A Look at Law School Teaching
Teaching Technique: Vary Your Pitch
By Ken Reinhard

The communications difficulty has been virtually ignored. Why? One reason is the bane of the Socratic-Langdell method because its inflexible delivery. (see Socratic-Langdell article). It is a tool but it is not the only tool. Another may be the lack of accountability inherent in a law professor's position. It resembles a city-state with a constituency of one—the law professor. Perhaps a third reason is the disregard of fundamental techniques that vary the learning process. For example:
- Have your instructors made use of the blackboard?
- Have you been given tentative syllabi for your courses?
- Have your professors selected case material or merely followed the dictates of case-book authors?
- Have your instructors used mimeographed materials such as diagrams to illustrate difficult concepts?
- Have your teachers sat in class ignoring the fact that movement keeps a student's attention?
- Have your professors utilized the lecture method to the exclusion of all other techniques?
- Have your teachers used the Socratic Method to the exclusion of all other techniques?
- Have your instructors ever attempted to change or vary their tone or rate of speech to emphasize crucial concepts? The above are simple gimmicks that bend to the diverse ways people think and learn. They are so obvious that they may have been overlooked by some professors.

Yet, progressive solutions may be forthcoming. Some teachers use a problem-case method in

"This may never have occured to you Alan, but my world does not revolve around the Uniform Commercial Code."

Perform a death-defying act.
Give Heart Fund.
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Due to graduation, this is the last issue of The Gavel under my editorship. I would like to thank everyone associated with The Gavel for having made this the most outstanding and productive year in the publication's history. Everyone needs a diversion to overcome the monotony and frustration of law school. The Gavel was mine, and I look back with satisfaction at what was accomplished.

Martin Nadorlik

THE GAVEL
Cleveland-Marshall College of Law
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
216-687-2340

Editors
MARTIN NADORLIK
LEE ANDREWS
KENNETH E. REINHARD

Faculty Advisor
THOMAS D. BUCKLEY

Business Manager
WALTER BUBNA

Production Artist
ANNIE SIMPSON

Typesetter
JOHN MASLANKA

Staff
Paul Collarle, David Douglass, Paul Edwards, Sue Edwards, Alan Fisher, Mile Gentile, Maria George, Lenny Gluck, Tom Johnson, Lee Kravitz, Steve LaTourette, Scott Lee, Tom Lobe, Diana Miosi, Gail Natale, Mike O'Malley, Lawrence Sheehan, Bruce Walis, Ken Callahan

Copyright 1978 by The Gavel. Permission to reprint any part must be obtained in writing from The Gavel.

 Entire contents copyright 1978 by The Gavel. Permission to reprint any part must be obtained in writing from The Gavel.

The views expressed herein are those of the newspaper or its bylined reporters or contributors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the student body, administration, faculty or anyone at the College of Law of Cleveland State University, unless specifically stated.
In a recent interview Dean Bogomolny was asked to respond to the suggestion offered in the last issue of The Gavel that it was time that he and the faculty gave greater concern to students. In the Commentary section of that issue a reporter argued that faculty practices of handing in grades late, and handing in blue books without comments were hurting students; and that the Dean's unwillingness to regulate the faculty contributed to the problem. Elsewhere in The Gavel the Dean was criticized for his cameo performance at the Niagara International Moot Court competition, hosted by the C-M Moot Court Team.

In his interview the Dean:

- said that his nurturing of the faculty worked to the benefit of students
- allowed that there were times when faculty autonomy and students needs might not mesh, and where some middle ground might have to be defined
- insisted that the Faculty and the Administration are very interested in students.

At the onset of the interview we asked the Dean the question our readers often ask us; how does he spend his time?

Bogomolny promptly rattled off his schedule for that day which included, besides his interview with us, a conversation with a faculty member over a secretarial problem, an Administrative Council meeting at the University; a meeting discussing plans for the next Marshall Fund lecture; a meeting with trustees of the Cleveland-Marshall Educational Association, the fund which provides emergency loan assistance to students; meetings with two students who had set up individual appointments to see him. The Dean said his ongoing activities include fund raising activities, negotiations with the university over the budget, reorganization of the Placement Office, planning the direction of the school, and preparing for the class he teaches.

The Dean also emphasized that a significant amount of his time is spent meeting with faculty members to help them plan their research projects and their careers. "I see my own role as making life for them (the faculty) productive. The reason you nurture the faculty is that the faculty is the one continuing part of the law school."

Bogomolny contends that the fruits of these meetings ultimately trickle down to students. "If the faculty is great, the students benefit." "If the law school's reputation improves, the student's job market is better." "You get more jobs if your faculty is a better publishing faculty than a teaching faculty, rather than if its a good teaching faculty and a lousy publishing faculty."

