3-22-1967

State of the Law School, March 22, 1967

William B. Harvey
Indiana University School of Law

THE STATE OF THE LAW SCHOOL ADDRESS
by
DEAN WILLIAM B. HARVEY
March 22, 1967

I am very grateful for this opportunity to talk with more of the law students than I usually see. There is a little group of thirty students that I see with some degree of regularity since they study Contracts with me. It is pleasant to see a larger segment of our student body. At the start, I would like to apologize for the rather foggy state of my voice tonight. Hopefully, with the help of the amplifier, I will be able to make myself heard.

In the English university tradition, in which I once had an opportunity to serve, there exists the amiable custom of the inaugural lecture. This is an opportunity provided a new incumbent of a professorial chair to address his colleagues and the students in the University, to tell them something about what he sees of the future in his field, or about his hoped-for contribution to the institution. He may merely demonstrate his scholarship. In a sense this is my inaugural address in Indiana University. I am reminded of the fact, however, that once before when I delivered an inaugural lecture, in the amiable tradition of an English-style university, very shortly thereafter I was deported. Whether there will be any tendency for history to repeat itself on this occasion, I'll leave to the future.

I have been planning, later in the Spring when the work of the year is a little closer to completion, to chat with Mr. Foley and the other officers of the SBA about an opportunity to talk with you in order to make you more fully aware of what had been going on in the School this year, much of which, I am sure, has not been very visible to you. I decided, however, to accelerate the timetable just a bit, when I became aware of the fact that rampant in the School at this particular time is a spate of very terrifying rumors, myths, misconceptions, and what-have-you. Some of these, I am sure, are alarming to you. For example, I understand that one of these rumors is that in the future coats and ties will be required raiment for all law students at all times. Whether the required tie is to be a fore-in-hand or a bow tie, deponent saith not. May I, therefore, talk with you tonight about what actually has been going on in the School, about what we hope, and I think you will hope, will go on in the future. I want to inform, to dispel myths - insofar as myths have developed - and perhaps to confirm as fact some things that you have heard. Most importantly of all, I want to enlist your support in the enterprise in which we are jointly engaged. I would preface all of my remarks by restating my deep conviction that in this joint enterprise you as the student body in this School are one of the indispensable elements for the realization of our aspirations.

This has been in fact a very active year, though you perhaps would not have been aware of much of the activity. One of the most important things, of course, that had to occur was the start of the education of a new Dean. It takes time to become aware of the problems, the needs, and the potential of a new institution. Much that has gone on would have been

required simply for my own education. Beyond that, however, my colleagues on the faculty and I believe that in the life of an institution there should be a periodic reassessment of all that is going on. The questions should be put, are we doing the right things? Are we doing all of the things that we should be doing? And those questions are being put this year in very active study and discussion.

In order for you to understand what is going on, perhaps I should say a preliminary word about the government of a School like ours. I think there is a tendency on the part of students and perhaps a tendency on the part of outsiders to entertain misconceptions about what a dean is, about how he functions, and, perhaps as a result, to expect more of a dean than one reasonably should. It seems to me that a vital institution of quality has an enormous capacity for surviving a bad dean. On the other hand, the incumbent of a decanal office himself can do very little unless he has around him in the faculty and in the student body others who are deeply committed to the quality of the enterprise. This perspective is reflected, I think, in the way we conduct our affairs in this faculty. We study the problems, we discuss them, we debate them - sometimes we debate them very sharply, even acrimoniously. But matters of policy in this School are determined ultimately, as they must be in any school of real quality, by the members of the faculty after advising among themselves and, hopefully, also after considering the views of the students. With that background word as to the way we are proceeding to deal with our problems, let me tell you something about what has happened this year.

