Student Bar Association President John Lawson was ejected from this year's first faculty meeting on October 10, as it went into Executive Session. His exclusion was the first of the SBA representative in the memory of those present.

The SBA president has traditionally been treated as a nonvoting member at faculty meetings, including at its Executive Sessions, when the faculty discusses subjects which it considers inappropriate for student ears. There is no indication that student members of faculty committees will not continue to sit in on Executive Sessions when their respective committee matters are being discussed.

The ejection of Lawson followed a request by Interim Dean Hyman Cohen, and a formal objection to his presence by Professor Sam Sonenfield. No vote was taken.

"This goes against all precedent," Lawson told The Gavel. "In the past, the SBA president has always remained during Executive Sessions to voice the student viewpoint on all issues which affect students at the school--an indication that the faculty has cared to consider student opinions in their final decisions. This new move indicates the exact opposite."

As to whether Lawson's exclusion could become permanent, Cohen told The Gavel that, as the Chair of the faculty meeting, he "would defer to faculty wishes," and that he will take up the issue at the next meeting.

The Executive Session in this instance dealt with a series of student petitions for grade changes in former Professor David Engdahl's constitutional law class of last year. Engdahl assigned final grades despite the fact that sixteen members of the class had duplicate examination numbers on the midterms, and that these students' actual identities were never validly determined. With one exception, the other 66 members of the class received a final grade identical to their respective midterm grade. These facts, plus the lack of any marks or grades on any of the midterms or final exams, "led the Academic Students Committee to conclude that there was a very great likelihood that Professor Engdahl did not grade the final exams."

Cohen, prior to the motion for Executive Session, requested a motion to foreclose all debate on the subject since, he felt, "the record reflects adversely on the professional integrity of a former faculty member."

Also ejected from the faculty meeting was one of the petitioners of the Engdahl grades. (See Letter.)

The Gavel was ejected from the Executive Session.

New State Pot Law
Makes Smoking Less Hazardous

House Bill 300, was quietly passed this summer by the State Senate and went on to approval by the Governor on August 22, 1975. The bill is intended to review the drug abuse and control laws of Ohio. Effective in late November, it will be the most lenient marijuana law in the continental United States.

Buried deep within a bill that contains harsh penalties for hard drug use and sale is a pot provision that will soon allow Ohioans to possess up to nearly four ounces (or exactly 100 grams) of weed, five grams of hash or a gram of hash oil without being subjected to incarceration or a criminal record. Such an offense is to be classified as a minor misdemeanor. Maximum penalty is a $100 fine. An arrest or conviction under this provision will not give rise to a criminal record, and it need not be reported by the arrested or convicted person in response to any inquiries about his or her criminal record. The penalty is a "civil" fine similar to one imposed for such offenses as carrying excess persons on a bicycle or jaywalking.

Week of October 22-26.

On Wednesday you will take only what you need. Look for a clear light on Friday. Over the weekend you may find that it is right to rebel.
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To the Editor:

As a new member of the Admissions Committee and, more importantly, as a concerned member of the law school community, I feel that I must respond to Professor Samuel Sonenfield's recent request to discontinue assignment of LCOP students to his first-year property class.

The first question that comes to mind is how Professor Sonenfield knows which students in his classes are in the LCOP program. Since students in his classes have spent more than two years at the law school, I have yet to ascertain just who is in LCOP. Of course, I don't sit in class pondering whether or not a certain individual is in LCOP. Moreover, I don't have access to school records. Consequently, I don't correct examinations, but I don't believe that students participating in LCOP have identifiable social security numbers. There is no way that a professor can identify an LCOP student unless he either checks records or performs examinations or has preconceived notions concerning the capability of black students (who in fact do not constitute the whole LCOP program).

The charge of racism is sometimes made unjustifiably. By the same token, the manifestation of racial prejudice is often disclaimed under a guise of concern for standards, academic integrity and objectivity. Whether a statement made is based on racial hatred or genuine concern for a problem, real or imagined, the result is often the same. The damage done is irreparable.

To take away a man's job is a serious measure which should not be taken lightly. On the other hand, to dismiss this episode as an unfortunate incident, as the administration has done, is totally unacceptable. I would request the president to relieve Professor Sonenfield of his teaching duties and if possible find a place for him where his "philosophy" is less harmful to the law school.

