

# The Justinian

---

Volume 1976  
Issue 4 *May*

---

Article 1

1976

## The Justinian

Follow this and additional works at: <https://brooklynworks.brooklaw.edu/justinian>

---

### Recommended Citation

(1976) "The Justinian," *The Justinian*: Vol. 1976 : Iss. 4 , Article 1.  
Available at: <https://brooklynworks.brooklaw.edu/justinian/vol1976/iss4/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Special Collections at BrooklynWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Justinian by an authorized editor of BrooklynWorks.





# Justinian

Vol. XXXVI - No. 10

TUESDAY, MAY 11, 1976

Page One

## Peltz and Davis Win; Election Turnout Light



New top men in the SBA: Howard Peltz, SBA President, and Brian Davis, SBA First Vice President.

Howard Peltz, a second year day student, beat out Diane Fernandez for SBA President. The turnout for the election was light with about 400 students voting. The final vote for president was 242 for Peltz and 204 for Fernandez. The other election results are as follows:

### First Vice President

Brian Davis — 219  
Alan Rosenberg — 190

### Second Vice President

Jayne Russell — 70  
Tom Urgo\* — 24  
Don Berman — 16

### Treasurer

Ben Weinstock — 218  
Bart Strock — 187

### Secretary

Dean Silverberg — 214  
Robin Garfinkle — 175  
Marc Aronson\* — 18

\* Write-in candidate



Outgoing SBA Executive Board: (l. to r.) Diane Fernandez, Benjamin Weinstock, Jayne Russell, Howard Peltz, Alan Tivoli, Elyse Lehman.

## SBA: Little Progress Shown in Five Years

News Analysis by John Rashak

In September 1970, the SBA passed a resolution "that a Student-Faculty (S/F) Senate be created consisting of members of the Student Body and the faculty to resolve problems between the parties. Said S/F Senate will have equal voting representation which will be binding on Students, Faculty, and Administration" (Justinian, 10/13/70).

The SBA proposed three more resolutions in September 1970. The resolutions were "to change the examination and grading system at BLS"; to "make all finals available to students regardless of grade, while eliminating the use of names on exam papers"; and to make class rank reflect class attrition. The four SBA resolutions hung in the balance for eight months, despite an unsuccessful SBA attempt to bypass the faculty and deal directly with the Dean. The faculty subsequently voted down all four student resolutions. As a concession, the faculty supported a voting student representative on the Curriculum Committee and a non-voting student representative on the Student Regulations Committee (Justinian, 5/10/71).

In order to salvage some measure of a year's work, the SBA delegates decided late in 1970 to concentrate on four issues, whatever the outcome of the faculty committee vote on the proposed resolutions. These prominent issues were: 1. Instituting an anonymous grading system; 2. Rendering the cafeteria "more presentable in terms of its gustatory effect and the sterile atmosphere it presents"; 3. Obtaining a system whereby student fees would be paid directly to the SBA instead of to the Registrar; 4. Keeping the library open until midnight (Justinian, 11/9/70). Not one of the four rejected SBA resolutions of 1970, nor one of the four prominent SBA issues of 1970 has been decided in the students' favor in the past five years.

### S/F Clinics' Committee

While BLS now has three student-faculty (S/F) committees, raising issues rather than achieving results has been the rule. For example, the S/F Clinics' Committee intends to send questionnaires to all evening-division law schools with a clinical program. The purpose is to inquire about

(Continued on Page 3)

## Registration Requirements: Are They Necessary?

By Dick Grayson and  
Kim Steven Juhase

The registration requirements mandating school attendance a minimum of four days a week and no more than five hours per day were suddenly thrust upon the student body on Tuesday, April 27. The Justinian placed its first bulletin on the first floor bulletin board at 1:45 that afternoon. Immediately, many individual students went up to the ninth floor to complain. Eventually, part of the ninth floor had to be sealed off because of the protests, according to Dean Lisle's secretary.

The next day, Dean Lisle called an emergency meeting of the faculty for April 29. In Dean Lisle's memo calling the meeting, it was noted that there had been student protests and that the SBA Executive Board had passed a resolution attacking the new requirements. On April 29, the faculty met and according to Dean Lisle, many faculty members were for even stricter requirements. Eventually it was decided that the four day a week requirement be dropped.

