

UCLA
The Docket

Title

The Docket Vol. 16 No. 1

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/74c5c8ss>

Journal

The Docket, 16(1)

Author

UCLA Law School

Publication Date

1971-10-01

Cal Advocate Future At Stake In University-wide Referendum

By Ron Ablesser

A public interest law firm, CAL Advocates, supported entirely by student fee money - will probably be in operation on campus during the upcoming academic year. A University wide referendum, similar to the one passed by over 70% of the students up at Berkeley, will be held towards the end of October at which time the students will vote on whether they wish to tax themselves a voluntary fee increase of \$1.50 per quarter in order to support such an organization.

CAL Advocates has been given overwhelming support from the Student Legislative Council, the Graduate Student Association and the Student Bar Association. Conceived by law students at UCLA, CAL Advocates, Westwood would concern itself with bringing together the entire University community in a concerted effort to research and investigate some of the persistent problems of our society and if necessary bring class action law suits to ameliorate such problems. The three main problem areas which CAL Advocates will concern itself with will be the areas of environmental preservation, consumer protection, and civil rights.

Like most thoughtful citizens, these students are concerned about persistent and divisive problems in these areas and the necessity for meliorative but peaceful social change. CAL Advocates holds that such change, benefiting all California citizens and taxpayers can and must be achieved through our legal system. There the issues can submit to rational confrontation, dispassionate review and equitable resolution.

To indicate the character of issues which often arise in the context of public interest law, the following examples of problems already litigated are offered as illustrations.

In the consumer protection area: clothing materials which, when exposed to flame, melt into a scalding napalm-like substance which clings to exposed skin areas; children's flammable nightgowns and pajamas; hazardous toys; marketing of insufficiently tested prescription drugs; unsafe home appliances; and deceptive advertising.

In the environmental protection area: enlarging public access rights to beach and shore areas; enforcement of applicable pollution control regula-

Continued on Page 3

WELCOME TO . . . LEGAL EDUCATION SCARCE RESOURCE

To the Class of 1974:

One of the pleasantest responsibilities of the Dean of the Law School is to welcome the entering class. I am particularly pleased to welcome the 340 members of the Class of 1974; it is as highly qualified as any of the 23 entering classes we have enrolled since the School opened its doors.

It is a credit, I think, to legal education in the United States and to today's college graduates that so many today have decided to choose careers in the law. The magnitude of this commitment is shown by some simple statistics. Two years ago the number of those who took the LSAT--now required by practically every law school for admission--was 60,000. Last year it was 74,000. This year it approaches 110,000. So far as I know, none of the 140 law schools in the United States has unfilled positions in its entering class this year.

What do these numbers signify? One significance is that legal education has truly become a "scarce resource." They mean, as well, that today's law student is as highly qualified--in terms of traditional admissions criteria--as any in the history of legal education in the United States.

On a different level, I believe that the numbers signify a general view that the problems of our social and political order can be addressed and ameliorated, if not totally resolved, through legal institutions, and that lawyers can be principal agents for bringing about needed change.

The education and preparation

of future members of the Bar for these purposes is a principal objective of the UCLA Law School. We attempt to implement this objective through as rich, challenging and diverse an academic program as we can devise within our resources. As our Official Announcement states, our offerings are concerned not only with the "rules and forms of law," but also with the "social context in which legal institutions are made and shaped, and of the uses of law as the instrument of guided change." And the many extracurricular activities in the Law School fill whatever hiatuses may exist in the formal curriculum.

For good or ill--for most of you the three years of law school will be your last contact with extended formal education. They will provide the foundation upon which you will subsequently build your careers at the Bar. The Law School will attempt to provide you with the fullest opportunity to develop yourselves for those careers. No matter what your particular career choices as men and women of the law, in a very short period of time you will assume responsibility for the affairs and lives of other human beings, and in increasing measure, for the control, development and change of the institutions of society. Your first professional responsibility is to build the best foundation. You can do that by exploiting as fully as you can what is offered you at the UCLA Law School.

Welcome.

Murray L. Schwartz
Dean

WHY GRADES? . . .

GRADE SYSTEM UNDER ATTACK

By Dave Ferguson

"The faculty is trying to bullshit the students. They speak of principles, psychological incentive, and motivation, but as far as I'm concerned the action is punitive, it is ridiculous."

