Professors’ ratings improve with some notable exceptions

By JAY COHEN

Teaching performance improved significantly in the 1975-76 academic year, according to the Student Bar Association poll conducted last year.

The percentage of professors receiving ratings of 80 percent or better on question No. 7, rose 12 percent from 1974-75, to 63 percent last year.

Question No. 7 asked the respondent if, knowing what he knew about a particular course at the end of the term, he would take the course again. Results were determined by dividing the number answering ‘yes’ by the total number of replies in the class.

The number of ratings of 100 percent on question No. 7 rose to six in 1975-76, doubling the previous year’s total. Professor Reimel, (international business) received the perfect rating.

Barry (international business) Levin (fut. interests), Lurie (Trademarks), Packet (Evidence), Rothman (Corps II), and Walsh (Fed (Courts) received the perfect ratings. Prof. Levin is currently up for review by the Tenure Committee.

Professors Cohen (Torts), Abraham (Criminal Law), and Levin (Future Interests), showed gains of 20% or more in 1975-76. The only significant drop in rating in the two-year period was Professor Dobyin (Insurance), from 93% to 67% in 1975-76.

The low ratings in the 1975-76 academic year were Professors Hysen (Environmental Law) 43 percent, Schenfeld (Business Planning) 25 percent and Frug (Civil Procedure) 15 percent.

These were somewhat lower than the lowest ratings in 1974-75. While a low rating on any one particular course may be misleading, a better picture of performance may be seen through an examination of an average of course ratings. (See chart.)

A notable improvement in teaching performance was noted in the areas of Appellate Advocacy, Environmental Law, and Evidence.

Several faculty members have discounted these figures because they say the poll is too unreliable to be relevant.

Response Drops

This may be somewhat accurate since the average response over the two-year period was 35 percent and first-year student response was more than twice that of the two upper classes.

The poll also measured teacher preparedness and ability to communicate, showing a general satisfaction of these counts among students, with the singular exception of Prof. Frug. Prof. Frug, on a scale of 1-5 (1 being unimpressed), received a rating of 3.5.

(Continued on page 11)

Law Review gains...slowly
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By BARBARA BODAGER and BARRY SCHUSTER

The Law Review, Villanova’s prime source of scholarly legal writing, has in the past several years fallen significantly off-schedule. To date it is three issues and as much as six months behind schedule. The last issue of the Law Review, published in August of 1976, was only the third of the six issues in Volume 21 which was the responsibility of the former Administrative Board. Thus the present board must complete the three remaining issues in Volume 21 before it can even begin its own Volume 22.

But this is not a new situation as it has existed now for several years, particularly under this staggered schedule. One former editor-in-chief placed this decline as early as 1972 after the Law Review switched from a quarterly format to publishing six times per year.

Another former editor-in-chief spoke of the inherent problem of the slowdown in the spring when the board was going on vacation.

Because several months are required to become acquainted with the work and procedure, the entry of a new board means slower publication. Other situations reported by several past present editors included such varied problems as article solicitation, the time required for reviewing articles, and the need for timely submission of articles.

Whatever the cause, such delays pose real concern to any law school. At a recent staff meeting, Shay indicated that there was a good deal of work for every member of the staff.

But is this the optimum size for the Law Review? A glance at other school staffs shows that at N.Y.U., there are 64; Yale, 44; Columbia, 60; University of Chicago, 50; Penn, 50; and Cornell, 60. It would seem that if, in fact, this is a large staff, then perhaps at least some of the effort could be directed to bringing the Law Review back on schedule.

But in spite of the problems inherited by this year’s Law Review, a dedicated Shay spoke very optimistically of the prospects of putting out quality work and catching up with, perhaps, an extra issue. It is this type of work that can lead to more comments similar to those voiced recently by Judge Van Dusen of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals when he spoke favorably to an alumnus about the Law Review and specifically about its Third Circuit Review.

The restraints upon the Administrative Board certainly pull between the pressure of the work and the creation and maintenance of a productive atmosphere. If this Board is able to achieve the goals it has set for this year, then the Law Review will certainly be on its way to recovering a good deal of its dependable timeliness to complement its other scholarly roles.

Most recently, the following people were selected to be members of the Law Review on the basis of their grade-point average or the open writing program: Stuart Agins, Joanne Alfano, Diane Ambler, Mary Lynn Bingham, Edward Borden, Anita Brandel, Susan Bringham, Emmy Brown, Edward Charlton, William Frey, Jerome Gilligan, Patricia Godfrey, Robert Grimes-Hardie, Robert Heideck, Charles Heinzner, Martin Kane, Susan Krouse, Madeline Lamb, Thomas McCarrigie, Silvana Moscati, Nagy Pollack, Debra Poul, Ira Rappaport, Donald Reid, Harold Rosen, Jeanne Rohne, Richard Schey, Kurt Staub, Robert Welsh, Lynn Zeitlin, Gary Bragg, Edward Carey, Andrew Dohan, Michael Fingerman, Michael Fishbein, John Freund, Reginald Krausen, Thomas Russo, Sara Spellman.

Managing Editor Mark Levin (standing) and staff members

Reimel competition

21 teams survive first round

Round one of the Seventeenth Annual Reimel Moot Court Competition got under way on October 11. Twenty-one oral arguments involving 42 teams, were heard during the week. Participants argued before three-judge panels of practicing attorneys. In reaching their decisions, judges were to evaluate the written briefs and the oral arguments. The merits of the cases were not to be taken into account.

In the 21 arguments heard in round one, petitioners were victorious in eight, while respondents won in 12.

The two upper classes.