First of all, I would like to talk about the faculty itself. This is a year in which we are going to experience some very substantial losses. At the end of this academic year, one of the distinguished members of this faculty will reach the age of retirement from active teaching. Professor Austin Clifford joined this faculty in 1946. He will reach retirement age in June 1967. Thus, for better than a generation, Professor Clifford has made an outstanding contribution to the education of lawyers in this state and in this country. I have never had the privilege of sitting in one of Professor Clifford's classes. I can't, therefore, speak from first-hand knowledge of his expertise, his wisdom, in the fields in which he has taught primarily - Torts, Evidence, International Law and others. But I am reminded of the picture which the poet Arthur Guiterman in his Laughing Guitar paints of the youthful future President, James Garfield, being taught by Mark Hopkins. Guiterman says: "I don't care what Mark Hopkins taught, If his Latin was little and His Greek was naught. For the farmer boy he thought, thought he, All through lecture time and quiz, 'The kind of man I mean to be is the kind of a man Mark Hopkins is.'" I hold the conviction that of law students who have passed through this School over a generation have looked at Austin Clifford in this way, and have respected, admired and been guided by the example of professional discipline and integrity that he has provided. We are going to miss him in the classroom. We hope we will continue to have him as a friend and colleague around this University.

I should mention that two other members of the faculty have submitted their resignations in order to take advantage of professional

opportunities outside the field of law teaching. Professor Ritchie Davis resigned from the faculty effective as of the end of January, and Professor William Golden has submitted his resignation in order to enter the practice of law in Boston in the coming summer. They, too, will be missed, and I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation, and I am sure the appreciation of my colleagues on the faculty, for their contributions to the School.

Though we have sustained losses, we have gained new strength for the faculty as well. I would like to report briefly to you on some of the new appointees, one of whom has already joined us; the others will do so in the coming Summer or at the beginning of the Fall semester.

Professor Arthur Kola, who began his work with us at the start of the second semester, did his undergraduate work at Dartmouth College and was graduated with high honors from the Duke Law School. Following his graduation from Duke, he practiced for a period with the distinguished Cleveland law firm of Squire, Sanders and Dempsey. He was lent by that firm to the United States Army for 2½ years, and we were able to persuade the Army to let us have him at the end of his active duty. Professor Kola is at the beginning of his teaching career. His interests are still formative, though he has a developed interest in the maze of legal problems that arise out of the process of urbanization that is such a prominent feature of American life today.

Professor Philip Thorpe had his law study at the University of Michigan, went on to a judicial clerkship and an active practice before returning as an instructor to the University of Michigan Law School. From Michigan, he moved on to the University of North Carolina as Assistant Professor of Law. Professor Thorpe will join us at the beginning of June as Assistant Professor of Law and Assistant Dean of the School. I have been concerned since I have been here that in trying to handle the variety of things for which the Dean's office is responsible, I have not had as much time to see you, to talk with you, to turn the open face of the administration to the student body, as I would like to have had. With Dean Thorpe's arrival in June, both he and I can share these responsibilities to the School and to you. I am sure he will make a significant contribution to the development of our program here.

Joining us in the Summer Session, to begin his work as Assistant Professor of Law, will be Professor Byron Bronston who did his undergraduate work at Yale and his law study at the University of Michigan, where he was a member of the Michigan Law Review, and of the Order of the Coif. On graduation he joined the excellent Chicago law firm of McDermott, Will, and Emery where he has practiced in the fields of Trusts, Estate Planning, and Probate. He will work in those areas with us as well and, I know, will make a significant contribution to the teaching strength of our faculty.

The fourth new member of the faculty is Professor Robert L. Birmingham. He graduated first in his class from the University of Pittsburg Law School and then took a Masters degree from the Harvard Law School. He apparently did not find his studies at the Pittsburg Law

School, where he also served as Editor-in-Chief of the Law Review, sufficiently time-consuming. He therefore decided to "double in brass" and with his law study took a Ph.D. in Economics. He will be joining us in September. Professor Birmingham will teach Contracts next year.