On Tuesday of that week, Dean Lisle allegedly told a group of students that the idea for the new requirements arose when Dean Prince told Dean Lisle that he had heard that a few law schools had been threatened with a loss of accreditation because they had too many students taking too many courses in too few days a week. Later, Dean Lisle denied the story. However, there is no doubt that the underlying reason for the restrictions was the Administration's desire to meet what they think the American Bar Association and the American Association

of Law Schools require. To check this assumption, the Justinian called the ABA in Chicago and the AALS in Washington, D.C., to find out what they actually mandated.

The pertinent ABA and AALS regulations follow:

The AALS policy, page 7, states "A full-time student is one who devotes substantially all of his working hours to the study of law. 'Full-time' study can occur only in a program where the curriculum and academic schedule are so arranged as to require substantially the full working time of students."

Standard 305 of the ABA Standards for the Approval of Law Schools states: "... 'Full-time student' means a student who devotes substantially all of his working hours to the study of law."

Question 17, page 17, of the Inspectors' Questionnaire (referring to full-time students) asks, "What steps are taken to ascertain the extent to which each student... is employed during the school year? What steps are taken to discourage such employment by students (e.g. loans, scholarships, class schedules)?"

Frederick Franklin, assistant director of the ABA Section on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, noted that students are allowed a certain amount of flexibility with which to plan their courses. "After all, there might be adequate reasons for scheduling classes on only a few days." But he did warn that if, during an inspection, the inspectors find "many students" taking classes three or four days per week, they might consider the school as not fulfilling its respon-

sibility to see that students devote "substantially" all of their working hours to the study of law.

The associate director of the AALS, Wayne McCormack, also emphasized the subjective nature of the determination. He stated, "The AALS first looks at a school's educational pattern and not at individual cases. Then it looks to see if the pattern is really for an educational purpose. If a school schedules classes for Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, is this a pattern that the school condones? This might make full-time students into part-time students, and raise a question of residence, since part-time students must spend four years in school."

Neither McCormack nor Franklin were aware of serious threats by the ABA or AALS to take away a school's accreditation because of a school's failure to insure that its students were substantially "full-time."

But McCormack did warn that "if there's a pattern of students not substantially spending their full time as students, and the school is cognizant of this pattern, the school has a responsibility to act accordingly."

A Justinian survey of local law schools found that of the four other schools with evening programs — NYU, New York Law, Fordham, and St. John's — only St. John's has the four day, five-hour restriction. All the other schools have no restrictions.

The result of our inquiry seems to show that even though the accrediting institutions do not directly require registration restrictions, having such restrictions cannot hurt the school's standing with the ABA and the AALS.

## New Justinian Editors



Typewriter passes to new generation: Managing Editor John Rashak and Editor-in-Chief Dick Grayson.



## Justinian

Published under the auspices of the Student Bar Association

BROOKLYN LAW SCHOOL

250 Joralemon Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

Telephone: (212) 625-2200 Ext. 50

Editor-in-Chief ..... Kim Steven Juhase  
 Managing Editor ..... Matthew J. Trachtenberg  
 Associate Editor ..... Marcia Knigin  
 Copy Editor ..... Linda Riley  
 News Editors ..... Dick Grayson, John Rashak  
 Staff: Randall S. Ferguson, Paul Forman, Lillian Gewitz, Anne Hunter,  
 Elyse Lehman, Joel Mitofsky, Howard Peltz, Dale Mark Ross, Ed  
 Steen, Joseph Supp, Manuel Taitz, Michael Weinberger, Debra Wolin.

345

## Leaderless SBA

In Spokane, Washington, the SBA of Gonzaga University Law School organized a tuition strike when it learned that their ABA accreditation was threatened because of the failure of the University to allocate increased funds for the law school. What would our SBA do in a situation like that? Based on past performance this year, they would probably do nothing more than pass a resolution deploring the situation.