Barry Grimes-Hardie, stopped in last year’s semi-final round with partner Charles Mitchell. will try again with his colleague of last year for the top spot.
Dean's column

BY DEAN
J. WILLARD O'BRIEN

One of the more difficult and sensitive problems in the Law School is the administration of our sometimes painful decisions that must be made on individual applications for aid; there is also the financial situation will ultimately restrict access to the Law School to the rich or near rich. A sound financial aid program is necessary if the Law School is to remain accessible to the sons and daughters of middle and lower income families.

Our current tuition of $2,750 per year is substantial, even if it is not as high as the tuition charged at many other private institutions. For example, the tuition at some other private law schools are: Boston College $3,200, Catholic University $3,100, Fordham University $3,000, Georgetown University $3,375 and Notre Dame $3,050. The University of Pennsylvania Law School is $4,190. Private institutions cannot, of course, compete on the basis of tuition with state or state related institutions whose programs are supported by the public treasury.

Whatever our competitive situation might be, our commitment, as a Law School, is to represent a financial commitment on the part of those who attend our Law School. As our tuition philosophy is, among other things, an integral part of our total financial aid program, it is my understanding that that topic will be addressed elsewhere in this issue of the Docket.

In this column I will discuss only that financial aid which is paid out of current Law School income. Other financial aid is supplied by individual benefactors, foundations and the state and federal governments. I shall not include work study even though work study is supported in part by private monies. It is, among other things, an integral part of our total financial aid program, and it is my understanding that that topic will be addressed elsewhere in this issue of the Docket.

In the past the Law School's basic approach was to award financial aid in the form of full or half tuition remission. In each of the years during the period 1968-69 through 1973-74 there were, on the average 27 full tuition scholarships and 27 partial tuition awards. There were also during this period benefits that came to nine Dougherty Fellows receiving full tuition, room and board each year, and the Fiske Fellowship, each of whom received full tuition, room and board, plus a cash stipend. In 1974, we changed our financial aid program. In 1974-75 we changed our financial aid program.

That system of measuring financial aid in terms of full or half tuition was replaced in 1974-75 with a new system based on the dollar amount of each Law School award to the specific needs of the individual student. In its first year of operation the new system permitted awards to be made to 112 students, approximately double the number of the 1972-73 recipients.

While clearly beneficial to more students, this new program fell short of our needs. Since about 200 students request financial aid each year, many deserving students are annually denied assistance from the Law School. The ultimate reason, why, of course, is lack of money. In the next few columns or columns I will discuss the entire budgetary process and its raising, distribution and use on the Law School. At this time I shall convey myself to the Law School's budgetary financial aid. One of the expenses charged against current Law School income is the cost of financial aid, in the form of full tuition, room and board each year. That item amounted to $100,000. This year it is $125,000. That means that that $125,000 is not available for such other purposes as additional faculty to provide more small group instruction, more assistance for our placement effort, and so on. It is clear that only so much of our income can be allocated in any one year for financial aid.

Historically, the Law School regarded the recipient of a financial aid grant to be under a moral obligation to repay the sum awarded. Some obligations he has undertaken that obligation and a few have done much more. Most have not. If all the financial aid awarded in the past had been repaid and placed in an account for Law School use, today we would be able to meet more student requests for financial aid. We would also be closer to insuring continuing access to the Law School to the sons and daughters of middle and lower income families.

In 1972-73 and 1973-74 less than 10% of the financial aid awards were in the form of loans. In 1974-75 fully 80% of our financial aid was in the form of loans. In 1975-76 a new policy adopted by the faculty declared that all aid, in excess from the Law School (excepting the three McDevitt Fellowships) should be allocated on the basis of financial need, irrespective of class standing, and be in the form of interest free loans. All promises are deposited to a special account for the benefit of the Law School. In the event of reusing our income and building an endowment of our own. The Law School has none now. We are a step closer to insuring continuing access to the Law School to the sons and daughters of families much like many of our own.

Dean Wiesner

Work-study program offers students hope

BY BETH WRIGHT

Are you broke? In debt? In need of work? Then consider Villanova's National Legal Aid and Defender Program. This program, which was established in 1972, provides work-study students from Penn and Villanova with the opportunity to work for the Defender's Association. Villanova's new National Legal Aid and Defender Program, which was established in 1972, provides work-study students from Penn and Villanova with the opportunity to work for the Defender's Association.

The National Legal Aid and Defender Program is a unique program that provides students with the opportunity to work for the Defender's Association. This program is designed to help students gain real-world experience in the legal field. The Defender's Association is a not-for-profit organization that provides legal services to low-income individuals and families. The Defender's Association's mission is to provide quality legal aid to those who cannot afford to pay for it. Villanova's National Legal Aid and Defender Program is one of the few programs in the United States that provides students with the opportunity to work for a legal aid organization.

The Defender's Association is a not-for-profit organization that provides legal services to low-income individuals and families. The Defender's Association's mission is to provide quality legal aid to those who cannot afford to pay for it. Villanova's National Legal Aid and Defender Program is one of the few programs in the United States that provides students with the opportunity to work for a legal aid organization.

The Defender's Association is a not-for-profit organization that provides legal services to low-income individuals and families. The Defender's Association's mission is to provide quality legal aid to those who cannot afford to pay for it. Villanova's National Legal Aid and Defender Program is one of the few programs in the United States that provides students with the opportunity to work for a legal aid organization.

The Defender's Association is a not-for-profit organization that provides legal services to low-income individuals and families. The Defender's Association's mission is to provide quality legal aid to those who cannot afford to pay for it. Villanova's National Legal Aid and Defender Program is one of the few programs in the United States that provides students with the opportunity to work for a legal aid organization.
Hooker returns to VLS

By MARIA RODEN

Prof. Ian W. Hooker has arrived at Villanova Law School from Nottingham, Eng., but only after a considerable delay in which the school took extraordinary steps to accelerate the processing of the required immigration visas for Hooker and his wife and three children.