In the meantime, someone should inform Professor Sonenfield that this law school also has standards of performance which a professor must meet. If he is incapable of meeting those standards, he is quite free to find a law school which permits its professors to select those students they wish to teach. In that event, I will be the first to wish him luck.

Jeffery P. Reinhard

---

To the Editors:

Last Friday I tried to attend a faculty meeting. I had heard that students were allowed, and I wanted to observe how the faculty was going to treat the many petitions presented by students, including myself, concerning the teaching and grading system of Professor Engdahl in his Constitutional Law class of last spring. Those who had Mr. Engdahl are aware of the problems that might have arisen from his attitude toward the course.

At any rate, I entered the room early and picked a seat in a corner where I would not be in anyone's way. I did not wish to be heard or present my case; I was merely concerned about my grade which affects my present and future as it does every student, and don't let anyone tell you otherwise. The meeting had not begun when I was asked to leave on orders from the dean. I received no explanation, but I unceremoniously left.

The next school day I was told, upon inquiry, that one needed a good reason and the dean's permission to attend a meeting. When I approached the dean to ask permission to continue to the next meeting, he told me that it was a faculty decision whether or not a visitor may sit in on a meeting. The next question, of course, is how does one petition the faculty for a vote to grant permission to attend a meeting when one is ejected before the meeting begins; but alas, this is not the point of this article.

We as students are attending this school with the hope of improving our lot in life or for whatever reasons we individually have. Grades are probably the most frequently looked-at standard for evaluating a graduate's ability. Hence, it is an underlying assumption by everyone that an instructor is rating his or her students by some criterion that is at least remotely related to the student's effort and performance. When a particular instructor seems derelict in this, it is not only the faculty's concern but more so is it the students'.

(See Page 4)

---

Normal Predictors of Success?

By Mike Evans

"In recognition of one of our crucial missions--to provide quality legal education to the community we serve--the faculty of the Cleveland State University College of Law voted in 1971 to establish a special recruitment and admission program for minority students and students disadvantaged educationally because of racial, economic, or other factors."

So reads a paragraph in a pamphlet published and distributed by Cleveland-Marshall describing the Legal Career Opportunities Program (LCOP). But what has been the effect of the Program?

One hundred seventy-eight people have been admitted to Cleveland-Marshall through the LCOP since its inception in 1971. Of those, 145 were black, 19 were white, 10 were of Spanish descent and four were Oriental; 116 were male and 62 were female.

Nineteen LCOP admittees have graduated and the only one who has taken the bar exam and received the results passed. Fourteen have voluntarily withdrawn. It is in order. It was conceived, as the early figures reflect, to provide greater access to a legal education for racial minorities, although the Program now seeks to approach racial parity. A program of this type was necessary, as Dean Hyman Cohen recently told the Gavel, because "traditional admissions criteria are unreliable predictors."

(See Page 3)
Sonenfield Denies Racist Motive In Memo

The following interview with Professor Sam Sonenfield had been in planning stages prior to the recent demand for his resignation, but was conducted on October 6, 1975 in response to that demand. His interviewer was Mike Salling, a 1975 C-M graduate and a friend of Sonenfield.

Question: Your now widely publicized memorandum was stated in the form of a request. What were you requesting?

Response: It is no secret that I opposed the LOOP program at its start and the reason for my opposition was that I feel it is reverse discrimination which is as obnoxious to me as discrimination. I feel that it is morally wrong to admit one percentage of the student body based solely upon their grade performance and their performance on the LSAT, and to deny another percentage based on a small or small upon so-called special considerations. I have, however, to the best of my knowledge, done nothing which was an attempt or could be construed as an attempt to sabotage that program. I reserve the right as part of my freedom of speech to oppose the program and to persuade a majority of the faculty that it should be reconsidered. But it is my duty as long as the program exists to refer to it in any respect in a manner in which I think it is either for or against the program.

Q: How do you respond to BALSA’s charge that your memo is an instance of racism which threatens the LCOP program?

R: They call it a direct and immediate threat.

Q: What percentage of the faculty has encountered problems similar to yours regarding the LCOP program?