The SBA Executive Board has shown a total lack of leadership in student affairs. Not only have they failed to mobilize student opinion in crisis situations, but they have actively tried to prevent it by attempting to keep students uninformed, preferring to work "behind the scenes." Because of the Executive Board's "behind the scenes" work, we have new registration restrictions and no student representation on the Decanal Search Committee. The Executive Board should realize that they are powerless in their dealings with the Administration unless they can show the Administration that they have the affirmative active support of the student body. The board should also realize that this support will only arise when the students are informed. Instead of requesting that the *Justinian* not publish something for fear that we might disrupt "behind the scenes" negotiations with the Administration, the SBA executives should approach their student newspaper and inform us of their actions so that we may inform our readers.

A perfect example of the power of an informed student body thwarted by a leaderless SBA is the recent registration requirements controversy. Despite the protestations of some members of the Executive Board, we decided to inform students through a *Justinian* "bulletin" before the issue became moot. Upon reading of the new restrictions, students became outraged. So many individual students tried to complain to the Administration, that, according to Dean Lisle's secretary, the Administration decided to seal off the rear ninth floor corridor. However, the Executive Board failed to organize the student protest, being content with passing a resolution and working "behind the scenes." Because of student pressure, and not the result of any SBA action, an emergency meeting of the faculty was called which resulted in modification of the requirements. The requirements, however, still in practice, maintain the status quo. If this result were achieved as a result of unorganized student protest, there is no doubt that if the SBA Executive Board took a position of leadership, a massive organized student protest could have been initiated that would have resulted in the requirements being laid aside.

Unfortunately, the outgoing SBA Executive Board could not provide such leadership. We can only hope that the newly elected board will learn from their predecessor's mistakes and not be afraid of both informing the students and organizing them against the Administration when the need arises.

## Moot Notes



Elyse Lehman won first prize in the Intramural Moot Court Competition. Susan Haine, addressing the Bench in the above photo came in second. Moot news also includes the election of new day Moot Court officers. They are Chairpersons Barry Salzberg, Vice Chairperson Marcia Margolin, Editor Ted Bartlesone, Secretary Robin Capacio, Business Manager Bart Strock.

## Faculty Hiring:

## Who Chooses The Chosen

By Joel A. Mitofsky

There might come a day when one or several of us will consider or be considered for a faculty position at BLS. What decision-making body will you confront, and have to convince of your pedagogic worthiness? With concerns such as these, this reporter approached several members of this important body and came away with several answers, as well as several questions.

The Faculty Appointments Committee at BLS is entrusted with complete, albeit not final, authority as to the recruitment and hiring of new faculty personnel. This committee has as its members the entire existing faculty at BLS. In order to become one of the chosen, you must conclusively establish that you deserve to be one of the chosen. It is, in a most democratic sense, a process of trial by potential peers.

Prof. Allan is the chairperson of the Faculty Appointments Committee and also this committee's subcommittee. It is this subcommittee that bears the brunt of the work and responsibility entailed by the need for additional faculty members. In addition to Prof. Allan, the subcommittee has seven members: Professors Crea, Hoffman, Hahl, Farrell, Comerford, Schenk and Schultze. The initial phase of the hiring process, i.e., getting people to apply for a teaching position and the screening of these applicants, is handled entirely by the subcommittee, through the authority delegated to it by the Faculty Appointments Committee (a.k.a. the faculty). There are several sources that are tapped when the subcommittee begins the screening process. Of course, there are applications received from those who are interested in joining the faculty at BLS. Some amount of solicitation of applications is also conducted by asking the Deans of other law schools to suggest the names of those who might be interested in coming to BLS to teach. Law firms are also contacted in an attempt to uncover potential applicants for a teaching position. The subcommittee sends three of its members to an annual A.A.L.S. convention to meet and talk with as many people as possible in the four days the convention runs. The most recent convention was held in Chicago this past December, with Professors Schenk, Comerford and Allan attending. Primarily from these three sources does the subcommittee garner its mass of applications and thus begin the process of selecting new faculty personnel.