Hooker is no stranger to Villanova. He spent one year here in 1972 in a teacher exchange program in which Prof. Gerald Abraham went to England. The program, which seems to have been very successful, began with an exchange of professors in 1963.

A native New Zealander, Hooker attended the University of Canterbury in a town called Christ's Church. While studying law in New Zealand, he worked as a law clerk.

Upon graduation, Hooker taught law in that country. He was subsequently involved in a teacher exchange which took him to Nottingham, Eng. After his year's stay he was asked to remain at the English school, where he had a 10-year tenure.

Enjoys States

Hooker feels that he will probably stay in the United States permanently, however. "My family and I enjoy the lifestyle here, as well as the climate and the people, most particularly the people at Villanova Law School," he said.

Hooker is teaching criminal law this semester and will teach torts next spring term. He is also teaching a section in professional responsibility this term. Next semester he will have a seminar on Topic of Comparative Law, which will compare the problems and procedures of the American and English legal systems.

Prof. Hooker has a high regard for American law students, whom he favorably compares to students in England where law is an undergraduate study and the students are much younger. He feels that the extra maturity of the American student shows itself in the classroom. It seems that the more experiences one has before one studies law, the more interesting the study will be and, therefore, one would learn more easily, according to Hooker.

He states that the process of admitting students both here and in England is highly selective one. He has seen a high caliber of student in both places. However, he said the students here seem to be more committed to their studies.

Moreover, he added that they not only know that they want to study law, but they are more likely to have made a clear determination of what their future will be as opposed to the 18-year-old law student in Nottingham, Eng.

Lecture Method

The teaching method in England differs from the American method in that the lecturing is the principal tool rather than the case method. Only a few minutes are spent by the case method in Nottingham, and even then, the teacher uses more lecture than class discussion. Small group tutorial teaching supplements these lectures. The teacher meets with group of approximately five students and looks to the students to provide questions which have occurred to them on the subject. Students are also expected at that time to answer the questions the teacher poses. Thus there is more personal contact between teacher and student.

This can exhaust the teacher both physically and mentally since the teacher has to repeat the short sessions many times over in order to reach the entire class. He may have meetings on the same subject for over three hours, according to Hooker.

Three years ago, Prof. Hooker was appointed a lay magistrate to sit in a criminal court. About 95 percent of all criminal actions are handled by these courts in England. This is paradoxical in a way, he observed, because recently in England, many of the matters which would be the basis of collective bargaining here have been introduced as statutory rights by Parliament. The workers automatically get these rights, thus eliminating many bargainable subjects.

When asked his opinion on the Watergate scandal and the general political scene in England, Hooker admitted that he knew little about the political scene. However, he said that the students here seem to be keenly aware of what is going on in the United States, especially those who are American students.

"My family and I enjoy the experience," he explained. "Hooker feels that he will probably stay in the United States permanently, however. "My family and I enjoy the lifestyle here, as well as the climate and the people, most particularly the people at Villanova Law School," he said. Hooker is teaching criminal law this semester and will teach torts next spring term. He is also teaching a section in professional responsibility this term. Next semester he will have a seminar on Topic of Comparative Law, which will compare the problems and procedures of the American and English legal systems.

Prof. Hooker has a high regard for American law students, whom he favorably compares to students in England where law is an undergraduate study and the students are much younger. He feels that the extra maturity of the American student shows itself in the classroom. It seems that the more experiences one has before one studies law, the more interesting the study will be and, therefore, one would learn more easily, according to Hooker.

He states that the process of admitting students both here and in England is highly selective one. He has seen a high caliber of student in both places. However, he said the students here seem to be more committed to their studies.

Moreover, he added that they not only know that they want to study law, but they are more likely to have made a clear determination of what their future will be as opposed to the 18-year-old law student in Nottingham, Eng.

Lecture Method

The teaching method in England differs from the American method in that the lecturing is the principal tool rather than the case method. Only a few minutes are spent by the case method in Nottingham, and even then, the teacher uses more lecture than class discussion. Small group tutorial teaching supplements these lectures. The teacher meets with group of approximately five students and looks to the students to provide questions which have occurred to them on the subject. Students are also expected at that time to answer the questions the teacher poses. Thus there is more personal contact between teacher and student.

This can exhaust the teacher both physically and mentally since the teacher has to repeat the short sessions many times over in order to reach the entire class. He may have meetings on the same subject for over three hours, according to Hooker.

Three years ago, Prof. Hooker was appointed a lay magistrate to sit in a criminal court. About 95 percent of all criminal actions are handled by these courts in England. This is paradoxical in a way, he observed, because recently in England, many of the matters which would be the basis of collective bargaining here have been introduced as statutory rights by Parliament. The workers automatically get these rights, thus eliminating many bargainable subjects.

When asked his opinion on the Watergate scandal and the general political scene in England, Hooker admitted that he knew little about the political scene. However, he said that the students here seem to be keenly aware of what is going on in the United States, especially those who are American students.

"My family and I enjoy the experience," he explained. "Hooker feels that he will probably stay in the United States permanently, however. "My family and I enjoy the lifestyle here, as well as the climate and the people, most particularly the people at Villanova Law School," he said. Hooker is teaching criminal law this semester and will teach torts next spring term. He is also teaching a section in professional responsibility this term. Next semester he will have a seminar on Topic of Comparative Law, which will compare the problems and procedures of the American and English legal systems.

Prof. Hooker has a high regard for American law students, whom he favorably compares to students in England where law is an undergraduate study and the students are much younger. He feels that the extra maturity of the American student shows itself in the classroom. It seems that the more experiences one has before one studies law, the more interesting the study will be and, therefore, one would learn more easily, according to Hooker.

