On Friday, October 20, the Executive Faculty Committee of the Law Center voted overwhelmingly to adopt a draft of proposed alterations in the present legal research program. Initiated and enthusiastically endorsed by the fledgling Student-Faculty Committee, the changes are due to become effective this year. The only major stumbling block to the resolution vanished when the Law Center approved a $6000 budget to implement the changes. Immediate assimilation of the changes into the present legal research program rests only upon the selection of necessary personnel.

As adopted on Friday the new program will select fifteen law students for membership in a Legal Research Instructors Society. Membership in the Society will be on a highly qualified basis with applications for membership, however, solicited from the entire student body. The Student-Faculty Committee points to recent polls conducted at the Center which indicate that a large segment of the student body would favor involvement in such a program. It is expected that the small size and restrictive qualifications will produce a society comparable in stature to the law journal. As an added incentive, the operating funds for the society include monetary compensation for the members. Exact figures on compensation, however, have not yet been determined.

The purpose of the society will be to assist both the 1st year students and their legal research instructors. One society member will be assigned to each legal research section as supplemental instructors. These student-instructors will be available both during legal research class hours, and for private instruction on the initiative of the confused 1st year student.

The original legal research program ideally was designed to provide each 1st year student with extensive practice in practical research and writing exercises. Coupled with this was the goal of individual attention and supervision by the research instructors. The pressures of time have resulted in a less-than-optimum success with these goals. Professors and legal research instructors often are too pressed for time to fully realize the individual instruction desired. It is hoped that the utilization of 2d and 3d year students as supplemental instructors will relieve the burdens of the present system and reach the desired goal of personal attention. In addition to the values of these changes to the legal research program, the direct involvement of 2d and 3d year students in the educative process will have a positive influence on their development of legal skills. Further, the legal skills of the instructors themselves will be enhanced by the interplay between instructor and assistant.

Motivating these changes is a desire in the student-faculty committee to involve the student body at a higher level, in the curricula of the Law Center. From this involvement it is expected that concrete proposals for change and extension in the curricula will follow. Running contrary to this desire, however, is the feeling of several committee members that movement too far, too fast in this direction will ultimately result in a serious impairment of the academic freedom of the faculty. Consequently, most committee members view this legal research change not so much as a permanent institution, but rather as an experiment which may lead to a further re-evaluation of the educational process at the center.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERS COURSE CHANGES

A course in Legal History, one on the Legal Problems of the City and State, a greater emphasis on independent research, and a full-time sociologist, these are some of the ideas which the student committee studying the curriculum at the Law School has been considering. The committee appointed by Frank Dubofsky and headed up by Don Burris and Bob Fabricant will make a report to the SBA recommending changes in and additions to the courses offered at Georgetown.

Jurisprudence is the first area that the committee has looked into. Burris noted that many of the better law schools offer first year students a comprehensive course in Legal History intended to give a purview of all aspects of the law. In order to accomplish this, it has been suggested that such a course could be taught by three or four professors each representing a different area of the law.

A second area of recommendation calls for a greater emphasis on the use of papers rather than examinations. The committee remarked that many schools offer their students much wider options for independent research and study, whether it be through an expanded seminar program, independent study under the guidance of a professor or the substitution of papers for exams.

A third area for change reflects the increasingly important role that sociology plays in the field of law, whether in urban development, criminology or in poverty programs. Georgetown's response to this change in the direction of the law has not been as marked as many other schools. Though two or three courses are offered in this area, all are seminars so that very significant new direction in the Law School has been considered.

CURRICULUM—continued on Page 6
id est …

Most sincere congratulations are due to all the members of the new Student-Faculty Committee, for its riding shot-gun on the proposed legal research changes. It is encouraging to see concerned faculty and student members finally taking the initiative in areas of concern which have all too long hindered the academic growth of this school. Yet the praise for a job well-done is heady wine to those unused to it. The fact still remains that the Student-Faculty Committee does not seem willing to assume the role of leadership of which it is capable. The legal research proposal, for example, was faced with no strong opposition. And yet the proposal was six-weeks in passing the committee. One can only wonder what will happen when a truly controversial issue is placed before the committee.