Leonard Torres
Vice-chairman, CLSA

By secret ballot, the faculty voted last April 26 to change the grading system in this law school. Effective this quarter, it is now possible for 70% of the students in one class to receive an I grade. Previously, the limit was 10%. Although the probability of any professor assigning such a large number of failing grades is remote, the possibility of any increase has concerned, even angered, many students.

Leonard Torres is far from alone in his views. Mike Fields, President of the Student Bar Association, feels that the faculty move was an attempt to do away with the special admissions program for minorities, in essence by letting them in the front door and pushing them out the back. He points to history saying, "Racism does not have to be overt to exist."

Although some professors, such as former Dean Dale Coffman frankly admit that they do not approve of special admissions, the faculty uniformly denies that the change reflects any racial attitudes or was intended as an attack on the minority program. In fact, many professors, such as Reginald Alleyne, point out that the move may actually have

been anti-white. It appears that certain faculty felt that their white students were loafing because the students felt that the 10% cushion was taken up by minority students.

When questioned about their personal motives for voting for the grading change, most professors defend the new system in terms of principle, grading curves, and decimal points. As stated in the original proposal submitted to the faculty by Professors Asimow and Rintala, "our reasons for this are essentially two: consideration of academic freedom and pragmatism."

Students, however, are upset by more than just the intent and effect of the new change. In a general student body meeting held a few days after the faculty vote last April, Mike Fields and Cornell Price, among

others, charged that the faculty had acted covertly and in complete disregard of any student opinion.

Dean Schwartz rebuts these charges by pointing out that there were students present at both the March 19 faculty meeting in which Professors Asimow and Rintala first submitted their proposal to eliminate the 10% limitation on I grades, and at the April 26 meeting at which the proposal was approved. He cites "student apathy" as the reason for a lack of communication.

This is not the first time the grading system in this law school has been attacked. An examination of the history of the past controversies, and of the personalities involved, reveals much about the present issues. Those topics will be discussed in Part B of this article.

. . . CLASS OF '74

HONORED TRADITION REALLY A BROTHEL

By Mike Fields,
President, Student Bar Assn.
Member,
National Lawyers Guild

The world you have just walked into -- beneath the oak-paneled doorways and the leather-bound casebooks -- beneath the outer garments of dignity and stability -- is a world in turmoil. Notice how the "liberal" deans seem more frightened of their own students than of the money-crazed regents or the demagogic politicians. Listen as the "liberal" faculty confide to one another that "it is those 'radical attorneys' who are out to destroy the legal profession." But there is really very little virtue left intact for an adventurous rogue to deflower. Having long ago compromised justice for a substantial share of corporate profit, the profession which you have just penetrated is a painted lady. The time-honored tradition from which we extend our welcome is nothing more than that of a brothel.

You probably feel as we did our first day at the UCLA School of Law -- nervous, uncertain, with occasional twinges of outright fear. You must be disoriented enough without somebody taking pains to extend the malaise. And although you probably feel insignificant in your new and strange surroundings you are, in fact, exceedingly important. The vultures are already hovering over your futures: The Regents have their eyes on you as do the deans; the Law Review might like you and so would Uncle Sam; the District Attorney might find a place for you and so might O'Melveny and Meyers. Some would have you become the pawn-brokers of other peoples lives. What we ask is that you feel out the situation, mull it over, and disorient yourself from these or anyone else's plans for you.

The attempt to figure out what to do, where to go, and most important, what to be, is a collective problem. The solutions which will arise will be arrived at with various amounts of difficulty by each of you. Either purposefully or unconsciously, you will change or be changed greatly in the next three years. You will be called upon to make choice of varying magnitude: To further or disavow lucrative careers, to support or reject the demands of racial minorities, to open a casebook or rear back and throw it as you watch your future clients tear-gassed, billy-clubbed and shot. You will make these choices either consciously or unconsciously, and the result of non-action is to culpably help perpetuate the existing state of affairs.

The American Dream of equality and justice has become a nightmare. Familiar guideposts, such as the legal profession, appear to be pointing towards a junkheap of planned obsolescence. The role of the lawyer will become increasingly more marginal in a society which seems to be riding hell-bent-for-leather down the very short road to fascism. The law school is becoming the sepulchre rather than the shrine of a once purposeful calling. In the next three years you may more than once find your lives in crisis -- not only because of what you personally will do, but because of what all of us within the broad confines of the "movement for social change" will be fighting against and fighting for. We offer our help, invite your support and ask you to remember the point made by a learned scholar when he noted that the Chinese concept of "crisis" is expressed by two other characters denoting the concept of "danger", but also of "opportunity."