The fifth of the appointees for next year is Professor James S. Gordon. He was graduated from the University of Florida, from the Yale Law School with high honors, and is now completing his doctorate at the University of Chicago Law School. He has had already a remarkably productive career as a scholar in the fields of Antitrust, Trade Regulation, and Regulated Industries, and he will work primarily in those areas with us.

What we are trying to achieve by these appointments and others that will be made soon, is a faculty large enough to permit us to offer more of our instruction on a small group basis. This would re-establish a tradition of the Indiana Law School. The student body in this School has doubled approximately in size in the past five years. As a consequence, the older tradition of instruction in quite small groups in which the students could know the faculty and the faculty could know the students has been to some extent diluted. We want to re-establish and reinvigorate that tradition. With the new appointments, we will be able to move in that direction, though not as far during the coming academic year as we would like. We want also to develop the faculty strength for the enrichment of our curriculum in areas that I will mention briefly later.

There are problems in faculty recruitment today. There is an extraordinarily active and competitive market for high-quality teaching talent, and that is what we are after. In virtually every case where we extend an invitation, the man in whom we are interested is at the same time weighing an invitation from one or two other law schools of real quality. We don't get all the men we want - no school does. But we have had our share this year, and we will continue to get our share of the "cream", if I may use that term in referring to my colleagues. In our appointments procedures - which I would re-emphasize are procedures carried out by the faculty, not by the Dean - we are setting our standards high. We intend to keep them high. On that basis, I think we are building an ever-better Law School.

In addition to the very large amounts of time that we have devoted to faculty development this year, we have also devoted much attention to the curriculum itself. Our Curriculum Committee, of which Professor William Oliver is the Chairman, has concentrated this year primarily on the first year program and on the Legal Techniques courses. Now you may ask why are we going through such a general study and reassessment of a curriculum that is strikingly similar to curricula in most other good law schools and that seems to have worked reasonably well in the past. I suppose the factors that motivate us primarily include most prominently the fluidity that we perceive in the society we are trying to serve. We may stand still, and institutions like law schools have a tendency to be fairly stable, but that degree of stability is not usually found in the surrounding society. Society moves and its needs change. The curriculum

of the Law School must change as well, if it is to carry out its responsibilities. Over a period of time, a curriculum acquires a certain amount of "dead wood". Courses developed in the past to meet existing needs and to reflect the vital interests of the faculty survive their motivating forces. We therefore find ourselves listing a substantial number of courses that are no longer taught or are taught very infrequently. These need to be re-examined to determine whether they represent any longer a vital and responsive part of our teaching program. The views of the faculty on appropriate coverage, on techniques of teaching law, also change. We want to reflect these changing perceptions of need and technique in the curriculum itself. Finally, any law school that aspires toward excellence must pursue it relentlessly, through its curriculum planning and every other channel. We are now in the process of doing that. The process will probably require a full three years for completion. We will examine carefully the coverage and responsibility of every course that we offer. We will eliminate any offerings that have been over-taken by obsolescence; we will also define new needs to which the program of this School should respond.

As I have suggested, the Curriculum Committee has concentrated this year on the first year program and the Legal Techniques program. Its first major report is now before the faculty. I can report to you, in general terms, some of the leading ideas that have been advanced by the Curriculum Committee, but you should keep in mind that these ideas and recommendations are still fully subject to faculty debate and decision.

First of all, with respect to the first year program, an effort is being made to concentrate some of the courses that have been taught over the full year into one semester courses. The Committee is proposing that the courses in Torts and Criminal Law be put into one semester packages, Torts in the first semester and Criminal Law in the second. The thinking of the Committee supporting this recommendation is that by consolidation in these two important areas we can achieve greater impact for the instruction, and also, because of the relation between packaging and the examination schedule, that we will be able to balance the examination loads of the first and second semesters somewhat better. Another major change recommended is that instruction in Procedure be introduced into the first year. Sir Henry Maine's insightful comment that substantive law is merely a deposit in the interstices of procedure was not valid only in Sir Henry's time. Most of us feel that it is impossible fully to understand so-called substantive law unless one sees it within the total institutional setting, including the procedural system through which substantive rules are applied. We contemplate therefore a full year of Procedure as part of the required basic instruction.