The problem does not seem to lie with the student committee members but rather with the faculty. There has emerged no firm, positive voice among the faculty members. The faculty seemingly exists solely as a check upon the initiative and enthusiasm of the student committee members. And while checks are certainly necessary they should not exist solely for their own sake nor to assuage the personal fears of the faculty, especially when they hinder needed reform. If this is indeed, as it is reputed to be, a faculty-run school, then the time has long since arrived for the faculty to shoulder their share of the initiative. Progress is achieved only by individuals willing to assume the risks consonant with involvement, willing to consider more than personal security, willing to have a finger pointed to them as innovators. It is certainly true that the faculty has more at stake by condoning reform and change than do students. After all this is their livelihood—they need a job here after the students have left. Yet it is for this very reason that the faculty must assume a dominant initiating role. The faculty alone has the continuity to develop and expedite long-range reforms.

There is vacuum at Georgetown Law Center. Consequently the Center has failed to go forward as it should. It is the faculty’s right and duty to fill this vacuum with a forceful drive and determined sense of purpose. The faculty members of the student-faculty committee are in the best position to voice this vital drive and determination. Hopefully they will assume their responsibility before they have deadened all spirit of innovations with their flaccid immobility.

JABERWOCKY

Dear Sir:

I took strong opposition to the articles in your October 13th issue concerning the grading system at the Law Center. In reply, I would like to address myself first to the “news” article, second to the letter from Miss Gordon, and finally to some suggested improvements.

Your article, “G.U.L.C. Grade System Will Be Investigated” was not a factual report in any sense. It was a dissertation against the system more befitting the editorial page. I hope the Weekly will quickly reverse this trend towards editorializing the news, and pursue a factual and informative format.

Several statements in your article shocked me. The “do or die” examination has been a traditional mark of a quality law school which seeks to test the ability of a student to neatly recognize issues, to grapple with their implications, and present a clear and precise analysis of the issues. It tests a process in the mind of a lawyer, an approach cultivated only after months of reading and briefing cases. It’s a demanding examination, but reflective of the “on your feet” ability expected of competent professionals. And to hear talk of “pop-quizzes”! What rubbish! Would the quizzes ask, “Who wrote the majority opinion in Ash-wander?”, or “What was the name of the railroad company in the Palsgraf case?” God forbid that Georgetown Law Center should revert to high school pampering “to encourage the students to keep

LETTERS—continued on Page 4
Many students, especially those enrolled in the Evening Division, were taken aback recently upon learning that the Law Center did not rank day and evening students together. This current realization has induced a group of students to petition Dean McCarthy for a re-examination of this policy. Dean McCarthy, in turn, referred the matter to the Student-Faculty Committee where it remains pending resolution.

In the interim a petition was circulated in the Evening Division to gain support for propositions: (1) day and evening students should be ranked together at two points in their respective careers: upon graduation and after the third year of the evening students and the second year of the day students; (2) for a cumulative as well as a yearly ranking at the end of each academic year.

The more controversial of the two issues is of course the ranking of day and evening students together. Spokesmen for the group seeking the affirmative support of the Student-Faculty Committee advanced the following support for their position.

(1) The present policy is discriminatory in its treatment to evening students. Any policy treating those under equal obligations and responsibilities unequally manifests that the group discriminated against is inferior in some fashion. Evening and day students are faced with comparable courses, professors and tuition fees. They compete in the same market place for employment. Certainly all should be categorized in the same basis.

(2) In many potential employment areas evening students are considered to be inferior, especially by larger law firms. Georgetown has always pronounced that their evening school was of the same quality as the day school. Yet, this policy seems to reinforce the belief that some law evening students are not equal in their ability or achievements to day students. The present difference emphasizes the "stigma" placed on an evening school graduate.

(3) Arguments have been advanced that a student should be ranked with his peer group. Day students are divided into sections, have different professors and courses, yet all are ranked together. Why not consider the Evening School to be simply another section for the purposes of ranking?

(4) The Washington office of the ABA, when queried about the problem stated: "The ABA considers night students every bit as important as the full time day students in those law schools offering a program of evening studies." It is contended that the Law Center should have the same attitude with respect to ranking.

The Student-Faculty Committee is expected to take up the question in the near future.
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CLERKSHIP IS RESUMED

This month the SBA intends to re-establish the General Sessions Temporary Clerkship Program, whereby a temporary clerk spends one week assigned to a particular judge at the Court of General Sessions. Although the clerk's main role is that of an observer, the actual latitude of his duties will depend upon the discretion of the judge.