Docket Resumes After Difficult Time With Little Support

With this issue, the Docket makes its first appearance in 1971. For all practical purposes, the Docket folded last December 9th with only its second issue of the last school year. Lack of SBA (Student Bar Assn.) to the paper and a decline in the number of advertisers due to the general economic condition were reported as the reasons for cessation of publication.

The staff of the Docket is entirely new, consisting of two editors-in-chief, one feature editor, a business manager, and one photographer at this time. Due to the appointment of the two co-editors by the SBA just before finals, there was little opportunity to recruit a more extensive staff for the first edition. However, at present, the Docket is attempting to bring more people into the publication of the paper.

The new co-editors are David Ferguson, 22, and Tony Ferguson, 24, both second-year students, but not related. David Ferguson has held various positions with the U.C.L.A. Bruin as an undergraduate and also has extensive business experience. Tony Ferguson holds a B.A. in Journalism with an em-

Continued on Page 3

Replacement copy 2
6-18-75

UCLA DOCKET

Editorial Board

Arnold Gross Managing Editor
Dave Ferguson Co-editors-in-chief
Tony Ferguson Co-editors-in-chief
Pat Hatcher Feature Editor

Grades—An Alternative

A big stink rose up in this law school near the end of last quarter. It involved an issue of importance to every student here, although not all are willing to admit it. Grades. The faculty voted to remove the ceiling on the percentage of incompletes (I's) that could be given in one class. Before this change, only 10% of the grades given could be I's.

Some students were fairly troubled by this move on the part of the faculty, and demanded to know why they hadn't been informed in advance. And then all sorts of stories, positions and opinions began to appear. Some Professors spoke about the subject in their classes, while others chose to duck an open debate, although in some instances debate appeared to be more of a loosely restrained confrontation. With the hard pressed time of finals and a long summer break ahead, most students left the issue in abeyance, but promised to resume the attack in the fall. And from all indications, this issue is far from being tucked away as this quarter begins.

The relevant questions on this issue are not related to stale events. Rather, the questions about the new rule, which goes into effect this quarter, revolve around whether or not it should be retained. And even further, whether the entire issue of grades and grading should be closely looked at for possible change and revision, even to a major extent.

Regardless of its possible disadvantages, a grading system's first function should be that of an educational tool. And this is the prime area where it appears that this system at UCLA and the systems at most law schools have failed.

In most of the present grading systems, there is no effective feedback, no distinctive manner of informing the student just what his strengths and weaknesses are. Finals taken during the last quarter are generally graded so late that the student has tended to forget just what all the key issues in the final were.

It seems that much of the blame can be placed both on a tradition of law school testing dating back to Harvard in the last half of the 19th century and on professors who show more interest in outside activities such as employment, clinical programs or writing than in benefiting the learning process of the student.

As to the current grading issue in this school, it is clear that if the ceiling is removed on I's, then all enforced curve requirements should be equally removed. It makes no logical sense for a Professor to have the right to give up to 70% I's and only 10% Highs or 20% high passes.

But beyond this, even greater change should be made. Dean Schwartz has admitted that it has been some time since this school has admitted students who could not succeed here provided personal problems do not interfere. And if education is the key purpose of testing process, a grade ranking does not serve any benefit, except to employers. With the broad ranking here, and with the lack of class standing, how does one differentiate between the student with the highest pass grade and the one with the lowest?

The position of this paper is simple. It agrees with the vote of the faculty senate. No ceiling should be placed on I's. If a student does not know the material, he should not receive a passing grade merely because 10% of the people below him knew less. In addition, this paper takes the position that all other grade distinctions should be removed. In essence, a straight pass-fail system should be instituted. Since class ranking is not given and since much in the area of student feedback needs to be instated as discussed above, the advantages of the pass-fail system appear to outweigh other systems. Either this school should return to the dark days of numerical ranking down to the third decimal point, or abandon the entire ranking system and get down to the business of learning the law.

**Problems Facing Law Graduates
New Focus of Research Course**

By Patrick Hatcher

The first year Research and Writing Course has been restructured and made a part of the Clinical Education Program according to Dave Binder, Program Director. In an effort to make the course more "realistic" Instructors Linda Duvall and Ron Micon have created a program that will simulate many of the problems faced by the recent law graduates.