He states that the process of admitting students both here and in England is highly selective one. He has seen a high caliber of student in both places. However, he said the students here seem to be more committed to their studies.

Moreover, he added that they not only know that they want to study law, but they are more likely to have made a clear determination of what their future will be as opposed to the 18-year-old law student in Nottingham, Eng.
Past, present deans preside over reunion

By LORRAINE FELGEY

Villanova Law School's classes of '56 and '61 held their 20-year and 15-year reunions October 2. A total of 36 alumni attended.

The reunion of the class of '56 was especially significant in that these alumni were the law school's first graduates.

Dean Emeritus Harold G. Reuschlein, the first dean of the law school and guest of honor, made the trip from San Antonio, Tex., to be present. Reuschlein was dean of the school for 19 years before he joined the staff at Mary's University in San Antonio.

Dean Reuschlein confessed that although he and Mrs. Reuschlein find Texas very agreeable, he does miss all his Pennsylvania friends. When asked to what he attributed his success in helping to establish the law school, the former dean jokingly replied, "to an abundance of nice people easily conned."

Expresses Gratitude

After dinner, Reuschlein gave an impromptu speech, reminiscing about the first years at Villanova. He expressed his gratitude to the class of '56 for the trust and confidence its members placed in the school for 19 years before he left. He also expressed his gratitude to the library. "Things have not changed."

Growth Noted

The committee which organized the reunion included Jim Conners, Jim Garland, Joe Glancy and Al Janke, all from the class of '56; and Tom Pitt, Robert Sheta and Joseph Walheim, from the class of '61.

In addition to the organizers, the committee included Gerry Glackin, Jack Hinson, Nick Klim, George Klocik, Ralph Levitan, Joe Marta, Mike McDonnell, Bernie McLaugherty, Joe More, Frank Murphy, Harry Ouzman, Norman Shuchay, Carl Schoe and Tom Stevens.

Dean O'Brien (center) with class of '56

By KIM McFADDEN

The Montgomery County Public Defender's Office has been working closely with student volunteers to better acquaint them with the criminal justice system as well as to give them practical experience in brief writing.

By Attorney Michael Morris, administrator of the 29 district justices of Montgomery County.

Morris explained that with the demise of the justice of the peace system in 1969 came the district justice, who has original jurisdiction in all criminal cases. This expansion of jurisdiction has brought with it a need for screening the quality of those involved in the system. Before anyone can file for election to the position of district justice, he must pass a test qualifying him for office. If elected, he will be constantly informed of procedural changes and new laws. This is a far cry from the often uninformed JPs who worked on a commission basis — no charge, no fee!

Mark Schultz, a 1975 VLS student who worked with the MontCo DA's office, conducted the second lecture, informing students of the duties and difficulties facing the DA's office.

The program will extend throughout the year. Any second or third-year student who would like to participate in the second semester should not hesitate to take advantage of the practical experience offered through service to the Public Defender's Office.
21 teams survive first Reimel round

(Continued from page 1)

a second after finishing last year's competition as semi-finalists.

In this year's Reimel problem a divorced father was denied the custody of his infant son by operation of a Villanova statute which provides that the mother shall be awarded custody unless it is shown that the father is unable to bring up such minor without injury to his welfare. Asked whether the father was a fit parent to raise the child, the judge stated that the custodial contest turned on the question of whether the father was capable of bringing the child up, independently of his earning power, with or without the aid of a custodial mother. In his opinion, the father had failed to prove that he was capable of bringing up the child, and therefore the custody of the child was awarded to the mother. The problem involved a factual situation in which the father contended that the mother was an unfit custodian because of her mental and physical condition. He claimed that she was unable to care for the child adequately, and that she was not morally fit to have custody. The court considered the father's allegations and found that the mother was fit to have custody, and that there was no evidence to support the father's claim. The mother was therefore awarded custody of the child.

The intense competitive spirit that characterizes the Reimels was manifest when Grimes-Hardie and Mitchell, counsel for the petitioner, confronted James Detweiler. "It is a difficult case, and I do not think that the respondent-wife is capable of being reduced to a perfect nonplus by the present evidence." Standing square-shouldered before the court, he gestured emphatically when making a point and after answering each question he paused before continuing.

Speaking first, Mitchell strode to the podium and addressed the court. "You have heard the testimony, and now you must make a decision. This case involves a young woman who has been through a difficult time in her life. She is faced with the task of proving that she is fit to have custody of the child, and I believe that she is. The evidence presented in this case is overwhelming, and I urge you to grant custody to the respondent." The Court was impressed by his arguments and awarded custody to the respondent.

Grimes-Hardie manifested the same poise and confidence as Mitchell. Standing square-shouldered before the court, he gestured emphatically when making a point and after answering each question he paused before continuing.

"I am on the same side as the petitioner," he stated. "I believe that the respondent is not capable of being reduced to a perfect nonplus by the present evidence. I believe that she should have custody of the child." The Court was impressed by his arguments and awarded custody to the respondent.

While the lawyers were addressing the court, the audience was captivated by the intensity of the arguments. The Reimels were known for their ability to present a strong case, and the audience was eager to witness the final round of the competition.

In the second semester, the teams of four will split into teams of two for the Moot Court portion of the course. Teams will then be assigned to represent either the plaintiff or defendant and will be required to write a brief and engage in oral argument. The panel will take up the evaluation of last year's program, it was decided that a major revamping was necessary. According to Prof. Gerald Abraham, coordinator of the course, the idea behind combining the legal research and Moot Court programs was to make it possible for the student to be better able to work on legal analysis and preparation for oral argument.