An appeal for support was recently affirmed by several judges at the municipal court, Judges Halleck and Green, among others, indicating their approval of such a program. The response by members of the bench indicates their belief, and sustains the views of previous temporary clerks, that the program is extremely beneficial to the law student.

Practical experience should be an essential part of every law school curriculum. Serving as a temporary clerk is one means of filling this need. The student will not only see what pleadings are and what forms they take, but more important, how they pass through the judicial framework.

On a different level the temporary clerk has the opportunity to weigh more fundamental considerations: how cases really are decided, if precedent can provide continuity without stifling thought, and whether defendants and accused receive a fair trial regardless of the price of their attorneys or the particular judge that hears the case, or if the burden on General Sessions is too heavy to adequately deal with each case. Presently numerous criticisms, many justified, are being leveled at the Court. Nevertheless, the General Sessions Court was recently recognized as one of the finest of its kind in the country. The active participant will have his own thoughts on this.

This program is open to all interested students; applications may be obtained in the Registrar's Office. Anyone desiring further information should contact Charles Murry, Jack Tierny or John Carlin.
As for Miss Gordon's letter protesting the "arbitrary or unjust grading practices", it seems as if she has felt the sting of a low grade. If so, I can sympathize with her from experience. I don't feel, however, that the professors should be made to operate under the threat of administrative reversal. Judicial review is hardly an applicable concept in grading on the law school level. I'm reminded of Harry Truman's famous comment—"If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen."

Finally, I do believe there can be some measures to standardize the testing process. I suggest that all the students taking a given course in a semester be given the same exam regardless of the fact that they had different professors. The professors could consult in advance and agree on a uniform examination for that semester's course. But, let me emphasize, the grading of the examinations from any one section would be done only by the professor who taught that section. He would evaluate the examination results according to his own standards in order to reflect what he emphasized in his class. The advantages in this procedure would be to guarantee that all the students were faced with the same examination, while retaining the essential element of professorial discretion.

In closing, let's keep the Law Center a professional institution with professional standards.

Sincerely,

Francis J. Gorman

Dear Mr. Editor:

As the author of the article "G.U.L.C. Grade System Will Be Investigated," in last week's Law Weekly, I feel it incumbent upon me to reply to the biting criticism leveled at the weekly by the writer above. A number of things in his letter are disturbing. Although the writer is somewhat upset, perhaps justifiably, by the so-called "editorial tone" of the article, he seems far more upset about the substance of the implied attack on the grading system itself. In this vein I must take issue.

First, the fact that Professor Bradley's important Academic Standards Committee has initiated an exhaustive investigation of the grading system indicates, I think quite clearly, that responsible and concerned members of our Faculty have some doubts—perhaps serious ones—about the judiciousness of our present system. This is not to imply that they, or I, suggest scrapping the system. It indicates instead that there are those who feel the examinations as now given and assessed may not in fact be "... a traditional mark of quality ..." No one is foolish enough to suggest that we obliterate the present system until we have something with which it can be replaced and improved. Yet I think it is equally foolish to decide that just because we have always had this system, and other law schools have always had this system, there is something mystically valuable about it.

There are some things about the present grading structure which are unjust, in my opinion. It is based on the assumption that the only valuable measure of a law student's accomplishment and potential is a once a year, or once a semester, three or four hour examination. It gives no reflection of the necessary talent of expressing yourself on your feet; it gives little indication of the ability of a law student to do intensive and accurate research on a complex issue of law or fact; it gives the student no opportunity to explain the inevitably incomplete reasoning which often takes place in that tense and critical environment—the examination room. Admittedly, tension and pressure are qualities of professional life with which the lawyer must cope, but they are not the only ones; they do not reflect the talents of the "whole lawyer". We have our moot court programs, and our research projects, but they are not for real. They are games we play in token deference to crucial legal talents. They count for next to nothing on our records, and they are completely voluntary.

Such also is the fate of those who would give their time to legal aid or similarly worthy undertakings. They add nothing to the almighty judgment of class standing. They may add to personal self-respect, or a feeling of accomplishment but is it not the duty of this school to measure the complete student? And is this presently done with the grading system now in force?