In addition to the traditional Legal Bibliography introduction to the library's resources, the course includes two Law and Motion problems in which students will prepare and argue briefs based on real case plead-

ings. Ms. Duvall indicated that an attempt is presently being made to plan field trips to meet with Law and Motion Calendar Judges of the Superior Court.

The Moot Court Brief has been made mandatory again: last year some of the instructors had made it optional. The argument is still optional however, and it is hoped that once having completed the brief and in light of the experience provided by the Law and Motion problems, that most students will argue their briefs and benefit from the education experience. An attempt is being made to create twelve Moot Court problems based on actual cases

WHY GRADES? ...

Grade Change—Mixed Reaction

By Dave Ferguson
Traditionally, the concern of our professors is tradition. And traditionally we must have grades. Professors point to the fact that if we did not have grades we could not choose an Order of the Coif, law firms would not know which students to hire, and Law Review would be open to everyone. A few professors, such as Kenneth Karst or Ken Graham, do feel that ideally they would prefer a system with no grades, but for the moment, at least, the question seems settled.

The question as to the wisdom of this particular change, however, is far from settled. Students, and certain members of the faculty, express great discontent with both the reasons for the change and its possible effect. Much of the worry is centered about the possible effect on our Minorities Program.

Barbara Rintala, states that she had three main reasons for proposing the change: First, she feels it was logically inconsistent to combine both qualitative and relative judgments in the same grading system. Second, she feels it is a disservice to both the student and the law school to give passing grades to students who have in fact failed. She says, "It lowers standards generally and gives students a false impression as to the quality of their work. Lastly, although she regrets it is true, she feels some students must be encouraged to work by the threat of grades."

All professors, however, are not sure the motives involved were so pure. Ken Graham feels the move was a "political coup" by Professor Michael Asimow, whom he describes as an "arrogant intellectual elitist". It seems that the original 10% limitation, which Asimow ar-

dently opposed, was the result of a delicate compromise.

When Asimow submitted his latest proposal, however, many of the professors favoring the limitation were conveniently on sabbatical or otherwise unavailable.

Despite other disagreements, all faculty members contacted were adamant that the change was not intended to affect the minorities program. Students were not so convinced.

Marilyn Ainsworth, vice-chairman of the BLSA, is sure that antagonism to the minorities program was a factor of the vote. Referring to the fact that some professors place more importance on standards than on social justice she says the faculty is "trying to raise prestige by flunking folks out."

Frank Gomez, chairman of the CLSA; share similar views. While hesitant to claim

outright bigotry, he feels the school places too much emphasis on Bar results as an indication of the quality of the school.

Regardless of intent, much of the concern centers around the effect of the change on minority programs. Due to societal handicaps and less developed verbal skills many minority students have had difficulty with the law school curriculum which is said to be geared to the white middle-class.

As put by Marilyn Ainsworth, "Traditionally Blacks have been in the lower percentages. When I's have been given, the majority went to Blacks and Chicanos."

Frank Gomez, however, is proud to point out that the minorities programs has made tremendous progress, and what might have been true in the past may not still hold.

WHY GRADES? ...

What Do You Think?

If you are interested in the grading issue, please take the time to state your viewpoint in the following poll. Return your poll to the box either in the library entrance or at the Docket office, Room 2487D. Results of the poll will be published in the next issue of the Docket and given to the faculty senate and the SBA.

Circle One:

1. I feel that the ceiling on I's should remain in effect.
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
2. I feel that the ceiling on the

number of H's (highs) and HP's (high passes) should remain in effect.

- a. Yes
- b. No
3. I feel that the present grading system should be removed and the following substituted:
 - a. A numerical ranking, ie. 90, 80, 70, etc.
 - b. A straight pass-fail system for all classes.
 - c. No system of grading should be in effect
 - d. The present system should be retained
 - e. Other (fill in your solution)

WHY GRADES? ...

ONE PROF.'S VIEW

... PART IV

The Maximum I—A Shackle

Ed. Note: This is an edited letter from Prof. Coffman to Dean Bowman on grading.

1. The limitation of 10% of the class to the grade of I or I/NC means that an instructor is required to give a grade of P, which means "Pass-satisfactory performance" to students who have not passed the course with satisfactory performance. Examinations in a professional school should be graded according to objective, fair professional standards. That is the way they will be graded in the Bar examination. That is the way they will be measured as professional men, assuming they pass the Bar examination. To require an instructor to certify that a student has passed the course satisfactorily, when he has not, is a gross interference with that instructor's

professional integrity and his academic freedom.