R: I have never counted the number. I have had faculty members express to me essentially the same doubts... I do not feel compelled to answer this. I only point out that we may be doing a disservice to the LOOP students when we throw them into competition with those that are better prepared. I have heard expressions from other faculty members of the same unhappiness of having to put up students who may not be ready for an important course to a student who came in here under this handicap. We do not like to fail a student. When I fail a student I have a feeling that in some way I too have failed. Now I have to fail non-LOOP students also. Oftentimes it is very difficult to comply with the legal issues involved. Often it is inability to express himself, or he expresses himself so poorly that one is compelled to say that if he ever gets in front of an appellate judge with a brief written by me, he will be cut out to ribbons.

Q: Now jumping back, you’ve made a reference to your hope that this controversy will soon be over.

R: I hope that the persons who made the charge will take the time in a lawyer-like fashion to read the memorandum written by me and not hastily say to them that upon careful reading they will find that it has no tinge of racism, and except to the extent that they wish to read it so.

(See Page 6)

...LOOP History (from page 2)

Professor Robert Willey, Chairman of the Admissions Committee, agreed, saying, "The basic premise behind the Program is that we don’t trust the LSAT. We know it contains a cultural bias; Educational Testing Service admits that.

In 1971, 16 students were admitted under the LOOP, 15 of whom were black. The Program continued to admit almost exclusively minority students in 1972, 1973 and 1974 (104 minority students compared to one non-minority student). This was due in part to the operation of another special interview program in 1973 and 1974 designed to provide access for applicants with scores lower than average but who showed the ability to do well in law school, regardless of their racial status. The two programs were combined in 1975 and now operate under the same set of standards, and last year 40 minority and 17 non-minority students were accepted under the LOOP.

For the first four years of the Program, the school’s goal was to admit at least 80% of the entering class under the Program, and this goal was substantially achieved (62% in 1971, 92% in 1972 and 1973 and 91% in 1974). In the past year, however, 65 positions (approximately 22%) were available to LOOP applicants while only 57 students were admitted under the Program. This should not be construed to show a lack of effort on the part of the Admissions Committee to meet the 22% goal.

"Until it was too late, we thought we’d have no problem filling the positions," Willey said. At the time mail registration began, he said 73 people were to be admitted through the LOOP. However, many regular admits filled these slots causing the Program to accept non-LOOP students. Consequently, those in the LOOP with the highest PFYA’s were considered regular admits and no longer part of the Program.

In 1971 and 1972, the attrition rate of LOOP admits was higher than that of regular admits (37.5% in 1971 compared at 29.1%; 33.3% in 1972 compared to 21.7%). However, in 1973 the attrition rate of LOOP admits was 8.8% compared to 19.3% for regular admits and 15.2% for those admitted under the special interview program. Statistics for 1974 are not yet available.

Median grade point averages of LOOP students compared to the total class have given us extremely low marks. Grouping students by the number of hours completed as of the end of Spring Quarter 1975, the figures are:

- Second year day—all college, 2.69, LOOP, 2.27
- Second year evening—all college, 2.64, LOOP, 2.25
- Third year day—all college, 2.76, LOOP, 2.39
- Third year evening—LOOP, 2.74, 2.46
- Fourth year evening—LOOP, 2.26

The foregoing is the bare bones of a statistical outline. It only begins to ask some basic questions concerning law school admissions, not the least of which: Regardless of statistics, what are the social conditions and purposes that generated the LCOP?
**By Stuart Garson**

**FIRST YEAR**

Franctic (to himself): That mother better not call on me. I was prepared every day last week and that creep did not even once get over to this side of the room. Oh crap, he's going alphabetically. I don't have a chance. Oh my God, what are the operative facts, he's going to reach me.

Pass. Hey Schmaltz, what are the operative facts?

Schmaltz: What do I care, I'm cool for the week.

Franctic: Gargoyle, let me see your brief.

Gargoyle: You won't be able to read it.

Franctic: Try me. I've always been very good at reading typewritten print.

(to himself): O.K., get a hold of yourself, be calm, stay rational. When he calls your name simply say not prepared. I'm sure it's been done before. I've heard somewhere it was once done. I'll do it. I know I can do it.

Prof: Mr. Franctic, will you please give us the issue.

Franctic: I'm not prepared because yesterday I was at my allergist and I normally would be prepared but I got home late because I helped serve at the law review mixer and besides I read my property.

(to himself): What the hell is everyone looking at? I suppose I'm the first person who was ever unprepared. They're all hypocrites, I'm the only one honest enough to say so. Well, screw 'em all. At least I have my self-respect. I'll show them. I'll be on Moot Court.