I think the major fallacy of the letter above is its underlying conception of what the professional man—the professional lawyer—really is. He is, it seems, a man who should get out of the kitchen if he can't stand the heat. I wonder is that really the best measure for a man who hopes to build his life on a body of principles and rules which attempt to develop the most humane and moral environment possible for the human community? The "heat" which all of us will face is the heat of complex claims of individuals and groups vying for recognition in the forums of judicial and administrative decision-making. Success in this area demands much more of our minds and spirits than the ability to recite the law on paper once or twice a year.

I challenge the present system of measuring students at Georgetown. I question its completeness, its accuracy, its effectiveness in stimulating students truly to understand the law. I do not suggest that it be immediately scrapped, or even eventually completely removed. I do feel, however, that it should be intensively and harshly assessed for the benefit of those who will follow us, and for the benefit of the quality of our school. I think the beginning which has been made in this area is laudable and forthright. I think it can have good results if we are all honest about the evidence which is uncovered. There should be no "interest groups" on this issue, only an attempt to reach open decisions, retaining that which is useful and proven to be valuable, rejecting that which is seen to be harmful or illogical, and implementing that which could prove helpful to educating more mature and talented lawyers.

Frederick L. Miller, Jr.
BRADLEY NOTES '20% DROP-OUT

Professor Edwin J. Bradley, a distinguished member of the Law Center Faculty, discussed problems of legal education with members and guests of the Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity on Wednesday, October 11th. A luncheon at the Dodge House Hotel provided the setting for the professor's comments which placed Georgetown's difficulties in the field of legal education into perspective with those of the rest of the legal community. Prof. Bradley's discourse settled upon the three main areas of grades, student motivation, and the progressiveness of the Law Center.

The first area considered was that of the grading system currently in effect. It was observed that in the past there have been vast differentials in the average grades of the sections as well as from individual professors. Then Professor Bradley noted, to his amazement and consternation, that for the past two years the fail out—drop out rate has approached the reprehensible combined rate of nearly twenty percent in the first year. Such is the case despite the fact that teachers grade upon the same criteria as in the past and are grading students, relatively homogeneous in nature, who are of a significantly higher quality than those of years past.

The second area investigated was that of student motivation. In Professor Bradley's view, the students at Georgetown law Center lack the keen awareness of purpose and objective possessed by those students entering the few law schools of higher quality than Georgetown. As a result, those students are capable of more assiduous application to legal study and at the same time produce atmosphere of intense competition not found here. But Prof. Bradley did not place the entire fault for lack of motivation at the feet of the students as he indicated that not all the professors were providing intellectual stimulation to the students.

The third area was that of the progressiveness of the Law Center. There is a strong indication that GULC is more than non-reactionary. Apparently some form of grading system will, by necessity be continued, since graduate law schools and law firms virtually require them, but Prof. Bradley feels that a plausible modification of some kind could be effected. He also indicated that a shift from the traditional case method in the second and third years and an emphasis on the problem method could be brought about. These, among other areas under consideration for reform, indicate that this law school desires self improvement; the fact that significant changes have been made in the past and that more are currently considered, demonstrate that it is not a musty institution. Professor Bradley intimated that the presence of such desire and receptivity to new teaching concepts may place Georgetown in a position where it too could afford to accumulate a little dust.

NEW—FIND SCHOLARSHIPS BY COMPUTER

Last year $30 million in college scholarships went unclaimed — because no qualified persons applied . . . because no qualified persons knew of them. Now ECS engineers and educators have programmed a high-speed computer with 700,000 items of scholastic aid, worth over $500 million, to permit students to easily and quickly locate scholarships for which they qualify. The student fills out a detailed, confidential questionnaire and returns it to ECS, with a one-time computer-processing fee of $15. In seconds the computer compares his qualifications against requirements of grants set up by foundations, business, civic, fraternal, religious, and government organizations, and prints a personalized report to the student telling him where and when to apply for grants for which he qualifies. Thousands of these do not depend on scholastic standing or financial need.

FREE INFORMATION AND SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Send Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (print)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Placement Director Says Students Procrastinate

STUART SHAPIRO

Ensnconed in the cramped Sixth Street offices of one of the Law Center's late Victorian former dormitories, the Placement Service is a dynamic administrative office dedicated solely to the student body. Under the direction of Mrs. Anna M. Tucci and her assistant Mrs. Karen Duffy, the Service offers a multiplicity of services to both undergraduates and alumni.