2. There is also a side effect to such a rule which possibly was not contemplated when it was adopted. My class in Torts met at 9:00 a.m. four days a week through the fall and winter quarters. Regularly, 1/3 to 1/2 of the class was absent. This is my only experience with this phenomenon in my law teaching experience which began 40 years ago. One of the better students was in my office a short time ago and I asked him if he knew the reason for this. He stated that the class knows an instructor is limited to 10% of I or I/NC and they think attendance is not important. I quit taking the roll some time ago simply because it took too much time from the class to mark all absences. The ones interested enough to attend regularly deserve more.

3. A mandatory grade of P, Pass -- satisfactory performance is therefore meaningless. The student receiving this grade may have failed the course or have done work not amounting to a satisfactory performance.

4. The grades of H (10%) and HP (20%) mean only that the student was in the top 10% or top 30% of his class. He may well be a "C" student, and such mandatory grading is deceiving and unrealistic. Furthermore, in checking my last class with numerical grades, I find I would have to choose the final "H" from 7 papers with identical grades. This is purely arbitrary and unfair to the other 6 students.

5. No student in a professional school should be fitted into a mandatory curve in grading. He should be judged by fair and objective professional standards. If every paper in a class is excellent, they should all receive A or H, or B5 or above, or however we designate excellence. And conversely, if everyone writes a failing paper, everyone should receive a failing grade. To require an instructor to grade a percentage curve is an interference with his

basic academic freedom to teach and grade according to objective professional standards.

6. When we followed the numerical grading scale, which I installed in this Law School even before the first class met, I seldom, if ever, had more than 10% below 65 or fail. I am convinced that one reason for this was that the students knew there was no mandatory scale. But when one has a class where there are consistently 1/3 to 1/2 absent (because they know 90% must be passed) the mandatory scale is little (but very little) short of preposterous.

7. If an instructor has an upper class course of more than 40 students, he is to follow the mandatory scale unless there are "very persuasive considerations" to depart from the mandatory scale. Suppose he has the top 21 in the senior class and the top 20 in the second year class. Mandatory scale? Or suppose he has the bottom 21 and 20? Or suppose all 41 are in the middle of each class?

8. I/NC is described as "utterly worthless examination papers." What does that mean? Failing, as tested by objective professional standards? May the paper be failing to meet such standards, and still not be "utterly worthless?" If so, there a paper which should receive a grade of F might have to be given a grade of Pass -- satisfactory performance. This is no service to the Bar or to the public, and will only serve to give the Regents and the politicians more ammunition to prove that the educational process at the University is not doing its job.

You ask for constructive suggestions for improvement. I suggest the return to our numerical grading, which proved so satisfactory for so many years.

Or, secondly, if numerical grading is too difficult for some, why not simply A, B, C, D, and F (which everyone can understand) with absolutely no mandatory scale? Grade points could be ascribed to each.

Tight University Budget Stunts Law Library Growth

What's new in the Law Library? For the first time in several years, returning students will find no immediately visible changes in the Law Library, as no rearrangement of the collection was necessary this summer. But this is nevertheless a year of change for the Law Library. In some cases it is a change for the worse, in other respects it is a change for the better.

The tight University budget situation will hit the Law Library with considerably greater impact than it has in the previous two or three years. The reasons for this are continued growth of the Law School, growth of the library collections, growth of faculty and special groups such as Clinical Associates in the clinical program, and static or reduced financial support for the Law Library. General assistance funds will be particularly tight this year.

One of the changes with an optimistic turn are several very promising additions to the staff of the Law Library. Mrs. Ann Mitchell joined the Law Library staff in June as Head of Public Services (circulation and reference). She comes to us from the Public Affairs Service of the University Research Library where she had established a strong reputation as a service-oriented librarian. She will, of course, be relying heavily

on other staff in meeting the needs of the library's patrons, especially Mr. B.T. Davis, who is in charge of circulation, Mrs. Barbara Williams, on desk duty during the day and Mr. Roger Mullendore, on during the evenings. Mr. Roy Ellison and Mrs. Sylvia Merritt will again share responsibility at the Reference Desk.

This fall, entering freshmen will be introduced to the library not only through an improved legal research and writing course, but also through a self-guided tour. This approach, which has been tried with success at one or two East coast law schools, allows the student maximum flexibility in orienting himself to the library. He goes at his own pace, when he wants to, repeats if he thinks it useful, etc. In addition, the library tour will be augmented by hand-outs at each of the "tour stations" which will describe that particular aspect of the library in much greater detail. This will allow an additional element of flexibility. We hope second and third year students will be aided as well by these materials.

