faculty domination.

DESTRUCTION

It is hardly a "Steering Committee" in any accepted sense of the word that

is proposed. It is rather a faculty-dominated governing committee. It was the destruction of the office of the Dean that was attempted. A Dean who is denied his customary role, who does not schedule faculty meetings, who is divorced from establishing the agenda, who presides at meetings which "any three members of the faculty may call" — such a "Dean" is not even a plausible figurehead.

The problems of the Law College cannot be resolved by destroying the position of Dean. If anything, the role of the Dean needs further strengthening.

I refuse to speculate about the motives of the authors of the resolution. It is to the predictable

consequences that we must look in examining such a radical restructuring of the leadership system.

In this instance—and I draw upon twenty years of experience in academic administration, including six years as Academic Vice President in a University with a Law College—the unintended consequences of shifting many of the duties of a Dean and his associates to a faculty-dominated governing body with be escalating confusion, drift in decision-making, and an over-emphasis on faculty prerogative to the neglect of student and public concerns. The proposed "system" is a caricature of

(See PRAISE p. 4)

Inside . . .

Civil Case No. 1984.....	page 2
A View of the Forum.....	page 2
Sayeth the Sooth Sayers.....	page 3
Love Rome More.....	page 3
Love Caesar less.....	page 3
Ides of January.....	page 4
Friends, Romans.....	page 4
The Citizens Speak.....	page 4
The Seventh & Last Day.....	page 4

CIVIL CASE NO. 1984

EDWARD CHITLIK, ET. AL.
PLAINTIFF,

v

CRAIG CHRISTENSEN, DEAN
DEFENDANT

by Marvin E. Sable

MEMORANDUM OF OPINION

Action: Plaintiffs in this action sought to invoke the equitable powers of the Discreet Court to enforce a resolution of a majority of the Cleveland State Law School Faculty. The case is here on an appeal from a judgment of the Discreet Court granting defendant's motion for summary judgment under Rule 56, Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure.

Facts: On January 14, 1972, the Cleveland State University law faculty, at a regularly scheduled meeting, passed a resolution by an 11-10 vote. The resolution provided in substance for the creation of a law faculty steering committee, comprised of five members and to be elected by the faculty. The functions and duties of the "steering committee" were defined as the scheduling of regular meetings of the law faculty and the establishment of the agenda therefore, the selection of all member for faculty committees, and to represent and be spokesman for the faculty, inter alia. The student body filed a motion under Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 24, (A) claiming intervention of right based upon an interest in the subject of this suit such that a disposition without their presence might impair or impede their ability to protect that interest. Such motion was well brought and was therefore granted.

Plaintiffs' Case: The plaintiffs contend that their unusual action was justified due to a refusal on the part of defendant to listen to their various opinions and ideas concerning the operation of the law college. Plaintiffs assert that their action was consonant with the democratic ideals of a legal environment and a necessity for the successful administration of the law college.

Defendant's Case: The defendant asserts that the action of the faculty was ultra vires as well as without justification therefore. There is support for this view in defendant's brief, citing letter of January 16, 1972 from President Enarson. The defendant also raised the clean hands doctrine as an affirmative defense, contending that in substance the plaintiffs' pleadings are a sham. Defendant contends that the true complaint of the plaintiffs is not that their views are not listened to, but rather not heeded. Testimony on the part of many students indicating a lack of communication between the defendant and the students was introduced to impeach defendant's testimony. The inference raised by such evidence tends to lend some credence to the plaintiffs' claim of noncommunication.

Intervenor's Case: The intervenors came forward and attached to their motion to intervene as defendants, an answer. The answer sets forth the defenses of necessity and hypocrisy. The intervenors contend that is an absolute necessity for the Dean of the law school to have the powers of a Dean in their natural and unwatered form. It was further asserted that such powers were necessary in order to halt the adhesion to the regressive and archaic policies of past years.

The defense of hypocrisy, unique to the County of Confusion, is essentially that while the faculty complains of a lack of communication, it passes a resolution squarely bent on implementation.