The basic aim of the Service is to place each graduating student in the position for which he is best suited, be it with a large firm, the government, or in a small general practice. This aim is implemented through an ever increasing number of interviews with firms at the Law Center for senior and second year students, continuous listings of part time and summer job opportunities, and invaluable pointers on how the prospective employee can best present his merits. Although a less dedicated administrator might be hampered by space and staff shortages, Mrs. Tucci has carried on an ever expanding program for all interested students.

In the face of increasingly selective standards demanded by the law firms, she has successfully emphasized the high quality of all Law Center graduates. In addition to canvassing all fifty states for prospective employers, she has created a Senior Class biography pamphlet which goes out to a large number of prospective employers and has already netted several students offers solely on the basis of their abbreviated resumés.

Although the major effort is directed toward the Senior Class, Mrs. Tucci has spent a good deal of time and effort in appraising underclassmen of their opportunities for part time and summer employment. Her pamphlet a "Student Guide to Placement" is an indispensable aid to any student who wishes to make his future plans with any hope of fulfilling them.

When this reporter asked Mrs. Tucci what her greatest problem was, she replied that although the (Continued on Page 6)
Spokesmen for the Law Journal have stated that the first issue of this year’s Journal will make an impressively early appearance and will include a note on criminal law in the D.C. Circuit and an article on preliminary hearings, which should be of particular interest to first year students in the expanded criminal justice course. Of interest to second and third year students taking Administrative Law will be a note on the “Freedom of Information Act” (Public Law 89-487; 80 Stat. 250; July 1966) which amends Section 31 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 USCA 1002). This enactment gives the man in the street access to the public records of agency activities (e.g. agency opinions, orders, and proceedings) while avoiding the undesirable result of unduly exposing the internal operations of the agencies. The note analyzes how successful is this congressional attempt to strike a new balance between greater public information and the need for administrative privacy.

In the near future (late November or December) the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit will hear an appeal from a marijuana conviction which appeal presents (apparently inescapably) the issue of the validity of the inclusion of marijuana in the legislative category of narcotic drugs. The reader is doubtless further aware that there has been solicitation by hallway posters for research assistance in preparing an amicus brief in behalf of the appellant. This has not been met with sufficient response and the three proponents of this brief, who are indirectly connected with the Georgetown Criminal Law Institute, state that they need readers and summarizers of material ranging across law, medicine, psychiatry and sociology, relevant to whether marijuana is addictive, and whether its use leads to the use of narcotics, criminal behavior or psychological problems. A bibliography has been prepared by the authors of the brief to whom five or ten hours of reading and digesting would be of great service. The need is immediate, however, since the brief must be submitted to the court by November 15. If interested, contact Steve Rosenberg at the Criminal Law Institute, 419 6th Street.

One other item worth recalling attention to is the NBC Program entitled “Justice for All”, Friday night, October 27 at 10 PM, during which Professor Murphy and his seminar in Poverty and the Administration of Civil Justice appears.

CLASSIFIED ADS

A regular feature of this paper will be the running of classified ads. The cost of an ad will be computed at 2¢ per letter. Those desiring to put an ad in this paper should place the ad and the necessary amount of money in an envelope addressed to the Weekly. This should be left in the mail box in the Registrar’s Office at least six days before the publication of the Weekly.

CURRICULUM—continued

few students have the opportunity to take advantage of them. The recommendations in this area would be first to increase the number of courses offered and second to offer some of them as regular courses, not as seminars.

The final area under consideration calls for a greater reflection at the Law Center of the nature of the city in which it is located. Citing as examples Legislative Law, Administrative Law and Urban Redevelopment, Burris noted that it should be possible to incorporate into courses in these areas the first hand experience of those who are actively involved and who have taken leading roles in the developments in these fields.

The committee will have its report completed within a very short time, in the hope that some of its recommendations might be brought into effect by the time the second semester begins. Burris also expressed his views that the committee is open to any suggestions which students might have. Toward this end, the committee has prepared a questionnaire that will be circulated shortly.

PLACEMENT—continued

Service handles a tremendous volume of students each year, the students tend to procrastinate, to be unwilling to take the initiative, until it is too late to fully avail themselves of the services available.

The fall interviewing season is in full swing. The Placement Service Bulletin Board is jammed with part and full time job offers. The office is there. The staff is overworked but ever willing.