In an effort to make it easier to charge out reserve books, book cards are being placed in the backs of these books. Students will be asked to show registration cards, but will be relieved of filling out author and title information.

Last year, partially because of student concern expressed through the student representative to the Faculty Library Committee, Lee Stark, the library devoted considerable effort to consideration of ways in which library security could be improved. Effective library service depends largely on the recognition by the student body that their own interests are at stake. We will do our part by trying to maintain library services in a period of serious budgetary retrenchment. We ask the student body to do theirs by reshelving their books, reading the rules, following them, and by discouraging or reporting infractions by their colleagues and others.

Docket...

Continued from Page 1

phasis in broadcasting and worked for the American Broadcasting Company before coming to the law school.

The other staff personnel include Arnold Gross, 23, who is Business Manager and Managing Editor. Arnold has an extensive newspaper background as well as a BA in English.

Second year student Pat Hatcher, 27, functions both as a reporter and editor in charge of special features. Joe Hilbermann, 21, is the staff photographer, and was assisted in the first edition by Pat Hatcher.

Publication of the Docket is planned for at least once a month with more frequent publication hoped for if revenue and staff size increase enough to permit it. Total funding from the SBA to the Docket for this quarter has been \$240. If the revenue for the SBA is sufficient from student membership fees, more funding may be provided. Due to some interest from advertisers, ad revenue has been enough to cover the actual printing costs of this first edition.

The Docket office is located in the new wing of the law school. Those persons interested in submitting articles, working for the Docket or in merely seeing what is happening on the paper are invited to drop by.

Cal Advocates...

tions against flagrant and repeated violations of industrial pollution standards; enlarging the scope of rules governing the legal doctrine of "standing to sue" in public interest matters; and enforcement of regulations protecting endangered species.

Additional, subsidiary purposes include insuring access to the legal system for the poor and securing justice for the victims of racial, sex and ethnic discrimination. In these areas CAL Advocates will work in close co-operation with existing programs of the UCLA School of Law which assist the poor and legally under-represented.

CAL Advocates will consist of a fifteen member Board of Directors composed of representatives from the undergraduate and graduate student organizations, Student Bar Association and faculty. CAL Advocates will also employ a full time staff of attorneys experienced in civil practice, experts of varying specialties and necessary clerical personnel. A part time staff is also contemplated which will consist of law students, graduate students from other disciplines, professors and those persons in the community at large who wish to lend their support to the work being done. A program by which students, both undergraduate and graduate, would be able to receive unit credit for research and investigation done in conjunction with CAL Advocates is also under contemplation. A series of interdisciplinary team taught courses and research task forces is also contemplated by CAL Advocates.

Continued from Page 1

ciation and faculty. CAL Advocates will also employ a full time staff of attorneys experienced in civil practice, experts of varying specialties and necessary clerical personnel. A part time staff is also contemplated which will consist of law students, graduate students from other disciplines, professors and those persons in the community at large who wish to lend their support to the work being done. A program by which students, both undergraduate and graduate, would be able to receive unit credit for research and investigation done in conjunction with CAL Advocates is also under contemplation. A series of interdisciplinary team taught courses and research task forces is also contemplated by CAL Advocates.

The California Law Review Board (CLRFB) has just published a series of law reviews which we now have in stock in quantity.

Ask at our Book Information desk for them.

AS students' store
UCLA

SPECIAL LAW DEPARTMENT

Complete Stock for All UCLA Law Courses
"Everything for the Law Student"
Casebooks * Hornbooks * Texts & All Outlines
& Especially "Gilbert Law Summaries" (a must)

We have the largest inventory in the city of:

* SABO Law Cassettes
* SABO Law Study Cards

Gilbert Law Summaries
Rubens Law Summaries
Calif. Law Series

American Legal Publications
Cambridge Law Outlines
Legalines
Law Bennies

First time ever available to the public--
CBRC Outlines

COLLEGE BOOK STORE

3413 SO. HOOVER BLVD.

(Just north of USC)

1/2 block south of Jefferson

749-9329 749-0507 749-2912

Clinical Programs Offer Opportunities

Inasmuch as the first issue of *The Docket* is primarily aimed at acquainting the incoming student with the programs and polemics of the law school, a brief introduction to the Clinical Education Program offered to second and third year students is in order. Designed to prepare those students intending to pursue careers in the active practice of law, the program offers a wide spectrum of interests which according to Program Director, Dave Binder, do influence career choices. By cataloguing concepts rather than teaching students how to "fill out forms", the clinical experience offers the student a theoretical framework which he can draw upon later in practice - years after the forms have changed.