Bogomolny also insists that publishing makes professors better teachers. "Try to think of those teachers who are good teachers and aren't doing anything from the scholarship point of view... When you sit down and write something, it energizes your mind and keeps you mentally alert. If you write about the fields in which you teach it has a way of keeping you alive; you bring a lot more into the classroom."

Bogomolny says that students who question the worth of faculty publishing are not worried that publishing interferes with the professor's preparation of classes. "Students are really saying is that they want more attention to their lives. Faculty may be inaccessible, but its not because they publish," he said.

The Dean's policy of encouraging faculty self-regulation derives from his interest in making the law school a good place to work.

"I have a belief that quality in education as well as quality in students is achieved when the faculty is self determined. You don't make a good student body by overregulating student conduct. You don't make a good faculty by overregulating faculty conduct." So when the question is a close one, my philosophy leads me to opt for freedom or self regulation.

"My experience is that better institutions get better by doing that, they usually don't better by regulating."

The Dean admits that his philosophy sometimes interferes with grading deadlines. But he contends that abusive lateness in handing in late grades was confined to two or three professors; a condition he says which doesn't warrant a regulatory scheme that will fall on everyone.

He said the problem of late grades was forwarded to the Faculty advisory committee after the faculty refused to deal with problems at a recent meeting.

"If indeed the faculty ultimately decides that the problem is one that they will not act on, I suppose that I will ultimately be dragged into taking some action. I would be unhappy with that--it shifts the nature of my relationship with the faculty. It shifts it from a responsible adult function to a more direct employment relationship. This is not the way good faculty in good law schools are built," he said.

At the last faculty meeting the faculty tabled indefinitely a student proposal designed to encourage discussion of the problems of late grades, and getting feedback on exams. The Dean admitted that he was disturbed when the faculty tabled the proposal before SBA president Bill McGinty could even introduce it. The Gavel mentioned that this was just another example illustrating the faculty's lack of accountability to students.

The Dean said he sent the student proposal to his Faculty Advisory Committee, and asked them to resubmit the proposal to the faculty as a whole.

continued on page 6
The other day I was pondering the difference between my earlier education and the ‘law school experience’, which has consumed most of my waking hours for the past three years. Besides the mountains of nickels that I’ve dutifully deposited in the library copy machines, I decided that the one thing that separated the ordinary student from the legal scholar was the unwitting submission to the Socratic method. The first time I viewed Paper Chase was the summer before my matriculation at C-M, and I vividly remember the fear that welled up inside of me as Kingsfield relentlessly questioned his contract class. As I sank lower and lower into my seat, I decided that what really separated the ranks in law school wasn’t going to be sharp intellects or quick answers but rather those that would succeed would be the ones best able to keep their breakfast down. It was right then and there that I decided not to eat breakfast my first year in law school.

Anyone who has been at C-M for any length of time knows that the Socratic method of instruction is subject to various uses and abuses. Some professors strictly adhere to the repeated question and answer approach, others seem to have invented their own free-form method, while still others refrain from using it at all.

What is it about the Socratic method that reduces iron-willed liberal arts veterans to jellyfish, and where did it come from?

The idea itself is of course named after that famous imbibers of hemlock, Socrates. However, as the current issue of Student Lawyer points out, the rigorous process of question and answer had its roots in an even earlier day. An adequate dictionary definition explains the technique as “a philosophical method of repeated questioning to elicit truths assumed to be inherent in all rational beings.” Still it was many centuries until the practice was introduced into American law schools. In the late nineteenth century a man whose name was synonymous with exploration adapted the Socratic method to the study of law in America. Christopher Columbus Langdell, a one-time dean of Harvard Law School, was unsatisfied with the manner in which the law was being taught. Before Langdell’s arrival on the legal scene law students at Harvard merely sat through professional pronouncements on areas of interest and graduated after a three year residence. (It’s pretty easy to understand why previous generations have praised the nineteenth century as the ‘good old days’.) Langdell believed that simply lecturing on the law served no real educational function. It was his goal to train the minds of his students to ‘think like a lawyer’ by subjecting them to repeated questioning. It was his hope that by forcing the student to become involved in the legal issue under discussion the ‘answer’ to that issue would develop from the parameters of the student’s own legal analysis, and not from force-fed lectures. To further implement his plan for eliciting implicit truths from his students, Langdell also introduced two other innovations that have caused continual discomfort to every law student - the casebook study method and the final examination. While his casebook method initially met with stiff resistance, Langdell firmly believed that the law grew through the judicial pronouncements and his students could only keep pace with the changing face of the law if abstract legal principles were studied in the context of life’s realities. It was through a subtle blend of the Socratic method, casebook study and final examinations that Langdell hoped to mold a generation of independent thinking lawyers, each with the ability to question and analyze the legal issues confronting him in practice.