"Since the class is already writing a memorandum, it might as well use it towards an oral argument," Abraham said. The purpose of the program remains the same — to introduce students to what lawyers do by having them actually do it.

"Hopefully, some of what they will learn will stick so that they'll be better prepared when they get into practice," Abraham offered.

The Real Problem

The major concern is with the legal research phase of the course since this is where most of last year's criticism was directed. Finding the proper method for learning how to use the library is a real problem, emphasized Abraham, but he thinks that this year's set up will be effective.

"And, Prof. Harvey said, 'There are those who think that it's something that they can't be taught.' She feels that self-teaching is a good idea since in the final analysis, that's how to learn.'

It's still too early to fairly gauge student reaction, but all those involved in the program's organization are hopeful that it will work out and are awaiting student feedback with interest. As Prof. Harvey stated, "The method deserves a fair chance."
Reviewing the Review

Because every law school's law review necessarily reflects not only upon members of the review, but also upon every student, faculty member and alumns, we view with particular concern the significant delay in the timely publication of the Villanova Law Review.

The Villanova Law Review has not been able to publish on time for at least the past four years. However, in all fairness, the situation has improved immeasurably. The Review has been catching up admirably. But since the earliest projections anticipate at least a one and one-half to two year period before the Review has entirely caught up, the question still remains as to whether this is soon enough. That question is left for individuals to decide for themselves. Although it is especially important to appreciate that the publication of incisive legal scholarship is both tedious and time consuming, timeliness is an extremely crucial factor in evaluating the quality of a legal journal.

Therefore, law review members should remain sensitive to the particularly heavy responsibilities that result from membership on the Review. The sooner and more effectively that the present Board of Editors and staff are able to resolve these present difficulties, the greater the likelihood that the Review will further contribute to enhancing the reputation and prestige of Villanova Law School.

Exams: Prof irresponsibility

It cannot be emphasized enough that this editorial is not directed at any individual faculty member but at particular methods of examination.

We must necessarily begin with the assumption that there is no perfect method of measuring an individual's academic ability. Weaknesses can be found in virtually all academic testing. Therefore, the goal should be to develop a measurement of ability which is as reasonable as possible.

Every day in class, most law professors will use the hypothetical both to impart an understanding of legal concepts and to determine whether the class can apply a particular general rule to new and diverse situations. This is also the usual method of examination, that is, to create a unique factual situation that will attempt to measure a student's ability to apply general legal rules.

However, this is not always the case. One method of examination that is presently used at Villanova Law School consists of using an old examination (usually bound and accessible to all students) and either making in-significant changes in a question or lifting it verbatim from an old exam. This method of examination raises questions both of fairness and accurate measurement of academic ability.

Even though one can easily argue that all students have equal access to old exams placed in the library, most law professors be so lazy or unmotivated as to use old exam questions and make an already imperfect exam system even more unfair? After all, what are we testing—a particular student's ability to anticipate the exact questions on an exam?

Frequent usage of this testing technique encourages students to spend more time memorizing answers to old exams rather than learning the law. Spending several thoughtful hours analyzing and discussing an old exam question which turns up on "the" exam is a tremendous advantage. In an environment where grades mean so much and count so heavily, the mere possibility that such an advantage and its inherent unfairness may play a significant role in the examination process is no less than outrageous.

Valente's legal process a scheduling casualty

In light of criticism (see letters to the editor) in this issue, we were particularly disturbed at the administration's lack of sensitivity to student interests in requesting Prof. Valente to teach jurisprudence this semester rather than the legal process.

Although we believe that the particular letter to the editor sufficiently articulated the substantive academic merits for a course in legal process and because the school administration strongly encourages first- and second-year students to plan out course selections over the period of one to two years, this sudden course change especially disrupted the plans of those students who deferred enrollment in the course until their third year.

Since legal process courses are of the interests of a greater number of students who would have preferred to elect that course rather than jurisprudence, the administration's actions in this regard were particularly short-sighted and unfortunate. Consequently, we strongly recommend that the administration make every good faith effort to institute the legal process course in the second semester so that those students with a sincere desire to elect the course will be able to do so.

Legal process called "soo"

To the Editor:

It was with extreme displeasure that I noted the deletion of the course offering in Legal Process from the 1976-1977 law school curriculum. Perhaps that decision-making body (whichever one it be) charged with determining what course selection will most benefit law students believed that by erasing the Legal Process course from the curriculum slate, they would afford themselves an opportunity to fill the opening created with a more "relevant" or more "functional" course selection.

If such were the feelings of the curriculum committee, then, in my opinion, their reasoning could not have been more sorely misguided. I cannot, reflecting upon my three years of contracts, codes and caselaw, recall a course which...
In the concern over the ills of legal education, let me suggest another remedy. I believe that in pricing intelligence, law teachers have become too insensitive to — indeed, rejecting of — matters of the heart.

Legal education is an intensely cerebral pursuit. Inside the classroom, students listen as we dissect court opinions, ridicule fuzzy-headed thinking, stifle passions as unprofessional. We praise our students by telling them they “think like a lawyer,” an ability requiring a wholly analytical matrix for dealing with problems.

Within days after their arrival, our first-year students learn about Law Review. And it becomes an idea. We, who encourage, that their careers will suffer if Law Review, the quintessence of intellectual meritorious, eludes their grasp (even though this happen to 90 percent of them). So we conclude that we — and society — are to judge them highly, they must prove themselves with their heads.

I believe that the head is attached to the heart — not only biologically — and that is the pulsating heart of the professional man or woman that legal education has evolved.

I do not assert that legal education makes our graduates evil, but I do believe that legal education makes our graduates less feeling, less caring, less sensitive to the needs of others, less tolerant of the frailties of their fellow creatures, even less alarmed about the injustices of our society, than they were when they entered law school.