Opinion: This court finds that the Discreet Court did not abuse its discretion in granting the motion for summary judgment and that there was no issue of fact upon which reasonable minds could disagree. While there was an issue joined as to the existence or nonexistence of a faculty-administration communications problem, the adjudication of such issue is not an operative factor in the instant case. The resolution of which the plaintiffs sought enforcement goes far beyond any function of communication and strikes at the very heart of the administrative implementary powers. While we do not reach the issue of the administration's responsibility to make a bona fide attempt to hear all views and ideas, we do rule that its failure to do so does not justify a total usurpation of its powers. We do not say that there is not an appropriate remedy for an administrative deaf ear—we hold only that the remedy sought here is not such an appropriate remedy.

Order: The Discreet Court was manifestly correct in its ruling and should be and is hereby affirmed.

Syllabus: Where a law school faculty complains that the law school administration has not and will not listen to faculty opinions and where as a response to this apparently valid complaint the faculty passes a motion whose undeniable effect is to totally and decisively strip the Dean of his powers and duties, such resolution goes further than the alleged complaint could ever logically justify and the Discreet Court did not err in refusing to enforce such resolution.



"All right; don't tell me; let me guess?
Summa is bugging you guys.
Right, Brutus?"

(Reprint Permit by National Review)

page 2

A VIEW OF THE FORUM

by Michael Monteleone

As difficult it may be for some to see, I believe that what occurred at the Faculty meeting on 14 Jan. 1972 will improve the quality and quantity of communications between faculty and administration. This in turn should also improve the standard of education all students will derive in the future at CSU. I say this because if one thing was made apparent at the faculty meeting it was that the intentions of most faculty members is to guide the school along the path of better education. The means by which both factions seek to do this are obviously at odds. The faculty members who supported the motion felt most sincerely (I hope) that they had been denied a meaningful voice in where the school was going and how it was going to get there. They wanted to be heard as they felt they had a right to be. I believe it was a "last resort by the proponents of the motion. They obviously felt that every other possible means of communication was explored and badly failed. They appeared to be most adamant about their convictions and felt "excluded" when it came to an important policy or administrative matter. They obviously believe that the "entire faculty" should have an equal voice in the matters that most vitally affect the law school community. Whether or not they are correct is not for me to say. I don't think it fair to impute bad or malicious motives to their intentions.

It is easy to do this by pointing out that certain professors who supported the motion were not concerned with what happens to the school. I am unqualified to judge them & will not make unsound accusations. I may disagree with their "Means" to this end, but I do concur with what I like to think is their ultimate objective. That is, to improve the standard of education in the law school. I don't think that anyone who voted for the motion had ulterior or clandestine motives. If they did it for them to struggle with their own individual conscience.

Those members who fought against the revolution have equally good motives. They too, it seems want to improve the standard of education in the law school. They evidently feel no one member of the faculty had been excluded in policy matters. I think it unfortunate that the Dean saw this

motion as an attempt to "tie his hands." His idea of how a law school should be run is at odds with the members of the faculty who supported the motion. I don't think he seeks to be a dictator or autocrat. I think he desires to lead. Whether or not he does have a "circle of confidants," only he knows. Obviously a man who is chosen to lead cannot on every matter seek out the active advice of each & every faculty member. He is the one on whom the final decision rests. He must take the responsibility of mistakes and misjudgments. The final decision on some matters lies with him & him alone. For this burden, he must undoubtedly be capable to make some decisions on his own. When you win, friends flock from invisible corners. When you lose, you lose alone.

I think he has been the subject of undue criticism on many occasions. It is impossible for him to please every faculty member, trustee, administrator, and student on every decision. What is important is that he makes every reasonable effort to decide what is best for the entire law school community. He was hired to make decisions; and yet, we criticize and scorn when he does. We don't need 200 deans, we need one who can gather the support of faculty & student alike. That means tolerating what we believe to be wrong decisions and complimenting good decisions. I've seen much criticism ("little constructive") and few compliments.

One thing becomes apparent in the aftermath. We all, faculty and students, want to contribute our share to this school.