It’s obvious that no amount of rebellion will ever return us to the pre-exam ‘good old days’ as final exams and the Socratic method are firmly implanted in the curriculum of the law. Just as obvious is the fact that Langdell’s pedigree method has been cross-bred over several generations and the type of Socratic method one is likely to face in the classroom will resemble so many mutts and strays, depending on the past experience and temperment of the individual professor. What began as a ‘laid-back’ discussion of philosophy in an olive grove in Greece has been transformed into a method of learning the law that can either train a student in the art of advocacy or embarrass his pants off.

* * *

In Sympathy -

The Gavel extends condolences to the families of two members of the Cleveland-Marshall Community who died during the last month. They are Prof. Charles Auerbach and Dean Emeritus Wilson G. Stapleton.

We are sure that the entire faculty, staff, and student body join us in mourning their untimely passing.

---

**The Socratic Method**

By Steve La Tourette

The founding fathers: Socrates and Langdell.
Two Views on Teaching

boggling experience. Geneva recommends that students carefully examine the wording of individual sections and use the IRS Regulations to clarify the ambiguities. Naturally, in addition, he recommends heavy dosages of studying.

Geneva utilizes a modified form of the Socratic method. "The pure Socratic method can be threatening and debilitating. But it forces you to come to class prepared." Geneva goes through the assigned problems, then uses hypotheticals in an attempt to insure understanding and to expose the nuances of the statute.

On the topic of academic publishing, Geneva feels that it enhances one's own reputation and the school's. However, Geneva stated that it does not necessarily make a professor a better overall teacher. Being an expert in an extremely limited area has its drawbacks. From his own experience, he has found in class that when he reaches an area where he has done research and writing, he tends to spend an inordinate amount of time covering that particular topic.

Professor Geneva stated that his goals in teaching a course are: 1. helping students interpret statutory materials, 2. giving students an appreciation of the statute's importance, 3. providing a starting point for problem solving in practice. "If I can reach 80% of those goals," he stated, "I feel that I've done my job."

Cleveland-Marshall's new professor Louis B. Geneva blends the problem method of teaching along with a thorough, easy-going style in teaching tax courses. "The advantage of the problem method is that it gives you a focus," he said. Since tax is basically a statutory subject, Geneva feels that directing a student's attention to particular provisions through problem handouts is more effective than the casebook method. While cases may aid in understanding the statute's application, their value is diminished by the date of the case and the fact that tax provisions are frequently amended.

Liberal arts majors take heart. Geneva was an economics and math major in college. "People with accounting and business backgrounds generally have an easier time understanding taxation," he stated. "They have dealt with the concepts before." However, Geneva added that the danger exists that they will have preordained ideas about how a particular provision operates, and will substitute their own conception instead of carefully analyzing the statute.

On the other hand, Geneva feels that law students with liberal arts backgrounds typically have difficulty with tax because "they fight the statute. It doesn't make sense in their mind, so they convince themselves that it doesn't make sense overall." Liberal arts training enforces the notion of exploring the underlying reason why something exists or happened. Trying to understand the entire tax structure can be a mind
"What disturbed me was not outcome, but the process; for God's sake if students bring some legitimate claims to us that are serious to them, we might not agree—but we ought to at least talk about them," the Dean said.

Bogomolny was specifically asked about the problem of professors failure to write comments on exams. The problem was offered as an area where faculty interest and student needs did not mesh.

"I think that students think the comment process is more valuable than I do. I see it more as a question of security, than as a question of education. It's obvious that there is a middle ground, and the middle ground has not been addressed."

The Dean contended once again that student concerns in this area were also directed toward one or two faculty members.

Throughout the interview the Dean maintained that the Administration and the faculty care about students. "Students feel that the institution doesn't care about them. It's a real perception but its not the least bit true," he said.

"There are large numbers of faculty members that spend a lot of time meeting individually with students." The Dean states that he has an open door to any student who has complaint or grievance.

The Dean said that if he had received earlier notice about the Niagara competition he would have spent more time there. He said he went up to the chairperson the Tuesday before the event and asked her what he could do. She asked him to give a speech at the banquet on Saturday night. Bogomolny said he couldn't comply with the request because he had a commitment to be with his family that evening; a commitment that was made two months before.

The Dean said that he understands the lack of notice; he said students aren't used to setting their calendars in advance. But for someone who spent three Saturday nights last month at least partially on Law School activities, setting up a calendar in advance is a necessity.

Late Grades Scoreboard

Here is a list of dates for grades. The last test was given 12/18/78. The deadline was 1/16/79.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gard</td>
<td>Remedies</td>
<td>12/18/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auerbach</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>12/27/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabac</td>
<td>Secured Transactions</td>
<td>12/27/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierk</td>
<td>Tax I</td>
<td>12/29/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>1/2/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haley</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>1/2/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willey</td>
<td>Criminal Law</td>
<td>1/8/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willey</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>1/8/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Federal Jurisdiction</td>
<td>1/8/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacoby</td>
<td>Comparative Law</td>
<td>1/8/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacoby</td>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>1/8/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braucher</td>
<td>Commercial Law</td>
<td>1/12/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyke</td>
<td>Labor Law</td>
<td>1/12/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egan</td>
<td>Patent Law</td>
<td>1/16/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>Clin. Prac. I</td>
<td>1/16/79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Letters

Editor:

The last edition of The Gavel featured a poll which ranked law school professors in the categories of "best" and "worst."