The Curriculum Committee has recommended also that in the basic courses in Property, Contracts, and Torts, a small-group program be instituted. By this we mean that every student in the first year would have one of these basic courses in a class no larger than 20 to 22. In this way, the basic methodological impact of the first year instruction should be greatly increased. I suspect that those of you who have been here long enough to have developed some perspective on the total three-

year program would agree that it is in the first year, and specifically in teaching the basic methodology of the profession, that our most important work is done. If our teaching and learning can be improved at this level, the improvement will be felt in the second and third years as well. I have hoped that we would be able to begin the small-group program during the next academic year. It now appears, however, that out staff will not be adequate. Even if we cannot implement the program fully next year, we may be able to divide the class into three sections, thereby reducing significantly the size of each instructional group.

Over-riding all of these particulars is the need for a clearer articulation of the objectives that we pursue in the first year program, and for explicit assignments to various courses of responsibility for working toward those objectives. I think our current program is working toward many of these objectives in a variety of ways. We hope, however, to be able to sharpen our perception of objectives and thereby accellerate our progress in achieving them.

A number of years ago, through the generosity of Mr. Herman Krannert and the Inland Container Foundation, this School was permitted to carry out an experiment which you know as the Legal Techniques program. The time now has come, in the view of the faculty, when the results of that experiment should be reviewed and assessed. In discussing this matter casually with some students, I have noted a disposition to speak in terms of the abondonment of the Legal Techniques program. That terminology is inaccurate and regrettable. We <u>are not</u> in the process of abandoning the Legal Techniques program. What we are doing is examining in depth an educational experiment, assessing the contribution it has made to the on-going program of the School, and taking those parts that have established their merits and making them even more prominently featured parts of the curriculum. This development will be reflected in the conversion of certain of the elements in the present Legal Techniques program into separate courses that will stand on their own feet and will be taught by regular members of the faculty, though in some instances with the assistance of Teaching Associates. For example, experience with the Legal Techniques program has shown the importance of an emphasis on the planning function that lawyers perform for their clients. It therefore seems probable that out of the current review and reassessment will come a course in Business Planning. The importance of instruction in trial and appellate practice has also been demonstrated, and I think we will see established regular courses dealing with this important professional subject matter.

There are certain other needs in the development of our curriculum that I think can be identified readily enough. I mentioned earlier the important range of legal problems associated with the rampant urbanization that now is going on in this country. We need to devote more time and attention to the important problems of structure and process for handling the complex problems of local government: problems of land use control, air and water pollution, provision of legal services to the disadvantaged, etc. We need to do much more with various legal aspects of the conservation, control, and development of natural resources. We need to re-emphasize the importance of our work in the field of family law. We

need in all of our curricular development to utilize more fully the insights and the methodologies of the behaviorial sciences. Instruction in this School will in the future, I think, be increasingly aware that a legal order does not exist in a vacuum, that legal norms become meaningless or irrelevant of they are studied only in the flat plane of positive law. They must be related constantly to the society they are to serve, to its entire social, economic, and political fabric. Finally, we need to develop more opportunities for our students to have what we may call clinical experience. The clinical opportunity can be fruitful, but it presents certain dangers as well. We want to develop such opportunities and give them their proper place in the curriculum, without permitting them to take a dominant role in our teaching program. We realize that law students look with some envy on their friends in medical school who get to walk around in a white jacket, with a stethoscope around the neck, and occasionally to look at a patient or a cadaver. We want to provide comparable clinical experience for law students - to let you see what a client looks like, to see a number of the roles which lawyers play or should play, and some of the variety of settings in which lawyers have the opportunity to render their professional services.

In summary, our objective in all that we do with the curriculum is to make it more responsive to social and professional needs. In doing that, we hope to make it more stimulative of your best efforts through the full three years of your study with us.