What concerns me is the mind-set and the heart-set into which we mold our students; that it is better to be smart than passionate, that people who feel too deeply tend not to think too clearly, that a fine intellect can rationalize any position or state of affairs, no matter how outrageous or innocent or unjust.

That we put such a premium on the lawyer’s intellect would matter less if lawyers were less. But as we view our society, which has entrusted lawyers with so awesome a managerial role, we seem no closer than we were decades ago to achieving individual dignity for vast reaches of the population. Whether it be poverty, discrimination, joblessness, or courts, prisons and mental hospitals that do not work; or medical indigency, environmental pollution, or squall housing — there is not a fostering spot in American society that lawyers in their many power roles, if they cared, could not exert influence to improve.

Of course, there are many in the profession who do care. But there are far too many others who have not learned to care, or have forgotten how. And as we law educators have not thought it important to encourage our students to become compassionate public leaders, to become sensitive to the systematic changes that must occur if this nation is ever fully to realize its promise.

We should require our students to study first-hand our city courts, prisons and station houses, welfare centers, mental hospitals, to gain an insight into how these institutions work and, more important, the ways in which they fail.

We should require every student to give some time to public service. This might include representation of the poor, teaching law to high school youngsters, counseling community groups, serving internships in governmental agencies. Law students should know that with the privileges of our profession comes social responsibility. This lesson should begin early.

We should train our students to deal with other human beings, to begin to understand that the client who comes into a lawyer’s office is usually a troubled person, to begin to appreciate that what surfaces as a legal problem very often has its roots in deep-seated social problems.

Above all, I think that we as teachers must let our students know that we value their human as well as intellectual qualities — and our own as well as theirs. For unless lawyers value the compassion in themselves, I think they will be incapable of caring about the human needs of others.

The Heart of the Lawyer

Alfred R. Romano '76
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Who is suing whom for what?

I walk, I stroll, I run and dash
To come in late is much too brash
Approach the threshold, catch in throat
What were the damages — punitive? Remote?

I chit, I chat, I fumble about
Til fins hit — then familiar about
Round the podium, stamp the floor
"Kids, we’re in business," he says with a roar.

I shift, I squirm, I feel dismay
Wondering who’ll get nailed today
He’s caught my eye, glares with delight
Why did I get so high last night?

I read my brief, I stress, I strain
I rack all regions of my brain
Ask why, ask how I often neglect
Facts that from his mouth eject

I finish meekly, I should know the Laws
Knowing full well the snap of those jaws
I'm still drunk — I don't know what I'm doing
And then he booms with forceful strut

Ask why, ask how I oft neglect
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We should train our students to deal with other human beings, to begin to understand that the client who comes into a lawyer’s office is usually a troubled person, to begin to appreciate that what surfaces as a legal problem very often has its roots in deep-seated social problems.

Above all, I think that we as teachers must let our students know that we value their human as well as intellectual qualities — and our own as well as theirs. For unless lawyers value the compassion in themselves, I think they will be incapable of caring about the human needs of others.

Curtis J. Berger

Curtis J. Berger is Laurence Wien Professor of Real Estate, Columbia University.
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Frustration in Philly

Woee betide the hapless miss
Who thinks of Law School as a Kiss
Glance on it with mild disdain
A mere stepping-stone to fort’n ‘n fame
One who doesn’t realize how
She’s got herself stuck in this now

Just as the Kiss, without much thought
Often leads where it should not.
She finds with fear and trepidation
She’s bound in endless litigation

But perhaps the most amazing part
Warned as she was right from the start
She can’t discern, try as she may
And yet, admits it more each day
That in the midst of all dures
Law is her jealous "Mister-ess!"
Activist role urged in environmental law

By Kim McFadden

Albert Slap, Esq., an attorney with the Public Interest Law Center (PILC) of Philadelphia, met in-...
**GPA confusion**

By JEFFREY WEEKS

When you are a first-year law student, it's pretty easy to feel terrified by the thought of grades, especially when the administration posts the fall semester exam schedule during the last week of September.

This article is presented to help clarify the confusion concerning grades, especially on the part of first-year students. The following is a breakdown of the grading used at Villanova.

**GPA LETTER GRADE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.00-3.50</td>
<td>3.49-2.75</td>
<td>3.48-2.25</td>
<td>2.74-2.25</td>
<td>2.24-1.88</td>
<td>1.87-0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A first-year student must have at least a 1.67 GPA to move on to the second year. A second-year student must have at least a 1.75 average to move on to the third year, and a third-year student must have a 1.75 to graduate.

The following are percentages of all grades given for courses, excluding seminars, in 1975-76.

**PERCENTAGES CLASS OF '78 CLASS OF '76**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>Fall Term</th>
<th>Spring Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to a Student Bar Association request, Assoc. Dean J. Edward Collins posted the following:

"In order that students talking to recruiters may be better informed as to the significance of their grade point averages and class standing, the following information is made available. It shows the grade point averages in various percentages of the classes examined."

**GPA confusion**

By SUZANNE BLACK

Prof. Harry W. Jones, Cardozo Professor of Jurisprudence at Columbia University, delivered the inaugural Donald A. Giannella Memorial Lecture September 30 on the topic of "Lawyers and Justice: The Uneasy Ethics of Partisanhip."

The Donald A. Giannella Memorial Lecture Series is a unique foundation in American legal scholarship. It appears that only at Villanova Law School is there a lecture series established honoring one of a law school's own professors.

Born in Paterson, New Jersey, Giannella graduated from Harvard College and Harvard Law School, magna cum laude. He was associated with the New York law firm of Cahill, Gordon, Reindel and Ohi. From 1958-60 he was a teaching fellow at the Harvard Law School. Giannella came to Villanova Law School in 1960, attaining the rank of full professor in 1993. While at Villanova he served as executive director of the Institute of Church and State. Giannella died in February 1974.