It is unreasonable to expect all our ideas to receive a "stamp of approval". What the cries of "lack of communication" indicate are the willingness and desire to play a meaningful part in the decision-making process. Hopefully when our ideas are discarded they are done so in good faith. Hopefully they are listened to. How dull it would be if we all agreed. How vital it is that we at least endeavor to understand one another regardless of our own personal convictions.



THE
GAZZETTE



Cleveland State University

College of Law

Volume 20

No. 12

January 24, 1972

Room 416

1240 Ontario Street

Cleveland, Ohio 44113

687-2340

Paul T Kirner, Editor-in-Chief

Marvin E. Sable, Executive Editor

STAFF

Larry Benjamin, Lila Daum, Arthur Kraut, Barry Laine,

Michael Monteleone, Alan Rom, Stephen Yost.

The views expressed herein are those of the newspaper or its by-lined reporters and contributors, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the student body, administration, or faculty of the College of Law or The Cleveland State University unless otherwise specifically stated.

SAYETH THE SOOTHSAYERS

by The Minority Oleck, Werber, Leiser, & Sierk

We request that a special meeting of the faculty be called for Thursday, January 20, 1972, at 3:00 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge, to withdraw the resolution of the faculty meeting adopted by eleven to ten vote on January 14, 1972.

The basis for the request is the belief that the faculty and administration both desire full communication and cooperation between them, and that a desire to have improved communication and cooperation is shared by practically all.

It is our belief that institution of a committee for the purpose of faculty-decanal communication is ill advised, and that the wording of the resolution that was put into faculty members' hands at a late time before

the meeting-discussion went unfortunately far beyond what most faculty had in mind.

It is further our belief that the momentum of the meeting was such that many members voted for the principle of full communication without quite appreciating the serious impact of the wording of the resolution. It also is our belief that the Dean will make certain that communication between faculty and administration is improved.

Therefor, we move that the faculty rescind the resolution dated January 14, 1972 because that resolution as it now reads in effect usurps to a small part of the faculty the powers reposed by law and the State and University rules in the Law College administration.



"The citizens come to listen to the Senators at the town meeting January 17."

TOWN MEETING

"NOT THAT I LOVED CAESAR LESS..."

by Lila Daum

The students had discussed the issue vigorously among themselves, they had listened to SBA President Larry Smith read them President Enarson's letter to the law school faculty, they had heard Dean Christensen read a prepared statement and had the opportunity to direct questions and comments to him.

By 12:45 p.m. they felt ready to hear the arguments of the opposing side: the eleven faculty members who had voted in favor of the motion to create a five-man steering committee to aid in the administrative affairs of the law college at the January 14th faculty meeting.

At first there was doubt as to whether any of the proponents of the motion would agree to address the students assembled in the basement lounge, but Professor Alan Miles Ruben promptly responded to the invitation and was downstairs by 1:00 p.m.

Professor Ruben began by stating that the motion passed by the faculty would bring about a radical and upsetting change in the administration of the law school but that the standards supporting this change paralleled those laid down by the AALS convention. Although it is possible for any educational institution to be governed efficiently and effectively by an authoritarian form of administration, the standards set down by AALS and the principles which guide most great law schools are weighted in favor of that kind of administration dominated by democratic faculty participation in the decision-making process of all major issues. In order to insure democratic participation in major decisions affecting the law school, the eleven faculty members voted to

create a five-man steering committee to assist the Dean in keeping the channels of communication open between the administration and the whole faculty. Professor Ruben specified issues of major importance in the decision-making process to be in the areas of the granting of tenure status, the annual budget, and the determination of the new building and facilities of the law school on the Cleveland State University campus. He explained that since August most of the faculty had been shut out from participating in the determination of these matters and of many others, by an administration which had chosen to rely instead, on the word of only a few. He cited as a particular example, the choice of the McKee Building at CSU as the site of the new law school, a decision on which only Professor Browne had been consulted and only in his capacity as director of the library. Nevertheless, Professor Ruben made it clear that the motion for a five-man steering committee was not meant to be an action to oust the Dean nor to strip him of his power but rather as a means of securing the right of democratic participation in administration for the whole faculty.