Prof: Mr. Gargoyle, what is the issue?

Gargoyle: Whether or not a five year old child who has beaten his baby-sitter senselessly with day-old cupcakes is capable of comprehending his actions so that said child's parents who were at Chautauqua on a weekend swing would be liable in tort.

Franctic (to himself): I could've done that.

**THIRD YEAR**

Prof: Mr. Franctic, do you have the next case?

Franctic: Nah.

Prof: Why?

Franctic (scratching himself in a compromising place): It's rather personal.

Prof: Mr. Franctic, do you realize that you have not been prepared once this quarter?

Franctic (picking his teeth): Is that a fact?

Prof: Mr. Franctic....

Franctic (interrupting): Call me Roe.

Prof: Mr. Franctic, are you aware that the academic regulations permit a professor to dismiss any student for lack of classroom participation?

Franctic: Touchy, Touchy.

Prof (somewhat exasperated): I'm afraid unless you can adequately explain your unpreparedness, I am going to bring this matter before the Academic Standards Committee.

Franctic (almost alert): Do you realize that you are causing me great pain and embarrassment in front of my peers and that if you persist with this Mickey Mouse third degree I'm going to bring this matter before the Academic Standards and Ethics Committee pursuant to Academic Reg. 14-306 Sec. 6A(1)(e)(f)(g)?

Franctic (almost wide awake): Mr. Franctic, are you threatening me?

Franctic (to class): Hey, all I know is that I come to this place every day, mind my own business, help pay this cracker's salary, and all I ask is to be left alone.

Prof (wide awake): Mr. Franctic, the practice of law does not permit the practitioner to isolate himself from the world. On the contrary, it demands people who every day are willing to embrace challenge, remain informed, and at all times are prepared.

Franctic (wistfully): My fourth grade teacher was a little like that... The reason I'm never prepared (Franctic sneezes into his left hand) is because this year I didn't buy any case books. (Franctic wipes his left hand on his left thigh) I'm tired of reading cases that I somehow get the feeling I've read somewhere before. Change the names, change the facts, it's all the same. B-O-R-I-N-G.

Class (Chorus): Give 'em hell, Franctic. What a student. I never realized... Franctic for S.B.A.

Franctic (standing on his chair): For two years I let you people play with my head. For two years I wanted to believe that your way was right. But your way is mildew. I have been memorandumed and resolution-lized to infinity. You don't have any answers, just pretentious questions. (leaving the classroom) Go ahead, flunk me. What do I care. I'm protected by the game plan. Besides, I got a job with my old man.

Franctic (in the hallway): Hey, you got change for a quarter?

Class (Chorus): What a student. What a tribute to the guidelines. All I got is four nickels.

...Letter (from page 2)

The two students who were present at last Friday's meeting were asked to leave when the discussion of Prof. Engdahl's grading began. No student was able to hear what kind of discussion of the topic was done or how seriously the petitions were taken. It seems to me that students, who are certainly more affected by the decisions of the faculty concerning the academic quality of an instructor's grading or teaching policies, should at least be allowed to witness the decisions being made. Instead of the secret sessions, an instructor should be accountable for his actions not only to the administration and faculty but to the students as well.

Kenneth Hoffman
On Academic Freedom As Whitewash

BY WARREN ENDERS

Welcome, or welcome back to the law school community. Now that we are all engulfed in the flow of the fall quarter, it won't be long before that inevitable backwash, the grading system, rises to the surface. It's only when that final letter hits the bulletin board that most of us will consider what and how we are being taught. Of course, by this time, the A's and B's have lapsed into a smug silence, and the C's and D's (or umm, in some cases, Fs) are considered sour mash if they should gripe. This past summer, I've had time to ponder the whimsical way in which some courses are presented, and I've come to the following conclusions.

The text is written and the taught must realize where they are going before they get (or don't get) there. For the Con. Law professor who doesn't cover the commerce clause or the Evidence instructor who neglects to discuss hearsay, even the best of intentions can't make up for what that class has missed—and consequently must learn on its own or later be surprised.

Second—the mysterious mandate of "substantial attendance" on the part of the student. To cut or not to cut has been debated, I'm sure, ever since some Greek kid left his/her tutor in the lurch on the steps of the temple. That concern now is that in one class a student may be involuntarily withdrawn from a course for missing every seventh class. In another course, that student's instructor may not be heard of for a week or two and yet make-up classes are at his/her option and convenience.