**Of First Quality**

Prof. Donald W. Dowd, chairman of the memorial lecture committee, explained that the aim of the lectures was to bring to Villanova someone of "absolutely first quality — both of intellect and moral qualities" to deliver the annual lecture.

Under these criteria Jones proved a perfect choice. A long-time friend of Giannella's, Jones was closely associated with him in the activities of Villanova's Institute of Church and State. Both men shared an interest in the problems of law and morality and had hoped to collaborate on a casebook in the area of church and state.

**Cites Watergate**

Jones received his LL.B. from Washington University; He was the recipient of an honorary degree from Villanova in 1972. In addition to Columbia, Jones has also taught law at Washington University and the University of California, Berkeley.

In his lecture Jones cited the Watergate incident as a moment of truth in American legal history. The ABA in response to Watergate has amended its legal education standard for accredited law schools to require a course in legal ethics, focusing on a study of the Code of Professional Responsibility.

**New Emphasis**

Jones welcomed this addition to legal education in that it focuses attention on the lawyer's operation. It will also cause the Code of Professional Responsibility itself to be examined more critically, he said. The code will now be the kind of object of scrutiny which law professors and students had formerly reserved for statutes and appellate opinions, according to Jones.

The major problem with the code is that it is primarily a barrister's code, focusing on courtroom advocacy, Jones explained. It neglects the ethics of the attorney's role as counselor and draftsman where the traditional adversarial safeguards do not exist. Jones said that the code sets standards too low in this area. There should be a better accommodation between the attorney's partisan loyalty to his client and his objective of the attainment of truth and justice.
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The text of Jones' lecture will be published in a future edition of the Villanova Law Review. Members of Giannella's family, including his wife and mother, felt that Jones' lecture was an appropriate tribute to Giannella, both as a man and as a teacher. They offered their congratulations to Prof. Dowd for the idea of the memorial lecture series and for the fine organization which made the inaugural lecture a success.
Dick Allen: victim of insensitive press?

By JON KISSEL

This observer finds it necessary to inject an element of rational analysis into the controversies surrounding the less than successful division-winning Phillies. Public opinion is frequently orchestrated by members of the press who are unable to grasp the realities of the situations they attempt to recount. Day in and day out sports reporters endeavor to obtain statements from players which they mold, exaggerate or fabricate to reinforce their individual perceptions.

Little wonder that the Philadelphia Inquirer’s pride and joy of sports was kicked off the Flyers’ team place last year, and ordered not to accompany or confront the team again. Then there was Danny Ozark’s behavior in Pittsburgh earlier this year when he tried to punch another Philadelphia sports writer’s teeth out and followed by boycotting the press for over 60 games.

Boos Unequaled

I have attended athletic events in nearly every major city in this country. Philadelphia’s fans stand alone in the emotion and intensity they display for their teams.

The Philadelphia “boos” are unequalled, just as their cheering can be deafening. These are fans who embody their partisan nature in their hearts and souls. This intense devotion brings tragedy when a city’s followers are subjected to rumors, myths and legends perpetrated by writers who are outcasts of the system they vilify.

Philadelphia fans were shocked when they read that their beloved Phillies were a team torn apart by racial tension caused by “demon” Dick Allen. Yet these same reports could not realize how badly this situation had been misconstrued when they subsequently read Garry Maddin’s quote: “This is the closest bunch of guys I’ve ever played with. I never heard anyone say anything concerning racial tension until you guys brought it up.”

Unfortunate Veteran

Dick Allen is a man who won’t talk to the press because “they’ll never get me right anyway”. He is an unfortunate veteran whose career has been blackened by ruthless reporters whom he has avoided like the plague, yet a player who has won some of the highest awards baseball can offer to a rookie and a veteran and a human being who mentioned to a famous TV personality his dedication and devotion to the game should be rewarded, only to be quoted as giving an ultimatum to the team’s management.

Moreover, it is important to note that much of the criticism directed at Dick Allen is legitimate and well deserved.

Those who have never seen the “Ball Four” or “North Dallas Forty” side of athletics cannot be faulted for believing what they see. However, others, like myself, who have personally known the Phillies, talked with them, drank with them and seen what their lives and personalities are really like, realize the unfairness of the continued babbling of insensitive reporters.

The Phillies’ players know who Dick Allen is and respect him for what he is. Adverse statements from individuals who have played with or against Dick Allen are practically nonexistent.

What gives the press the right to fabricate to reinforce their individual perceptions?

Upset in ICC opener; Caniglia clause looms

By JON KISSEL

The Inter-Club-Council kicked off the 1976 flag football season with some lopsided scores. A standing-room-only crowd was on hand at O’Brien Field to witness one of the most astounding upsets in ICC history.

After the usual opening day parades, floats, and speeches, William Brunner, a custodian from the lower stacks threw out the opening pass to Football Commissioner Nick Caniglia. Game One of the ICC schedule was a rout, with the “B” Super Bowl runner-up for the past two years, facing a virtually unknown group of second-year students calling themselves Warren Stennis “B”.

Loren Schrum, in his usual pre-game psych, devoured two fans, half a tree stump and was attempting to dismember the train tracks before his lifetime Arce Gilligan reminded him he’d already eaten. Game One’s results showed Tuco’s lack of hunger as they cobbled 25-19 in overtime, on Paul Cody’s fourth touchdown of the afternoon.

Although the game featured a brilliant comeback by TMB, scoring two touchdowns in the final minute, victory was not in the stars.