Second year student, Alan Hirth, then posed the question to Professor Ruben that if the major concern of the eleven faculty members was the need for participatory democracy in the law school why wasn't student participation mentioned in the motion, and, in fact, why weren't students consulted about the formulation of the motion and asked to support it? Professor Ruben wasn't afforded the opportunity to respond properly to the question due to numerous other questions simultaneously posed.

Third year student Richard Sutter then asked Professor Ruben why the concerned faculty members had

FACULTY PROPONENTS

... BUT THAT I LOVED ROME MORE"

by Stephen Yost

As partial justification for its motion re: faculty steering committee, the distinguished (non-titular sense) professors supporting the action have cited the "Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" by the American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. Section V of this document deals with faculty responsibility in the area of "curriculum, subject matter, methods of instruction, research, faculty status (appointments, reappointments, decisions, not to reappoint, promotions, granting of tenure, and dismissal), and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process." Says the "Joint Statement", the faculty has "primary responsibility" for those "fundamental areas". The statement deals at length with the need for "active participation" by the faculty in the above areas and discusses several vehicles by which such participation can be achieved. One suggested vehicle is "faculty elected executive committees in departments and schools." The feeling of those faculty members voting in favor of the steering committee motion is that

chosen to meet clandestinely a week before the faculty meeting to determine their course of action and marshal faculty voting support without notice to the Dean or other faculty members before the January 14th meeting.

Professor Ruben responded that the "clandestine group meeting" of the week before had been simply a gathering of concerned and upset faculty member to discuss common problems and complaints and arrive at a possible common solution. He went on to state that the Dean had been notified a day before the faculty meeting that Professor Chitlik intended to make a motion for the creation of a five-man steering committee, and with that knowledge had listed the item on the agenda simply as "Professor Chitlik's Motion."

In answer to Mr. Sutter's charge that the motion was worded in such a manner that the purpose accomplished by the creation of the committee was not the establishment of faculty participation in administrative decisions nor communication liaison with the Dean but merely a shift of the powers which formerly resided in the office of the Dean to the five-man committee, Professor Ruben pointed out that the motion stated that faculty meetings were to be called at the request of the Dean or three faculty members and that faculty committee appointments were to be made by the committee only after consultation with the Dean and that the intention of consistent consultation with the Dean was inherent in the motion.

Professor Chitlik also appeared at the Town Hall meeting and spoke in favor of his motion, citing as its mandate for power the statement on government of colleges

their action reflects the principles and guidelines enunciated in the "Joint Statement".

The following is a verbatim excerpt from Section V of the "Joint Statement" which allegedly supports the steering committee motion. (Emphasis supplied by Edward Chitlik.)

Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present. An agency should exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty. The structure and procedures for faculty participation should be designed, approved and established by joint action of the components of the institution. Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty.

The agencies may consist of meetings of all faculty members of a department, school, college, division or university system, or may take the form of faculty-elected executive committees in departments and schools and a faculty-elected senate or council for larger divisions or the institution as a whole.

and universities by the American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. (See companion article entitled But That I Loved Rome More on page 3.)

Professor Chitlik told the students that the closed door decision-making habits of the present administration was not the opinion of a few professors but an actual practice. He mentioned that he had worked on the formulation of a clinical-legal program for the law school for the past two years but that this year when steps were taken to secure funds and to establish such a program he was not even casually consulted on the matter.

Professor Sonenfield, having been asked to address the assembled students by first year SBA representative Carl Noll, spoke mainly about the sincerity and the integrity underlying the action taken by some of the faculty. He talked about worthwhile faculty members having been treated shoddily and ignored by the present administration and the Dean's failure to openly advocate the granting of tenure to several faculty members for whom it meant a great deal.

Both Professors Chitlik and Sonenfield answered questions from the floor with patience and good nature. They did not appear to be ruffled by questions concerning the integrity of their motivation or by charges that they were making a power play.

Professor Chitlik said that the students had the right to question his integrity, to openly speak out against him, and further had the right to know what was really going on, but he further stressed that such students also had the right to be wrong—just as he and every other faculty member has that same right.