The different programs are divided into two basic categories, the first of which is the "In-house" program where the students enrolled take traditional courses at the same time. They are: Criminal Law Advocacy, Securities Investor Protection, Draft Counseling Center, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Indian Legal Services, Inmate Legal Assistance Group, La Casa Legal-Venice State Service Center, Trial Advocacy in Poverty Law, Veterans Administrative Ombudsman, and Welfare Law Advocacy. Changed this year were: the Department of Corporations (now Securities Investor Program) and the merger of the Venice State Service Center and La Casa Legal. Consumer Pro-

tection Advocacy and the Citizen's Advocate Office (associates of Ralph Nader) programs have been added this year. Planned for the future are the placement of students with the offices of: The U.S. Attorney, The Federal Public Defender, and the district attorneys and public defenders of five Southern California counties. The number of units given varies with each program, but generally involves 4 hours a week per quarter unit.

The second category is the "Quarter Away" programs where the student spends one quarter outside the law school for 12 units. They are: Alaska Legal Services and Public Defender's Offices, Indian Legal Services, Center for Law and Social Policy, Hawaii Public Defender's Office and Judiciary, and Micronesia-Samoa Attorney General's Office. Added this year were: a position at the Hebrew University in Israel (to work with the Ministry of Justice), the office of the general counsel of the American Film Institute, the Office of the General Counsel of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, and a D.C. public interest law firm. The extensive two year Correctional Program (discussed on page 4) was also added this year.

Presently students are allowed a total of 15 units of Clinical Education. It is anticipated that approximately 350 students will participate this year.

Yearly Orientation Welcomes Students

On Tuesday, September 28, the annual orientation assembly for first year law students will be held at the law school. The purpose of the orientation is to give the new students some idea about the problems encountered in law school and how to cope with them.

Most of the 340 entering law students are expected to attend the orientation on which begins at 8:30 A.M. in the patio area with coffee and donuts being served by Law Wives. At 9 A.M. a speakers program will begin with Dean Murray Schwartz addressing the students. Schwartz, who sees the purpose of the orientation to get the class together for the only time and to help relieve anxiety, will stress the honor code and its ramifications.

Following Schwartz will be Student Bar Association Presi-

dent Mike Fields, Prof. Richard Wasserstrom, and Prof. Kenneth Earst. Prof. Wasserstrom will speak on the relationship between the faculty and students while Prof. Karst will speak on how the law school is committed to the general society.

At 10:30 students will be broken into small discussion groups led by second and third year students. The purpose of the groups is to allow the new students a chance to question the older students about what really goes in the school.

The Alumni Association will sponsor a free lunch for those involved in the orientation program at noon. This is the first time in the history of the orientation program that lunch has been provided.

The View Inside

Students Do "Time" in Prison In Attempt to Reform System

ED. NOTE—This is the first in a series of reflections on the UCLA Corrections Program.

For ten weeks this summer, the first year UCLA law students entered California's prisons and parole system to launch an experimental program which gives law students unprecedented access to a state's correctional system. Allowed to talk freely with all people, including officers, psychiatrists, doctors, inmates, wardens, and members of the Adult Authority, the students had virtually unlimited access to observe the workings of the system.

Several students lived in small cottages just off the prison grounds, ate meals with inmates in the lines, stood around the yards shooting the bull with inmates and staff, and watched television in the big Television

rooms with inmates. Ten weeks were spent in institutions ranging from the minimum security of Chino to the "psychiatric prison," Vacaville, to the only women's prison in the state, California Institute for Women, and at the "heavy joints", Folsom and Soledad." Four students spent time working with paroles in Northern and Southern California while two workers spent time with the head department of Corrections.

One purpose of the summer program was to continue the trend of UCLA's Quarter away programs which introduces new dimension of legal education for students who intend to work in criminal law. This dimension of education combines practical field experience with classroom research. According to Bob Berke, director of the correctional program, its purpose is to cultivate a group of lawyers concerned about people who will learn to define their own legal roles in respect to criminal or corrections work.

During the next six months the program will emphasize in-depth research to explore many of the legal questions discovered this summer, reviewing present case law and examining prospects for future suits in the corrections area. Included in this six month period will be a Corrections Seminar,

open to any second or third year law student.