Finally—what recourse has the conscientious student who early in the quarter realizes that much of what was mentioned in the course description will never be presented. Unfortunately, there is little that can be done. In the past, the Academic Standards committee, a well-meaning body composed of faculty and students, has given individual students a reprieve to make adequate performance in the course. However, even in the instances when the committee found less than adequate performance by an instructor, their recommendations were voted down by the full faculty. One example—a professor who became involved in a trial last semester. His class could no longer make the scheduled 3 pm session. Instead, he volunteered to meet at 8 am or to ratchet his class so as to record some vestiges of wisdom to be played back, whenever. A petition to be graded pass-fail was signed by a majority of the class, but after the Committee's approval, the full faculty voted down this alternative. Their reason—even this inadequate remedy would unduly restrict a professor's academic freedom!

In closing, I make one suggestion. Rather than the present ad hoc procedure for handling student-faculty conflicts, there should be a regularized, semi-formal appellate procedure, with the opportunity for a hearing and the presentation of testimony by all concerned. Also, resolved disagreements should be recorded for possible future use as precedents. After all, this is a school of law. Until the time such a procedure is available, the concerned student can make his/her feelings known to a student bar representative who hopefully can at least present a friendly shoulder on which to cry.

VI. Quantifying Excellence: Exams, Grades and Grading Guidelines

In closing, I make one suggestion. Wearing one of his 'hat's' as he spoke before the City Club of Cleveland, Stokes was reminiscent of a construction worker, as he blundered away at both mayoral candidate Arnold Pinkney and City Council President, George Forbes. Pinkney was lambasted for his lack of a regularized, semi-formal appellate procedure, with the opportunity for a hearing and the presentation of testimony by all concerned. Also, resolved disagreements should be recorded for possible future use as precedents. After all, this is a school of law. Until the time such a procedure is available, the concerned student can make his/her feelings known to a student bar representative who hopefully can at least present a friendly shoulder on which to cry.

The other 'hat' made its appearance at C.S.U. where the roaring lion of the City Club became a meek lamb, as he participated in a memorial service for John C. Little. Stokes could be heard singing along with songs as 'Blowing in the Wind' and 'I'd Like to Teach the World to Sing'. At the conclusion of that memorial service, this interview was conducted.

When asked what his present thoughts were concerning the white liberal, a political integer which figured significantly into his

FINANCIAL AID NOTICE. All overdue emergency loans from the Cleveland-Marshall Educational Foundation and the William A. Smith Foundation of Delta Theta Phi Law Fraternity must be repaid by the end of Fall Quarter in order to be eligible to register for Winter Quarter. Students may make repayment arrangements by contacting Ms. Barbara Sper, room 1037, phone 687-2317, or Assistant Director, room 1052, phone 687-2305.

... 'Memo' (from page 1)

students in Professor Somenfield's courses lack confidence and trust in what is being taught so as to make it impossible for them to continue any longer in the course.

In an interview with The Gavel, Coveil expressed his continued support for the LOCP program, and his belief that the program is legitimate "because the traditional admissions criteria are unreliable predictors." He declined, however, to take a position on LOCP transfers from courses should the same issue arise in the future.
no threat to the LCOP program at all, no hope that I and they may be, to the ex-
any particular students to teach, but a
tent possible, spared the rigorous dis-
cipline which I impose upon first-year
might also be much more sympathetic to
students in property ••.. I think and
some other members of the faculty that
people in their haste and anger behaved
in a very unlawyer-like manner. They
fired their weapons before they were
aimed; they tried their case before
they knew what the facts were.
You are asking me to change my attitude
don't and I don't quarrel with their de 
position. But I have to live with mine.
towards what a student must learn in law
school, to tailor it as it were to meet
the needs of every student
ored to meet the needs of every student
as criti c al as you suggest it is, that
...
they might if they wish be given the op ­

...Stokes (from page 5)

story?" Asked if that were the

case with the Glennville incident
during his tenure as mayor of
Cleveland, Stokes replied that "three
policemen had been killed and five

Civilian had been shot and killed.
news stations are sensitive to
events themselves." 

offending certain groups, which they

consequently, items which affect the
interest of

restricted to the dusty, dingy law
decent income but make a social

contribu t ion. Lawyers shall be

redress problems, whether civil or

talents available to help people

find a job consistent with

inner-city areas and volunteer your

money to get divorces, to pursue

of a crime is given an adequate

to see to it that any person accused

Q: What if every professor felt as
you do? Where would that leave LCOP?
R: Well honestly, I believe I do not and I don't quarrel with their deci-
f. But I have to live with mine.