A more particularized look at these sources of applications is warranted, if for nothing more than to highlight the rather enormous burden the members of the subcommittee assume when joining the subcommittee. According to Prof. Allan, the school receives five batches of applications from interested parties during the months of October through January. The members of the subcommittee go through each application, determining which people they would like to interview in the future. This reviewing process is arduous. Professor Schultze commented that he must have read 1000 applications himself, and other committee members spoken to echoed his feeling that the screening of applications is difficult as well as time-consuming. The experience of those who

travel to Chicago for the convention is comparable. Although the tediousness of accumulating good teaching candidates is apparent, the subcommittee nonetheless elicits from these two sources a group of people who are deemed worthy of further consideration. Having successfully emerged as a possibility after this substantial screening, an applicant is invited to come and visit BLS.

Arriving at the eighth floor, an applicant can take a quick look at the layout provided for his potential brethren and peek into the offices they now occupy. The real purpose of this visit, though, is not to afford the candidate an opportunity to marvel at the architectural and esthetic splendor of the eighth floor. The candidate is here to meet the subcommittee, and, more specifically, to be, according to Prof. Allan, "put through the mill", by this group. This visit provides the subcommittee with the opportunity to delve into the applicant's motivations for seeking a position at BLS, his attitude toward teaching and interacting with students and to get a sense of who the person is and how he might fit into the present faculty. Inquiry is made of the applicant as to what he thinks about students (will this person be accessible?), and as to what this person is going to do for the school (willing to devote free time to attending school functions?). The importance of this phase of the hiring process can not be underplayed, and thus the intensity of the grilling the applicant is subjected to is well justified. For it is from this group of applicants who are invited to the school to be interviewed by the subcommittee that the subcommittee chooses their top prospects, approximately twelve in number. For these final dozen candidates, the visit with the subcommittee is not their final visit to the school.

Each current faculty member receives, prior to meeting the top applicants, a copy of each applicant's application and résumé. At this meeting the full faculty gets the opportunity to question and discuss with the candidate anything considered pertinent to reaching an informed opinion concerning the desirability of extending an offer of a teaching position to the applicant. After meeting all of the final candidates brought forth by the subcommittee, the entire faculty narrows down the number being considered for a position to a select few. It is at this juncture in the hiring process that those who will eventually benefit or suffer from the decisions made on hiring, i.e., the students, are brought into the picture. A student committee, appointed by the SBA and currently headed by Fred Hirsch, is allowed to meet and talk with the final few candidates being considered by the faculty. The students file a written evaluation of these candidates with the Faculty Appointments Committee, said evaluations containing their impressions of and recommendations concerning the applicant and the advisability of hiring him. The role of students in the selection of new faculty is nothing more than advisory. The weight accorded the student views by the entire faculty might not be "measurable", according to Prof. Allan. This is not to imply the effect or influences of student input into faculty hiring is "necessarily small," Prof. Allan feels.

Prof. Schultze, amplifying on the impact the voice of the students in the hiring decisions, noted that the student evaluations of the candidates are "very important" and are read, aloud, at the meeting of the entire faculty, prior to a vote being taken on whether or not to extend an offer to a particular candidate. It is Professor Schenk's feeling that the students' role in the hiring decision, as presently designed, is appropriate. She does not see any need to increase the power the student body wields in the determination of who shall be put in front of the classes that are conducted at BLS.

The faculty, after meeting the final candidates in person, reading their applications and résumés and reading the reports written by the student committee, is now confronted with the decision who is extended an offer of a position to. Prof. Allan contends that this decision is based, primarily, on the faculty members' impression of the candidate's willingness to give of his time and energy to the school and its students and on the ability and "brainpower" of the candidate to convey to students his knowledge. A vote is taken, and those candidates to whom a majority of the faculty react favorably, are once again contacted by the school. This communication to the faculty-approved applicant, however, is not an offer. The formal offer to become a member of the BLS faculty is tendered by the Board of Trustees after the approved candidate returns to the school to meet Prof. Allan and Dean Lisle to discuss the terms of the forthcoming offer. The Board of Trustees must approve the offer tendered by the school to the candidate. They retain the final voice as to whether or not a particular person is hired. If the Board of Trustees deems that the offer, as suggested by Dean Lisle and Prof. Allan be made, it is so extended. Upon the tendering of the offer the school's role in the hiring of new faculty is completed. All that remains is the decision of the offeree-candidate to accept or reject the opportunity to join the BLS staff.