The concept of evaluating faculty members is a positive one. This practice, however, becomes negative and destructive in nature when the procedure is loose and shabbily managed.

The Gavel did attempt to define what was meant by "best" and "worst" however, the manner in which the poll was conducted is highly suspect. It was never established whether the students actually had the professor that they were promoting or denoting.

Secondly and more importantly, the poll is suspect because some individuals may have submitted more than one survey in an effort to tilt the poll in the behalf or against a professor.

If The Gavel was sincerely committed to objectively evaluating the faculty, The Gavel staff should have utilized a much more refined survey.

This poll was truly damaging to the professional reputations of a number of faculty members. The selection of a professor as the "worst" as LeRoy Murad was, must be considered reckless. If a teacher has been demonstrated to be lacking by a responsible student evaluation, such results should be published.

The bottom line is simply that we are dealing with the professional reputations of men who have dedicated themselves to the teaching of law. And an evaluation of their conduct must be more responsible than the kind published in The Gavel.

Respectfully submitted

Timothy Misny  David Kaman

Editor:

While participating in the Niagara International Moot Court Competition at Cleveland State University February 1-2, 1979, I happened to pick up a copy of your newspaper, THE GAVEL. I was quite impressed with the content, organization and expertise exhibited by your newspaper. It is no small task to inform and entertain law students during their "agonizing metamorphosis from layperson to lawyer." Sincerely,

Peggy J. King
Detroit College of Law
Student Proposals Tabled
By Ken Callahan

In a move that was not entirely unanticipated, the law faculty voted to table indefinitely S.B.A. proposals submitted to it regarding grading procedure at C-M. All other business discussed at the meeting of March 1 carried unanimously.

The proposals consisted essentially of two persistent issues, the first of which concerned a suggestion which would require a midterm or practice exam for first year courses. In addition, the S.B.A. reminded the administration of its obligation to enforce the existing 28 day deadline for submitting grades, noting even more stringent requirements at the Ohio State and Toledo Law Schools. The proposals will now go back to the Dean’s Faculty Advisory Committee, where most observers agree that there is little possibility of the issues being re-submitted to the faculty.

In bringing a motion to table the proposals, a faculty member stated that although he was “basically sympathetic to student problems,” he was nevertheless “unaware of any pervasive problem as suggested by the students.” Other professors intimated that the proposals would have the effect of inhibiting their academic freedom.

Commenting on the action, S.B.A. President Bill McGinty said that “the law school has a very definite problem when the faculty will not even consider discussion of student problems.” McGinty added that the suggestions were not intended to be brought in a spirit of antagonism.

Members of the Dean’s Advisory Committee who were contacted were unanimous in the belief that the proposals, as were framed by the S.B.A., were now “dead issues.” One faculty committee member found that although “most of my colleagues are deeply concerned with improving classroom interaction,” that “that any action that will be taken on the proposals will be informal.” The Dean’s Advisory Committee will meet in a closed session with the Dean on March 27.

Proposal to the Faculty:
1. Professors should distribute at the first class meeting a syllabus containing the following information:
   a) Reading (and any other) assignments
   b) Criteria for the determination of the final grade
   c) Posted office hours.
2. A copy of all examinations should go to the library file. Professors should place sample answers or outlines of sample answers of their previous exams on file in the library.
3. Professors should make comments in bluebooks while grading them. All examinations should be returned with sample answers or outlines which specify what the professor was looking for in each answer and by what standards grades were assigned. Specifically, in regard to first year students:
   a) A midterm or practice exam should be a requirement for all first year courses. This first exam should be thoroughly discussed in class. Also, the professor should hand out a sample answer for this test.

LATE GRADES
The Dean, as the administrative executive, has the DUTY to enforce the existing 28 days deadline for late grades. For example, Ohio State University has a “ten day request” period for grades, and the University of Toledo has a 21 day period by which grades are to be turned in.

On March 13th the law faculty tentatively approved changes in the first year curriculum which would:
- reduce the first year students credit load.
- end three quarter courses in the first year.
- place the first year oral advocacy experience under the supervision of upper class students.
- institute three different teaching models in first year student’s small group sections.

Perhaps the most significant change that came out of the special meeting was an item that wasn’t even debated. It was the appropriation of a salary for an administrator to draft a cooperative education program for C-M students.