Q: Your suggestion would be just as
validly applied to some other profes-
sors, especially those who are not only
demanding but also rightfully enjoy rep-
utations for being acrimonious and

acerbic, which you are not.
R: I try not to be, I attempt to
make it clear to students that I will
not laugh at their mistakes. I may
chide them, and I have often said to a
class— to a student upon whom I called,
"Go ahead and give the answer, if the
class laughs I'll turn on them."
Q: You can see the problem that
would exist if only LCOP students were
given such an option to choose profs?
R: Perhaps it should broader.
Q: So there are problems any way we

R: There are. And I confess that
maybe I did not explore as deeply as I
might have the implications of my
request. I would say this, if I may.
This was a confidential communication;
that does not mean that I stand any less
regard for the fact that

Somehow got out of Dean Messerman's
office... and I regret also the fact that
BASMA saw fit to make use of it in the
manner they did. As lawyer they might
learn to respect confidential commu-
ications. And finally, if I may gently
chide them in one respect, BASMA is open
— only to students of black ancestry.
If that is not racism I do not what.
Q: I'm afraid I'll have to cor-
rect you on that.
R: Is the organization open to
whites? If they found a white student of
impeccably Caucasian ancestry who
said "I do want to join the organiza-
tion," would he or she be allowed in?
Q: I'll pose the question to them.
I alluded to that next question before,
now I want to ask you if you have con-
sidered resigning from the faculty be-
cause of this affair?
R: I have considered it and my answer
is an unequivocal "no."
As you know, Mike, I have long because of my age con-
sidered retiring, which is not resigning and
might leave this, unless you have further questions...
Q: I have more.
R: ..at the request of one of the
professors. One of his remarks was
"perhaps their punishment, if any is
due, will be that that old son-of-a-
bitch will stay around for three more years."

Notes & Briefs

SPECIAL EVENTS

CSU Film Society
6:00 p.m. Nov. 1 And For Some-
thing Completely Different Deliverance Nov. 14, 15
Call 687-3800 for further information,

CWRU Film Society
Alice Doesn't Live Here Anymore Oct. 25
I Never Sang for My Father
Harry and Tonto Nov. 1
Variety Lights Nov. 4
A Woman Under the
Influence Nov. 8
The Rain People
Hearts and Minds Nov. 15

CWRU IMAGES OF WOMEN SERIES
Gigi Nov. 28

Bus Stop Nov. 2
Suddenly, Last Summer Nov. 9
My Fair Lady Nov. 16
Call 368-2463 at CWRU for entertain-
ment information.

FRED HARRIS, presidential candidate, spoke here recently, sounding like
McGovern, alluding to Truman, and promising to make America work again.

THE GREATER CLEVELAND CONGRESS will present several International
Women's Year workshops on Oct. 25th,
26th and 27th, at the Cleveland Convention Center.

These workshops will be of special interest to law students:

Special Events

Saturday, October 25
10:30 a.m. Women and the Law:
Questions and Answers
About Your Life and the
Law, with Prof. Moody
Advertised: Political
Mental and Moral Issues
1:40 p.m. The Politics of Rape
1:40 p.m. Women in Government
Relations
1:40 p.m. The Female Consumer:
Consulted or Exploited?
3:30 p.m. Achieving Equal Employment
Opportunity for Women, with
Prof. Picker
3:30 p.m. A Woman's Place is in The
House...and Senate

Sunday, October 26
1:00 p.m. Women at the Capital:
Lobbying and the League
2:00 p.m. The Joy of Sexism:
Don't Despair, Women in Your
School System
2:00 p.m. Politics of the Prevention
of Rape
3:00 p.m. Women, Credit and the Law

Monday, October 27
9:00 a.m. Equal Rights Amendment
9:00 a.m. Legalizing Prostitution
11:00 a.m. Housing and Women: Tenant
Landlord? The Law Is
Made For You.
1:30 p.m. Housing and Women: Mis-
match—Discrimination and the
Law

Admission to the workshops is free.