After this research phase of the program is completed, five students will go on to work on sophisticated projects which will be designed in conjunction with the Department of Corrections. Some of these projects may include serving as ombudsmen in one or more major institutions, and designing a new disciplinary procedure for use inside the institutions. Students will get full academic credit under the Quarter Away program and will continue working the following summer.

Hopefully this program will produce ten lawyers per year who have the most intensive legal and practical knowledge of prison and paroles assembled to date. UCLA's program is unduplicated by any of the nation's law schools; none even approach the kind of access and legal training we will get.

This project was initiated entirely by first year law students with the assistance of Prof. Monroe Price. Student volunteers wrote the proposal with the help of Professor Price and received grant of \$75,000 for the first year. The group is preparing a combined report of our experiences which should be available soon.

Just Access to Legal System Goal of Chicano Law Students

Querido Hermanas y Hermanos, As we welcome you, know that a tremendous burden is upon you. A survey by Dean William G. Hall, of the University of Maryland School of Law, shows that there are only about 400 Chicano law students in the U.S. Though we are few, the national as well as the state Chicano law students association seek to increase our numbers. Our own success in law school must be one of the arguments which we must make to law school faculties who, though they have smiling faces and kind words, are often times unsympathetic to increasing the opportunities for a legal education for Chicanos.

But the focus is broader, then mere success in law school. It goes beyond the classroom, outside the University and to the barrios. There is where our roots are, and we must not forget. For the needs of the barrios are daily needs and they include just and equitable access to the legal system. By

no means are Chicago attorneys the only ones who can provide such access, but we have a greater obligation to participate in the struggle, because these are our barrios, inhabited by our people. They have been denied, but we cannot allow them to be denied any longer.

While at UCLA, you will have an opportunity to participate in the community through projects and programs supported by the Chicano Law Students Association and the Law School. We feel that all law students must provide some community service and the clinical programs and specifically Casa Legal, are ways in which they can be done. A balance must be struck between the burden to succeed in school and the necessity to serve the community but it is a balance which hopefully will precede a genuine commitment as members of the legal profession to the necessity of changing a legal system that has crushed the dignity

of Chicanos and in reality made them bitter and fearful of "justice" in this country.

Finally, although we must begin to look to ourselves in the struggle for dignity, we must not undertake the task alone. For the implications of what we seek are profound, and therefore, we must involve and participate with those who feel as we do. Justice in this country is a phantom, but we must seek out others whom, together with us, will reach out with their minds and their spirits for it, until there are so many of us that it will have no place to hide.

Buena Suerte,
2d and 3d year Chicano
Law Students,
UCLA

EDITORIAL

Communication Revised

It seems to be more or less a journalistic tradition for a newspaper when either new or resuming publication under new management to present some sort of position paper as to what it is attempting to do. While the staff of this paper does not always view tradition as being a valid reason for certain conditions to exist, it nevertheless will adhere to this one.

The primary purpose of this newspaper, as the staff sees it, is to present the facts of what is happening in this law school. No effective medium of communication presently exists. Many issues present themselves which are important to the students, and rumor has been more rampant than fact. But beyond merely trying to say what is going on here, the policy of this paper will be to present issues of interest to law students not only in the school but in the general society as well. Our emphasis will be to talk about what concerns and interests the students, be they in or out of this school.

We don't begin to expect to please everyone with our coverage. We want to hear criticism, comment and even praise if any is deserved. We want more students to join us, to be involved with this paper. We will welcome letters to the editor and will welcome offers of help in publication. We don't believe this is our paper or that it belongs to any one select group. It is for all students and we want it to interest and inform all students. Come by our office; we need your help.

It is our policy to take positions on what we consider to be important issues. And we will stand by those positions on the editorial page. But we will present those views which we do not hold, for our main goal is to be one more of balance rather than one of propaganda.

IN FUTURE ISSUES LOOK FOR:

- Women In Law
- Minority Programs
- Law Review Wrap-up
- Root Court Program
- And More!



Featuring:
Analytical approach to each subject . . .
Detailed substantive law discussion . . .
Free supplements and revisions as published

GILBERT

law summaries

complete . . .
concise . . .
at your book store

Get Your Law Study Aids at
CBC
Gilbers Reubens
Calif. Bar Review Course
Black's Law Dictionaries
. . . and many others

COLLEGE BOOK
COMPANY

Bankamericard Mastercharge