RUBEN



SONENFIELD



CHITLIK

PRAISE BEWARE THE IDES OF JANUARY

(From p. 1)

good practice. It cannot be defended. No talk about the need for "better communication" (now everywhere fashionable and always to some extent valid) justifies this unprecedented departure from accepted practice and from the test of experience.

THE DEAN'S LEADERSHIP

A Dean with the courage of his convictions will not solicit personal popularity, will not be silent on emotionally charged issues, will not turn his back on inconsistent grading practices, will not permit tenure by default, will not tolerate moonlighting (in this instance "daylighting," since much of the teaching is in the evening), and will not evade the painful burden of making necessary judgments, adverse when necessary, on promotion, tenure, and the like.

We have just such a Dean in Craig Christensen. I have complete confidence in his leadership. His insistence on high standards is not "purely academic". In the long haul the quality of the faculty will determine whether our students are equipped to pass the bar exam and to compete on even terms with the graduates of other law colleges. The Dean's "old-fashioned" insistence that a full day's salary requires a full day's work has my enthusiastic support, as it will have the support of law students and of the taxpaying public.

In conclusion, may I ask that the faculty of the Law College convene promptly, consider the full implications of its recent action, and—I trust—rescind its action of last week as the first step toward developing a complete draft of recommended By-laws with respect to internal governance. Under the rules of the University, the By-laws require final approval through an act of delegation by the Board of Trustees. Clearly this is a matter of considerable urgency, to be addressed promptly.

Sincerely yours,
Harold L. Enarson
President

BEWARE THE IDES OF JANUARY

by Barry Laine

Rejecting the prophecies of doom and denying the existence of an evil conspiracy, Professor Samuel Sonenfield discussed his views on the "Chitlik Resolution". He contended that the faculty members who voted with the majority did so for reasons of "academic excellence" and that the events of this past week will not adversely affect this law school. He denied that the "Unholy Eleven" was motivated by "ulterior motives". He noted that the majority has made its point, and will now "probably accept a compromise".

Yet he refused to compromise his principles, and still maintains that the purpose and the spirit of the "Chitlik Resolution" was to provide for a better law school by giving faculty

members rights which are properly theirs, to buttress his contention, he used the following three questions, which, he suggested, each student ought to consider before making a final judgment on this matter.

1. Students through the S.B.A. elect their voting members to Faculty Committees. Query—Why should faculty not have the same right?

2. Faculty committee members of university faculty committees are elected by the university Faculty Affairs Committee. Query—Should law school faculty have lesser rights?

3. The policies of the AAUP and the AALS provides, in essence, what the "Chitlik Resolution" called for. Query—Why should this law school and this university be an exception?

DAY SEVEN-THURSDAY

TYRANNY IS DEAD

by Paul T Kirner

The 3:00 Faculty Meeting started with some difficulty. Certain members of the majority (proponents of the "Steering Committee") were caucusing. At 3:30 Dean Christensen said the meeting has been postponed until 4:00. Due to further pre-meeting negotiation, the 4:00 meeting did not start until 4:35. It was an outrage said the dean, "Unfair to everyone that is being made to wait." But the meeting started with everyone present.

Carefully, the dean apologized and recognized Prof. Howard Oleck. Prof. Oleck moved for the rescission of the Steering Committee and to adjourn until 3:00 Monday. No second was given.

Professor Al Ruben then stated his motion which said in part:

"We hereby recommend that the Dean create a "Dean's Advisory Committee" consisting of six members of the faculty appointed by the Dean, with a seventh member to serve as Chairman. The Dean's Advisory Committee shall consult with, assist and work jointly with the Dean and be charged with the duty, among others, of drafting a new set of by-laws for the college of law which by-laws will provide, *inter alia*, for: (1) A structure of faculty organizations; (2) Procedures for the selection of membership on all faculty committees; and (3) A mechanism through which the law school faculty may initiate proposals for actions.

Subject to the implementation of this Resolution, the Motion of January 14, enacting a Faculty Steering Committee is hereby rescinded." The vote was 22-0.

The whole activity of the Seven Days in January was best summed up by Professor Ed Chitlik: "The system works. It has to be worked at and worked on—but it works. We all hoped it would work for the best interest of everyone; and it did."