Curriculum Changes, Co-op Program Approved
By Lee Andrews

One of the principles that the faculty agreed upon during the sometimes raucous meeting was that first year students are currently overloaded with credits. Professor Curry described the problem nicely when he questioned whether “first year students needed all that excitement.” The faculty responded by lopping off two hours from Civil Procedure and Property. Proposals to add two hours to Constitutional Law and to add a three credit course entitled Introduction to Law and Procedure were defeated. The first year students program will now look like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Law</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>8(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torts</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Law</td>
<td>6(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Procedure</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moot Court</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legal Research will be taught over a three quarter period by the library staff. Students will receive no credit for the course but will be required to complete assignments handed out in order to meet the requirement. The actual result of the changes will be that students will have two credits less in the first year—a maximum of 43 credits (including 1 for legal research) down from 45. Some students will have as little as 41 credits if Constitutional Law rather than
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Contracts and Torts is their small group section.

Students will still receive two hours additional credit for their small group sections even though the oral advocacy component, under the proposed changes, would be removed from the small group.

Small group sections in Constitutional Law, Torts and Contracts will be taught in either of three ways: Model I would feature team teaching. Three instructors would be responsible for teaching a section of sixty students three days a week; each professor would also teach a small subsection of 20 students, two hours per week. Each teacher would grade students in his small group. Students would be graded on a substantial paper and an examination designed by the team.

Under Model II one faculty member would teach a section of 60 students three times a week. The large section would break up into three small sections which will be taught by three different members of the faculty for two hours per week. Students under this "preceptor" model would be graded on class participation in their small group and upon examinations given by the large group instructor.

Model III would be similar to the current small group model. Thirty students will be instructed in the substantive material by one instructor. Under this model students will be required to write one paper, and "fulfill other requirements as the instructor may determine."

One of the reasons behind the experimentation was a shift from teaching writing to teaching legal analysis. Arguments for the shift came from two directions. Some faculty argued that students already write fairly well and need work in analysis. Others took the position that if a student's writing isn't structurally sound they weren't in a position to teach remedial writing.

A drastic reduction in legal writing in the first year, however, isn't forseen under the new small group models. Students in small group Models I and III will still be required to write a substantial paper. All students would be required to write an appellate brief as part of their oral advocacy experience.

Undoubtedly the consensus that first year students already were overloaded, the cutting of property credits, and absence of course sponsor Prof. Forte from the meeting, contributed to the negative vote.

The funding of an administrative position from Marshall Fund monies opened the way for cooperative education at Cleveland-Marshall. Cooperative education would allow students an internship in law offices or government agencies as part of their legal education. The funding of the administrative job came at the Dean's initiative. Surprisingly, the faculty were not asked for their view of the merits of the cooperative education, they were only asked to vote on the expenditure. Bogomolny suggested that a cooperative program might be one way of capitalizing on C-M's downtown location. Professor Flaherty questioned the school's ability to hire a quality administrator when there was no assurance that the school would fund the position for the following year. Bogomolny said that he believed foundation money was available for cooperative education.

The faculty also voted to use Marshall Funds for the funding of an additional staff person in the Legal Clinic. It was announced that David Barnhizer would move from the clinic to a regular teaching assignment. The faculty also approved the use of Marshall money to set up two $10,000 funds for the Dean's use as discretionary money, and to supplement expected faculty salary increases.

Professor Flaherty questioned the legality of these appropriations. The Dean said that the appropriations came within the "enrichment or development" language of the trust fund charter. The chairman of the fund, Prof. Goshien, added that the expenditures were appropriate given the vague language of the charter. Goshien also said that the fund had built up $240,000 of accumulated income, and the charter specifically prohibited the accumulation of surplus money.

It can be expected that the Dean will continue to tap Marshall Fund in the future for developmental money. All appropriations from the University to the law school are specifically earmarked, which creates a dearth of money for the creation of new programs.

The faculty tentatively approved the curriculum changes provided Mr. Greenwood could draw up a revised 1979-80 schedule. A final vote on the curriculum changes will take place at the next faculty meeting. Currently Greenwood is working on at least 3 schedule variations. One common feature of all the variations is that no first year course will run more than two quarters.

At the next meeting the faculty will also consider proposed revisions of the upper class curriculum which would make Evidence and Trial Preparation mandatory, abolish Administrative Law, and allow students additional leeway in satisfying the upper level writing requirements, which now can only be satisfied by completing an institute.

Faculty members of the Curriculum Committee are Professors Moody (chairperson), Barnhizer, Cohen, Kellman, Morse and Tabac.
Each quarter law students are assessed a fifty dollar general fee in addition to an instructional fee. A preliminary inquiry by The Gavel into where that general fee money goes revealed the following:

- law students receive a higher per student allotment of general fee money than their undergraduate counterparts
- 39% of the two million dollars the University collects in general fees is allocated to intercollegiate athletics.

The general fee money is distributed back to the law school in two forms: a $17,718 appropriation to the Student Bar Association, and a $9,700 appropriation to The Gavel.