The hiring procedure, as above outlined, is long and tedious, as it seems it must be. It resulted in the hiring of one full-time faculty member for the current academic year (Prof. Rice), and the hiring of one new professor for the 1976-1977 academic year. Different reasons were put forth for the relative scarcity of new professors coming to BLS, in light of the fact that there is a recognized desire on the part of the school to enlarge its faculty (Draft of the Report of the Committee on Self-Evaluation of the Brooklyn Law School). Prof. Allan stated, forthrightly, that it is difficult to get hired here. The earnest effort put forth by the subcommittee results in a very effective screening of candidates, resulting in only a select few candidates even being considered by the entire Appointments Committee. The entire faculty itself, commented Prof. Schultze, reflects diverse philosophies as to who to hire and thus it is difficult for many candidates to muster the requisite amount of faculty votes to be extended an offer. Both Professors Schultze and Schenk reflected on the overall quality of the majority of the applicants the school considers and noted that the quality is not

(Continued on Page 3)



## Hiring

(Continued from Page 2)

that outstanding. Prof. Schenk cited the convention in Chicago as a further example of this, where she said she did not see that many great candidates. She feels the convention serves a beneficial purpose, nonetheless, in that it serves as an opportunity for those attending it to "sell" Brooklyn Law School.

There are two remaining areas involved in the hiring of new faculty which must be considered if one is to get a composite view of the situation at BLS. The difficulty in securing new full-time professors is mirrored by the school's need to hire, on a semester by semester basis, adjunct faculty personnel. Whereas the hiring of full-time faculty encompasses

choose not to teach here — unwillingness to take a substantial cut in salary, which the shift from the "outside" world to the academic world often entails. Both Prof. Allen and Crea recounted an instance in which the faculty did offer a position to a black man, but the offer was refused, even though in terms of money and title, the offer was better than the one customarily tendered to potential faculty members. Prof. Schenk, in discussing the absence of any minority members on the faculty, repeated the accepted view that the school should not lower its standards to place a minority member on the faculty and stated that she had not come across a qualified minority applicant in her work on the Appointments Committee subcommittee. This lack of qualified minority candidates appears to be reflected

*"The School should not lower its standards to place a minority member . . ."*

a long and painstaking search conducted by the faculty, the retention of an adjunct professor is solely within the power of the Dean. As stated by Professor Allen, "adjuncts are hired solely and totally by the Dean". A bit of an incongruity appears to be present here, in that the collective voice and wisdom of the faculty essential to the choosing of a full-time professor is totally forsaken when an adjunct is selected. Professor Schultze sees in this system of Dean-selection of adjuncts the "potential for danger". He feels that this power inherent in the Dean's office should be "looked at", with more faculty involvement in the selection of adjuncts a desired consequence. With students having no voice in whether they are instructed in a particular course by an adjunct professor or a full-time professor, the inclusion of the thinking of the faculty in the selection of adjuncts appears quite worthwhile.

The final aspect of the hiring of faculty at BLS which merits consideration is that there is currently no minority representation on the faculty. As in the case of the minority admissions policy, the stated view of some faculty is that the school recognizes its lack of an adequate number of minority faculty members, but will not lower its standards in the selection of faculty to remedy the minority deficiency. The argument is that there is an unwillingness to hire a minority faculty member just for the sake of having minority representation on the faculty. There is no relaxation of the standards imposed on all applicants for a teaching position for any reason. Although recognizing that the lack of any minority representation on the faculty is a deficiency, Prof. Schultze contends that this situation can not really be viewed as the fault of the faculty. He emphasized the importance of not allowing any exceptions to the standards of acceptability established by the faculty and suggested that the school might try harder to attract and recruit qualified minority candidates in the future. Also discussed by some members of the faculty was the possibility that a minority person might not want to come to BLS to teach, for much the same reasons any person might

in the fact that only three minority candidates were interviewed for a teaching position for the upcoming academic year. What remains slightly puzzling is that with a stated policy of seeking qualified minority candidates, the school has not been able to find at least one qualified minority candidate willing to teach at BLS.