May I turn now from the curriculum to the student body itself. In general, our admission policy in the past has been non-selective. It is not difficult to understand why that policy had been followed. This School is supported fully by the taxpayers of the State of Indiana. They have provided us a fine building which until recently was not used to capacity. Reasonable arguments could be advanced for the view that we should admit all applicants who wanted to come, even though we might have some doubts of the qualification of some. Under this policy virtually all applicants had an opportunity, within the School itself, to demonstrate their capacity for the study of law. The price paid for this opportunity, in heavy first year losses, was high, however. The current demand for admission to the School now precludes this admissions policy. Our student body has doubled approximately in the past five years. Our physical facilities are being used beyond the capacity ascribed to them when they were constructed. We are, therefore, confronted by the absolute necessity of a more selective admissions policy. I think we ought to view the change, however, not only as a necessity but as an opportunity as well.

The primary criteria we are using for evaluating applications are the undergraduate record and the Law School Admission Test score. We have tabulated nine years of experience with these criteria. By using both factors in a multiple regression, we can make a fairly reliable prediction of how applicants with various combinations of average and score would perform in their first year in this School. In applying a selective admissions policy, we will work from the applications supported by the best credentials down the scale, until we have filled the number of places available in the first year class. With the increased number and, I think, improved quality of applications, it will inevitably be more

difficult to be admitted in the future than it has been in the past.

As I said earlier, the new policy reflects both a necessity and an opportunity. It provides an opportunity, we hope, to reduce considerably the waste of time and resources, the disappointment and distress of the heavy academic attrition that has characterized the first year in the past. At the same time, we hope to improve the quality of the educational experience within the School and the quality of the product we turn out. In this way the School can contribute to an improvement in the quality of legal services available to the community.

I turn now to another important aspect of our work this year. I have been concerned by several aspects of the academic regulations as they now exist. I am concerned by their form, for the simple reason that they are very difficult to discover and know. They are very difficult for the Dean to find, they are more difficult for the faculty to find, and, I suspect, they are almost impossible for students to find. They may appear in a faculty minute of several years ago or in small print somewhere in the Bulletin. Consequently, it seems to me, we have a significant problem of fair notice of the ground rules of the enterprise.

In addition, however, there are, I think, inadequacies of substance in the current academic regulations. My concern can be stated in the form of a question: "Are the standards we are applying appropriate for a school that thinks of itself as a good law school and that aspires to be a truly excellent law school?" I don't think they are. We are therefore taking steps to review and revise our academic regulations. Largely through the efforts of Professor Reed Dickerson, we have prepared a carefully worked out code of the existing regulations. This includes specific rules that have been laid down at some point in the history of the School, as well as administrative practice as it has developed over the years. In the near future, this code will be submitted to faculty committees for study and for reports to the full faculty on any changes that should be made.

What are the areas in which change is most likely to be made by the faculty this year? First, I would mention our grading system. We use, as you know, a system of letter grades. I think it is timely to determine, if we can, whether the faculty is in agreement on the meaning of each grade. One of the most ambiguous is the "D" grade. What level of achievement does a "D" represent? I have detected, I think, a view among some of my colleagues that a "D" is the minimum satisfactory grade, in other words, that it reflects a quality of performance more commonly represented by a "C". Now it is possible to define a "D" or any other grade in any way we wish. It is necessary, however, that we agree on the meaning of grades so that that meaning can be communicated accurately to persons outside the school.

I am troubled also by the fact that some of our grade categories are extremely broad. The "C" category is the most striking example. I can assure you that the difference between the "C" that is just barely out of the bog of "D-dom" is as different as night is from day from the "C" that is almost a "B". I cannot avoid the belief that a law faculty ought to be able to refine its grading categories so as to take appropriate

account of this difference. There is a variety of routes along which we might seek improvement. Perhaps we should move to a numerical grading system that avoids most of the problems of broad categorization. Or perhaps it would be preferable to develop somewhat more refined letter grade categories. At this stage, I suggest only possible approaches, because the faculty has not yet studied the problem. We will soon do so.