Figures from Vice President for Student Services, Arnold Eyman's office indicated that those appropriations gave each full time student at C-M a return of $28.93, on their $50.00 assessment. This is a higher return than that received by undergraduates and the graduate students at the university. Their allotment is $11.19. These figures were based on the following full time equivalent enrollments:

- Law School: 885
- Graduate: 1,020
- Undergraduate: 9,888

Student Senators originally distributed this year's S.B.A. budget in the following manner:

- SBA: $8,700
- BALSA: $1,532
- N.L.G: $1,125
- Women's Caucus: $1,175
- ABA/L.S.D.: $790

The major expenditures of the SBA were to include $3,165 for officer's salaries, $3,000 for the speaker's program, and $2,533 for office rental from the university. The SBA also purchased two typewriters for student use in the library, and allocated $5,757 for the purchase of law outlines to update the depleted supply at the library reserve desk.

At the last SBA meet senators amended those allotments. $500 was taken from the speakers budget and added to the ABA budget to defray additional expenses incurred for the recent ABA student convention held at C-M the weekend before finals. That put the total student cost of the ABA convention at $1,000.

$250 was taken from the speakers budget to subsidize tickets for the Cleveland Indians opening day baseball games. $125 was also transferred from the speakers budget to help an additional person go to the BALSA convention.

The SBA has given up on its speakers program after a poor student turnout for porno mogul defender Harold Price Fahringer in the fall.

BALSA's two largest expenses are a speakers program, $200 and out of state travel, $750. Women's Caucus has placed most of its allocation in out of state travel, $600, and in conferences, $475. Much of the NLG budget is allocated for speakers.

The Gavel receives its appropriation from the Student Publications Board. The Gavel's budget, ranks below the budgets of the two undergraduate papers, The Cauldron and The Vindicator, which get $29,350 and $15,950, respectively.

Peg Polley, Dean of Student Group Services, stated that general fees contributed by students totalled $2 million this year. Polley said intercollegiate athletics - 39% and intramurals 11% comprised half of that sum.

Students may voice their opinion on the allocation of general fee monies through participation on the Student Advisory Committee for the general fees. Cal Eyman is the law school representative.

---

Here's a do-it-yourself project for you. You can apply a few facts about your resources to our standard budgets and estimate your eligibility for campus-based funds.

**FREE MONEY - grants, tuitions and scholarships.** These do not have to be paid back. They range from $100 to full tuition and represent only about 10% of the total financial aid in any one year.

**JOBS - work-study, on and off campus.** The rate of pay is usually from 3.25 to 3.50 per hour. When you accept federal aid, any student job on campus becomes a work-study job. Typical jobs are in the Law Library, researching for faculty, clerking for law directors or courts, and public sector research.

**LOANS - National Direct Student Loans.** Up to $2500 per year loaned through the university at 3% simple interest, deferred until nine months after graduation. For the "magic formula" to arrive at eligibility, standard budgets include tuition, books and living expenses. You can build your own by adding your tuition, including out-of-state surcharge, if applicable, books at $80 per quarter part-time or $110 per quarter full-time, and the quarterly living expenses for your particular situation:

- Commuter (living with parents): $500
- Dorm Resident (plus two round trip fares home): $733
- Single (independent housing): $1125
- Married: $1789
- Add: (per child $186)
  - if employed full-time: $375
  - if spouse is a student

**& Books**

Starting with summer quarter 1979 and ending with spring quarter 1980, tailor your individual budget using the figures above.

After you have built your budget, subtract the following resources for the same period:

- Net employment income (student and/or spouse)
- Anticipated IRS refund
- Public Benefits (welfare, food stamps, VA, B VR, social security)
- Assets (35% of savings, stocks, bonds, equity in real property)
- Parent's gifts and contributions
- Alimony and Child Support

The only resource that you cannot compute is the expected parents' contribution for a dependent student. That contribution is analysed by the Graduate and Professional Students Financial Analysis Service.

If your resources do not approach your budget, you should file a GAPSFAS application before May 1st. They are available in Room 120. When your analysis is received form Princeton, you are notified of eligibility and given an opportunity to make some choices among the types of aid.

If your resources exceed the standard budget, you are still eligible to apply for aid from your bank or savings institution. A Guaranteed Student Loan may be borrowed at 7% simple interest, also deferred until nine months after graduation. The lender requires that you be registered for at least 6 hours, have a co-signer and be in good academic standing. Depending on the size of your standard budget and the policy of the bank, you may borrow up to $5000 per year in this program.
C-M’s BALSA team, Everett Bellamy, Janet Burney, James Hewitt.

BALSA Team Wins

By Tom Lobe

On February 15, 16 and 17 at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, the Cleveland-Marshall BALSA organization netted a first place in the Midwest Regional Fredrick Douglas Moot Court Competition. With BALSA members James Hewitt and Everett Bellamy arguing the case and with Janet Burney’s assistance in writing the brief, Cleveland-Marshall captured first place overall and obtained second place for best brief.