The process undergone in the hiring of new faculty members at BLS seems to be one aimed at ensuring the selection of highly qualified people. This goal would appear to be imperative, in that faculty selection must be viewed as essential to the continued development of BLS.

## Briefs

**The students trounced the faculty 13-12 in a softball game on Sunday, May 2 . . . Figures indicate that the Book Coop saved students approximately \$11,000 during the 1975-1976 academic year.**

## Little Progress

(Continued from Page 1)

sources of funding with the idea of funding an in-house legal clinic at BLS. The Clinics' Committee at the same time has the best source of information on student-run legal clinics at BLS: Gary Schultze.

Prof. Schultze in 1970 was the director of "the first and only student-operated legal services clinic in the city". The clinic had been organized as the result of the "combined efforts of Brooklyn Law School and the Fort Greene Neighborhood Legal Services" (Justinian, 10/26/70). The Clinics' Committee could better spend its time researching how the Fort Greene legal clinic was funded, rather than how other schools are funding clinics, if an in-house

To the Editor:

Senate Bill #1 is the proposed Senate Criminal Justice Codification, Revision, and Reform Act of 1975. The handiwork of the Nixon administration, S-1 also represents a far-reaching proposal for repressing civil liberties, individual freedoms, and Constitutional rights.

S-1 is far from a dead issue, although continuing pressure from the vast range of groups opposing the bill has so far hindered efforts by the present Administration and by Senate advocates to get the bill reported out of committee. While it now appears unlikely that the full Senate will consider S-1 before the summer recess, efforts continue to push for a vote on S-1 either before or after the November elections or following the opening of the new Congressional session next January. Meanwhile, the Justice Department has allocated over one million dollars to support passage of S-1 and is sending out speakers to counter opposition groups.

S-1 must be defeated, not merely amended. The bill, the longest in Senate history, is so laden with oppressive measures that one group of constitutional experts has suggested that at least 1,000 amendments of substance and 1,600 conforming amendments would be required to correct its defects. Since the bill's provisions dovetail one another, deleting one effectively would require modifying several others. More important, many offensive sections not generally considered controversial would remain undisturbed, such as a little-noticed section creating the new Federal crime of using the mails to send material advocating the breaking of any law. Were such a provision in effect

a few years ago, a mailing urging draft resistance would have been a criminal act.

The recent gestures toward amending S-1, revealed in a memo by co-sponsors Senators Mansfield and Scott, consist only of 1) changing the number of the bill to make it less identifiable ("The number S-1 now serves as a battle cry . . . To change the number would help to diminish the focus on that number which has become a source of . . . controversy.") and 2) separating out 16 of the bill's most controversial sections and resubmitting them as separate (again less publicized) bills.

Former Senator Sam Ervin, Jr., who initially favored revising the Federal Criminal Code, has described S-1 as "a hideous proposal which merits the condemnation of everyone who believes in due process of law and a free society. [It] would establish what is essentially a police state."

The bill strikes out at all manner of First Amendment rights. Journalists who receive classified information would be required to turn it over to the government and expose their source. The source in turn could be convicted of treason (a new capital crime) despite the fact that the document was wrongly classified. Labor union officials would face seven years in prison if, during the course of a labor dispute, merely the fear of violence were created in the mind of management (including the "fear" of economic loss). S-1 also effectively revives the Smith Act and goes so far as outlawing "active membership in an organization or group that has as a purpose the incitement" of conduct which "at some future time would facilitate

the overthrow of the government." S-1 also re-enacts the "Incitement to riot" statute but eliminates the element of intent and requires only threat of insignificant "injury or damage to persons or property."

There exists a broad and growing base of opposition to S-1. Groups which have joined the fight against the bill include: the Board of Governors of the Society of American Law Teachers, the United Electrical Workers, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the American Newspaper Guild, the Committee for Social Justice of the United Church of Christ, the Brooklyn Bar Association and the Congress of African Peoples.

In New York City, at least three boroughs (Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Staten Island) have active coalitions opposing S-1. The Brooklyn Law School S.B.A. has passed a resolution calling for the defeat of the bill. In conjunction with activities in other law schools, the B.L.S. Lawyers' Guild conducted a recent petition drive calling for the bill's defeat.