Honor has been saved for both Caesar and his Senators. Now maybe both will settle down in the Forum to improve and advance the quality of the school of law and its students.

DAY FIVE

"FRIENDS, STUDENTS & FACULTY"

by the S.B.A.

The following two resolutions were passed at the special meeting of the SBA January 18, 1972.

RESOLUTION

We the students of Cleveland State University College of Law are greatly disturbed by the action taken by the faculty majority which established a steering committee to take certain previously acknowledged powers from the Dean of the Law College.

We remind all parties to this dispute that the primary purpose of this institution is to educate students for the profession of law. We urge the faculty and the Dean to work together in spite of their differences so that education at C.S.U. College of Law shall not be impaired now or in the future.

In order to facilitate a settlement in the best interest of the Law College, we propose the following:

1) That the faculty rescind its motion of last Friday establishing a steering committee;

2) That Dean Christensen withdraw his resignation pending complete resolution of this dispute;

3) That President Enarson direct the parties in this dispute to discuss the issues and the facts in head to head discussion, assuming the above actions are taken by the Dean and the faculty;

4) Addendum—It is not the intent of this resolution to require the Dean to withdraw his resignation until the motion creating a Law Faculty Steering Committee is rescinded.

A RESOLUTION

In accordance with the resolution (above) passed by the SBA on January 18, 1972, the Student Bar Association does hereby create a committee empowered to express the feelings of the SBA and to take such action as they deem necessary to further the ideals expressed by that resolution. Such committee to have five (5) members to represent the present views of the SBA at the faculty meeting Thursday.

THE CITIZENS SPEAK FOR CAESAR

by the Students

1. Do you find those in favor of the resolution more creditable than those opposed?
2. Do you find those opposed to the resolution more creditable than those in favor?
3. Do you believe the resolution as passed is in the best interest of the law school?
4. Is the main issue one of the failure of the administration to hear the voice of the faculty?
5. Do you believe the faculty should rescind its resolution.
6. Do you think that the breach among the administration, faculty, and student body can be healed?
7. Should the autonomy of the dean prior to the resolution be reinstated?
8. Do you believe that the resolution as passed is the most appropriate method for opening better lines of communication?
9. Do students need more voice in the decision making process?

THE ANSWERS TO THE FOLLOWING POLL WERE PROVIDED BY A CROSS SECTION OF THE STUDENTS AT THE LAW SCHOOL. OUT OF A LAW SCHOOL ENROLLMENT OF 750, THE SURVEY POLLED 150 DAY AND NIGHT STUDENTS.

QUESTION No. 1	29	YES	92	NO	26	UNDECIDED	20%	YES	70%	NO
QUESTION No. 2	70	YES	54	NO	25	UNDECIDED	47%	YES	36%	NO
QUESTION No. 3	25	YES	108	NO	17	UNDECIDED	17%	YES	72%	NO
QUESTION No. 4	63	YES	70	NO	17	UNDECIDED	42%	YES	47%	NO
QUESTION No. 5	119	YES	22	NO	9	UNDECIDED	79%	YES	15%	NO
QUESTION No. 6	91	YES	36	NO	23	UNDECIDED	61%	YES	24%	NO
QUESTION No. 7	80	YES	40	NO	30	UNDECIDED	53%	YES	27%	NO
QUESTION No. 8	20	YES	113	NO	16	UNDECIDED	13%	YES	76%	NO
QUESTION No. 9	114	YES	20	NO	15	UNDECIDED	76%	YES	13%	NO

THE "RESOLUTION" MEANS THE MOTION IN SUPPORT OF THE FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE (SEE THE UNHOLY ELEVEN page 1).

THE
GALL

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF LAW
1240 Ontario Street • Cleveland, Ohio 44113

Non-Profit Org.
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
Cleveland, Ohio
Permit No. 2466

Return Requested

Please report any changes of address. Bulk mailings are not forwarded.

Dr. Harold L. Enarson, President
Cleveland State University
Euclid Ave at East 24th
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

F

#1

SENIOR PICTURES

The photographer will be at the law school January 27 & 28. Call 687-3552 for an appointment.