Cleveland-Marshall had stiff competition from Marquette, University of Michigan, University of Iowa, University of Cincinnati and the University of Wisconsin at Madison. The victory in the Midwest regional entitles the Cleveland-Marshall BALSA team to continue on to the National BALSA Conference in Oakland, California on March 28th through April 1st. The other three Regional winners will also advance and compete in Moot Court competition arguing the same case used in the Regional competition.

The issue that was argued involved a controversy where the Police Department was being sued by a black organization charging discrimination over testing procedures and height requirements. The parties resolved the matter and set up an Affirmative Action Program. A white interest group challenges the Affirmative Action Program on a reverse discrimination theory. The case history is that the complaint is dismissed and the action is appealed to the Supreme Court.

This was the first time that Cleveland-Marshall entered the competition without the assistance of Case Western Reserve University. By capturing the Midwest Regional title, BALSA has given Cleveland-Marshall some national prominence by its outstanding performance. Hopefully, the Cleveland-Marshall BALSA team will continue in its winning ways in Oakland, but no matter what the outcome may be, this year’s BALSA team achieved a plateau that only a few Cleveland-Marshall organizations have reached.

Newman Catholic Campus Ministry Announces

New Mass Schedule at
Church House Chapel
2230 Euclid Ave.
(Next to Trinity Cathedral)
Monday and Wednesday 12:15 p.m.

Newman Catholic Campus Ministry has announced a new mass schedule at Church House Chapel, 2230 Euclid Ave., (Next to Trinity Cathedral). Mass will be held on Monday and Wednesday at 12:15 p.m.

Shelving Problems
Plague Library

By Lenny Gluck

During the latter part of the Winter Term one could not help but notice cryptic signs written by students beseeching other law students to pitch in and reshelve library books. Recently, The Gavel interviewed Cathy Gillette, director of library public services, who discussed the problem.

Gillette pointed out that during the Winter Term, 2 members of the staff were ill for extended periods of time. This situation created a need for student desk employees. Meanwhile, undergraduate shelvers were quitting for various reasons (i.e., to prepare for midterms) creating a need for new shelvers. Therefore, new shelvers and desk help had to be hired and trained concurrently, creating a burden on the Public Service Department.

Gillette noted that student abuse of special library privileges and a general lack of student cooperation were contributing factors to the reshelving problem. For example, Law Review and Moot Court failed to replace volumes used for their research projects. Gillette said new policies will be instituted to alleviate this abuse.

Budget woes, according to Gillette, compounded an already abysmal situation. She said the library is applying for a substantial increase in its student employment fund but, in the meantime will divert funds from other accounts to remedy the problem.

In the past, it has been the library staff’s responsibility to reshelve and straighten the stacks. However, Gillette stressed the need for student cooperation in reshelving. She stated that the library doesn’t expect students to go from the basement to the second floor to replace a book but it does expect that students return reporters to their shelves. Hopefully, the next time you need 156 N.E.2d it will be next to 155 N.E.2d and not piled next to a photocopier.

Willey continued from page 5

“non-quality reasons.” Prof. Willey said there are three prongs to teaching responsibility - classroom teaching, publication, and public service. He stated that publication is a barometer of teacher interest in new problems. Enhancement of C-M’s national and state image, according to Willey, is a direct outgrowth of Willey’s efforts. According to Willey, Willey is a direct outgrowth of Willey’s efforts. According to Willey, Willey is a direct outgrowth of Willey’s efforts.

Placement Notes

There will be an open meeting regarding placement on April 3, 1979, at 5:00 p.m. in LB 101. Student comments will assist the Placement Office in setting goals and planning for the future development of the placement program.

A judicial clerkship seminar will be held on Tuesday, April 17th at 5 p.m. in Room 101. Pat Kleri, former clerk to Judge Alvin I. Krenzler and Terry Gravens clerk to Judge John T. Patton will be guest speakers.
Positive About Cleveland

By Tom Johnson

Are you pro-Cleveland? If so, you would get along well with this year's Albert A. Levin Professor of Urban Studies and Public Service at Cleveland State University, Wolf Von Eckardt. Von Eckardt was born in Berlin in 1918, came to this country in 1936 as a political refugee, and became a U.S. citizen. His resume and lists of awards is quite impressive but, the man, himself, is even more outstanding.

"Cleveland has potential but, its people have no faith in their city," says Von Eckardt. The small framed man, with his German accent and open manner, sees the city's problems the same as any industrial city - the industry is moving away. Cleveland is different from Baltimore and Minneapolis in that these cities changed over a 30-40 year period. Much of Cleveland's industrial change has happened in the last decade.

The nature of industry changes with time. Newer, more modern harbor facilities are needed; trucks are in demand rather than railroads; factories need to expand horizontally, not vertically; with the use of computers, more educated employees are in demand. Cleveland just hasn't been progressing in the right directions quickly enough.