It is impossible to obtain a copy of S-1 from Washington. The government has refused all recent requests, saying the Government Printing Office has run out of copies. We urge everyone to write his or her Senator, demanding a copy, protesting the cloak of secrecy covering the bill, and voicing strong opposition to its passage. Further information on city activities against S-1 can be obtained from the B.L.S. "Stop S-1!" Committee. Keep in mind the advice of a recent bumper sticker: "Stop S-1 before it stops you!"

**The B.L.S. "Stop S-1" Committee.**

legal clinic is to be started before 1980.

The S/F Clinics' Committee's function at BLS was usurped by an ad-hoc student group in February 1976. The students demanded the following before the monthly faculty meeting took place: 1. The hiring of four additional full-time clinical faculty for September 1976; 2. The "expansion [of the present clinical program] to guarantee that those students wishing to take the maximum number of clinical credits permitted by the Court of Appeals be able to do so"; 3. The immediate search for the necessary funds for the expanded clinical program.

The ad-hoc committee was organized under the auspices of the National Lawyers Guild. The NLG claimed strong student support for the above proposals, based on the number of students who signed its petition.

On Thursday, May 22, the S/F Clinics Committee scheduled an open meeting to orient BLS students to the clinical programs currently offered. These include clerkships with the U.S. Attorney's Office and the Federal Courts in the Metropolitan Area, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Police Dept. and the District Attorney's Office, the Surrogate's Court, and the catch-all Civil Clinic program. The success of any of these clinic programs depends not only on student support, which has been amply demonstrated in the past, but also on the administration's support and funding.

The students on the recognized

S/F Clinics' Committee had agreed in a special meeting chaired by Linda Sueskind on January 28, 1976, that "120 more students could be placed in the BLS Clinics' program if additional faculty were hired." The current situation requires six to seven faculty members to carry a regular teaching load of eight credits, while supervising 20-30 students each in clinic programs. The students are the losers. The faculty receives no recognition, nor do they have sufficient time to do more than orient each student to the clinic.

### S/F Relations Committee

Another good example of the lack of student voice in BLS decision-making is the still-active proposal for anonymous grading, with the option of the professor adding or subtracting a limit of five points, based on a student's performance in class. Although the S/F Relations Committee did get the anonymous grading issue to the students for a vote, many other issues are still waiting for a hearing. At least ten other issues were raised at a January 29, 1976, meeting of the students on the S/F Relations Committee, chaired by Phyllis Silver: 1. Development of standards for BLS scholarship awards (a student this year has the right for the first time to appeal a scholarship refusal); 2. Increase of student input into faculty-hiring decisions (select students have been able to interview prospective faculty this year); 3. Student input into BLS admission standards; 4. An illustrated student handbook; 5. A

day-care center; 6. A videotape system for educational and library retrieval purposes; 7. Student review of final exams (a perennial, along with anonymous grading); 8. Student review and appeal of the decisions of the Faculty Committee on Scholastic Activities; 9. A four-year day program and an accelerated day program for special students; 10. Elimination of the \$10 fee for the late change of a student's course program if there is a reasonable excuse.

### S/F Curriculum Committee

Only the S/F Curriculum Committee has to some degree narrowed its issues and focused on priorities in an attempt to be more than a discussion group. The curriculum Committee worked with the faculty to produce a four-year joint-degree program with Hunter College whereby a student earns both a J.D. and a Master's in Urban Planning. The Curriculum Committee also wrote a comprehensive report comparing BLS' curriculum with that of most other East Coast law schools. This report is a solid foundation upon which to reform BLS' curriculum.

### Overview

Over the past five years, the SBA has shifted much of its responsibility as the student voice to the S/F Committees. Not much has changed, though; the same issues are being debated. The main question is whether the three S/F Committees will be more successful in taking the issues, establishing priorities and getting results over the next five years.





# ROTOGRAVURE

Layout by Marcia Knigin, Photos by Howard Peltz, Ed Steen, David Sprafkin and Marcia Knigin