Desire Lacking

“We’re not organized offensively and a few of us don’t have the same desire this year,” said Jon Kessel, TMB’s captain, referring to some notable absences after the heartbreaking loss. Commissioner Caniglia, a man known for his wit and brevity, analyzed the TMB effort to Kessel by remarking, “You guys just stunk up the field, that’s all.”

In other contests CIA, TMA and WSA all won easily. Pre-season favorites Frank Deasey and Ted Metritt’s Warren Stennis “A” (2-0) who boasts; “If we can beat em, we’ll out run em” The Law Review’s “B” dark horse of the tourney, having slipped into tough competition in the third round, other than the tournament, other than the tournament, other than the tournament.

“The key to the match was that I was able to keep the ball in play,” said the champion of his victory. “He seemed to have trouble with the wind and he hit out on a lot of shots.”

Before its conclusion, the early line showed defending champions John O’Rourke to be the tournament favorite. O’Rourke had stormed past five, some opponents in Todd Vannett, Bob Genuario, Paul Cody, Rich Flexner and Paul Beek. He seemed quite in control, but was apprehensive about the finals.

“I expect Scott Wallace to win the tournament,” he stated a week before the finals. “He has beaten me more times than I have him.”

Many others also thought Wallace would be the other finalist. However, Wallace ran into tough competition in the semifinals and did not get a return shot at the title.

Wally Tice was the proverbial dark horse of the tourney, having triumphed over Reggie Kraemer, Jane Fromstein, Brian Schwartz, and Ted Metritt before facing Wallace. In the first set, the former player from Kenyon College went ahead early before losing the first set 5-7. The second set was a seesaw affair which was tied at 4-4, before Wallace completely collapsed. He proceeded to lose the next two games (and hence the second set) as well as being shot out of the deciding set 9-0.

‘Best Set’

“I don’t know if he choked or not, but something happened to him in the third set,” Tice commented afterwards. “He just didn’t play as well as he had before, but I also played about the best set of tennis that I ever have.”

While Tice’s victory over Wallace may have been the most shocking upset of the tourney, there were several others along the way. First of all, the tourney finalists had to be delayed for a week because tourney director Mike Sullivan skipped the player’s special ConRail train for three days in order to see his special doctor about a recurring shoulder injury. It didn’t help, though, as he lost to Paul Beck in the quarter finals.

Exit Editor

Another shocking upset was the defeat of Docket Sports Editor John Kissel in the second round. After an opening victory over Jack Duffy, “Little Johnny,” as his close friend Dick Allen refers to him, was shocked by Craig Schwartz.

The third surprising event was the appearance of a female player in the third round. Third-year student Tootsie Hans defeated Frank Deasey and Jim Seeley, before falling to Mike Sullivan.

Recent tennis aficionado Dean J. Willard O’Brien professed no prediction on the outcome of the tournament, rather, than the fact that he was struck by a...
Tennis tournament

won by O'Rourke

(Continued from page 10)

ball, thrown racquet, or beer can while watching the finals it would be considered an intentional tort, any mitigating circumstances notwithstanding. Rumors to the effect that a motionless highwayman would be in attendance at the finals proved to be false. "I really haven't been following the tourney closely enough to make a prediction," the dean stated. When queried as to the possibility of a winner-take-all challenge match before the finals, O'Brien said this means keeping technique in mind; the professor using the Socratic method will score less than the teacher who lectures frequently. When asked if the evaluation prepared was rated 97 percent as being between 1-3 in preparedness of those responding in Civil Procedure and 63 percent in Constitutional Law II. The evaluations have been criticized on this point for their vagueness and lack of subtlety. Frug told The Docket that the I-t-type response did not clarify what the problems were and that Prof. Abraham felt the numerical response left the interpretation too wide open. How to Interpret Dean J. Willard O'Brien explained: "The numbers themselves are only one bit of information." While not discounting them altogether, he said, "You have to know how to interpret the data." O'Brien said this means keeping technique in mind; the professor using the Socratic method will score less than the teacher who lectures frequently. At the Docket's request, Professor Abraham said he would like to see an example of a "success" and "failure" response. Abraham stated that the committee has evaluations from the last three to five years on each candidate. After a diligent search, The Docket was told by every authority, including the poll's sponsor, the SBA, that copies were available only as far back as 1974-75.

The chart above represents a tabulation of the results of question number seven on the course evaluation sheet. The question asked the respondent if, knowing what he knew about the course at the end of the term, he would take it again.

The Docket encourages contributions from students, faculty and alumni

INFORMATION PLEASE

Dear Alumnus:

We want to make sure that each alumnus is receiving The Docket. If your address differs from the address on the label, please fill in the "outcut" below and send it in.

If you know of an alumnus who is not receiving The Docket we would likewise appreciate your help in finding him.

We are also interested in finding out what you are doing and have done since graduation.

So fill in the card below and send it in. Also, if there is any particular event which would be of interest to our readers, please feel free to enclose a letter.

Your Name:
Address: street street city state zip
Name of Alumnus not receiving The Docket:
Address: street street city state zip
Your Present Position: employer address
Marital Status: Children:
Achievements:
Other:
See enclosed \\.
The Board of Law Examiners of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania announced October 18 the results of the bar examination given July 27 and 28. A total of 1,705 applicants took the examination, of which 1,527, or 89.56 percent, passed. At least 99.38 percent of those taking the Pennsylvania bar exam passed. It was not determined at press time whether one student had actually taken the examination.

The following graduates of Villanova Law School were successful in the exam:


- Dennis T. Burns, Patricia H. Burrall, Michael J. Casale, Jr., Harry S. Chernik, Jr., Kyran W. Ditter, Michael J. Casale, Jr., Charles H. Bowen, Matthew J. F. Evans, Robert W. Evans III.