Our political situation hasn't helped the dilemma. "You can't insult industry and expect it to return," says Von Eckardt. Although, he doesn't feel the same industry would return to the area anyway. Cleveland should be striving to encourage new and different business to the city, in Von Eckardt's mind. There are no big advertising firms in the city yet, Cleveland is the third largest corporate headquarters in the U.S. A large ad firm with ties in all the major cities would probably do very well. Cleveland is already known as a great cultural center but Von Eckardt thinks it could be even greater. Why not have a winter pops series?

All of these ideas would create jobs for young and old. They would require a certain expertise - individuality. The people qualified to fill these positions would require new housing. They would need something in the city, something sharp. Perhaps, a townhouse (the five up on Prospect are a beginning). They would demand first class stores downtown and places to eat, drink, and be entertained. Voila - a booming metropolis.

Von Eckardt doesn't think Cleveland's rehabilitation is fast enough. For example, Playhouse Square has some major attractions but, they are irregular and the building/theaters need to be redone. Von Eckardt feels all the places should be rehabilitated at once. If we could create a sort of Kennedy Center at Playhouse Square, masses would come to downtown, restaurants, like the Last Moving Picture Show, would not fail and Cleveland would be on the upward swing.

When asked about Cleveland transportation, Von Eckardt's face lit up. "Where in the United States can you get from the airport to downtown in twenty minutes." He likes the loop buses which he rides regularly for the ten cent fare. He stated, "everything can be improved but Cleveland does have one of the best transportation systems." Von Eckardt feels that the Halprin Plan is of little importance. Halprin proposed the installation of a 'people mover' on Euclid Avenue. Von Eckardt sees the 'people mover' as unnecessary. It would cast shadows on the street and large unattractive poles would predominate the avenue. It would become a modern Chicago loop. Halprin, also, advocated sidewalk expansion. Von Eckardt thinks this premature, like "the cart before the horse." Why would one expand the sidewalks, when there is no one to stand on the existing ones?

Von Eckardt would like to see a certain uniqueness in downtown Cleveland. He claims, "we are all getting bored with suburban shopping malls." He suggests a Gucci shop and other high luxury boutiques along Euclid Avenue. This would encourage the wealthy suburbanites to come downtown. Von Eckardt points out that in places like Minneapolis and Baltimore the old, rich families are the ones who put money into the cities and brought them back. He claims that the blue bloods of Cleveland, "have very little faith in their city." Perhaps, one day soon they will see that they are hurting themselves and get to work, as Von Eckardt says "shifting gears; and help get Cleveland back into its once prominent place among American cities. Who knows maybe Euclid Avenue will regain its title of, "the most beautiful street in the world?"
Runners Club

If you run for fun, exercise or as training for competition and are interested in joining the Cleveland-Marshall Running Club - please contact Keith Fabrizi at 631-4467 or Michael Fine at 221-1813. There will be an organizational meeting early spring quarter.

Typewriters in Library

Beginning spring quarter 4 IBM's electric typewriters will be available for student use in the Library, Room 64. There will be a signup roster to reserve a typewriter. Students must furnish their own materials. This is just a joint venture by SBA and the Library.

Women's Rights Workshop

Legal rights of women will be the subject of a day-long series of Workshops on Saturday, May 5th at 8:30 a.m. in Room 101. There is a $5.00 registration fee which includes a handbook, morning refreshments and babysitting. The fee may be waived on request. The workshops are sponsored by The Women's Law Caucus and The Law Student Division of the American Bar Association and are open to the general public.

Bye Bye Fran

CM's Administrative Assistant Francine Cole will be leaving for private employment in mid April. Fran's wit and charm as well as her willingness to help students made her an asset to the school. We will miss her.

Markus

Students flocked to The Gavel recently with news that Common Pleas Court Judge Richard Markus was not going to be able to teach at C-M anymore.

They drew the news from concluding remarks made by the judge at the last meeting of his Litigation Essentials class winter term. The implication, the students said, was the law school was not going to ask the popular and knowledgeable professor back to teach.

Not so says Dean Bogomolny and the judge himself. The Dean said that the law school would love to have more adjunct professors of Judge Markus' caliber.

Judge Markus said his inability to teach had nothing to do with the law school, but to the possibility of a change of his employment. He said he was not at liberty to comment any further.

Guild Speakers

April 13 - Victor Goode, Executive Director of the National Conference of Black Lawyers speaking on Weber.

April 20 - Chris Stanley, C-M grad and attorney for Lucasville Prison inmates who successfully challenged inhuman conditions at the institution.

April 27 - Steve Saltzman, attorney-in-charge of Hough Legal Aid Office in Cleveland on the Legal Service Corporations representation of Minorities and the poor.

Worth Remembering

It's not over 'til it's over. 
Yogi Berra