Another important aspect of our regulations concerns academic eligibility. As you know, at this time a student who has an average of 1.4 or above at the end of his first year is eligible to continue at least to the end of the third semester. By that time and thereafter he must have an average of 1.6 to remain in school. Now if you keep in mind that the 2.0 line, a "C" average, is defined as the minimum satisfactory level of performance, you will appreciate that under the current regulation it is possible for a student to enter the school and advance all the way to graduation without having his cumulative average ever reach the minimum satisfactory level. It strikes me forcefully that there is an anomaly here that ought to be resolved. It may be that the appropriate way of resolving it is by redefining our grade levels so that 1.0, a "D" average, is the minimum satisfactory performance. If, in fact, we mean what we now say - that 2.0 is the minimum satisfactory level of performance - I would suggest another kind of change. This change, which I will recommend to the faculty, is that we amend the academic regulations to require a significantly higher average for continued eligibility at the end of the first year and that for graduation we require 80 semester hours of credit with a cumulative average not less than 2.0.

I am doubtful also that the minimum load we now require for status as a full-time student is sufficient. The requirement of 10 semester hours is taken from the minimum standards laid down by the Council of Legal Education and Admission to the Bar of the American Bar Association. I doubt that this minimum should be taken as the appropriate standard for this School. We like to think that this is a school for the full-time study of law. The responsibility for serving the needs of part-time students has been assigned by the University to the Law School in Indianapolis. We do not want to impinge upon its purposes and responsibilities. I will recommend to the faculty, therefore, that the minimum full-time load which a student in this School must carry in order to earn full residence credit for a semester, and which he must carry unless granted a special dispensation, be raised to 12 semester hours.

Another matter of some interest and concern to many of you is our degree nomenclature. As you know, our basic degree is now the LL.B. We give the Juris Doctor degree to those students who enter with a baccalaureate degree and who maintain in this School "a superior academic record". A superior academic record is interpreted by the administrative offices as requiring a cumulative average of 2.45, less than one-half of a point above what is defined as the minimum satisfactory level.

All of you are aware, I am sure, of a trend among the American law schools toward the adoption of the J.D. degree for all graduates. I feel very strongly that we should have uniformity of degree nomenclature, unless

differences in terminology reflect truly significant differences in the work on which the degree is based. One possible difference might be found, of course, in the quality of grades achieved in courses and seminars. One might distinguish between the student who is truly at the honors level of performance, giving him the J.D. degree, and the student below honors level, granting him the LL.B. If this is the basis for distinguishing degrees, however, I wonder if the 2.45 line is defensible for identifying honors-level achievement.

There are a number of ways in which this problem could be approached. I don't know what the spectrum of opinion in the faculty may be. I intend to recommend to the faculty, however, that we conform to the current trend among the law schools and award the J.D. degree to all graduates of this School who enter with a baccalaureate degree, as virtually all now do. Among our graduates, we can recognize honors at appropriate levels either by cum laude, magna cum laude and summa cum laude or, if the Anglophiles prefer, "with honors", "with great honors", "with highest honors".

Let me bring all of these comments about academic regulations together under two general caveats. First, I have been stating to you personal concerns, doubts, and questions. All of these matters await faculty study and faculty action. Second, even if the recommendations I shall make to the faculty should be accepted, it would be necessary to exercise great care in the matter of timing so as to avoid any unfairness to students who are now in the School and who have come to rely on a different set of ground rules. You may be sure that the members of the faculty know how to draft a "grandfather clause". When we make changes, we will be able to time their effectiveness so that no one is unfairly affected.

May I conclude with a few comments on student organizations and activities. In a School like this, organizations perform a variety of functions. Some are professional, some are educational, some are social. Some are necessary functions, and, within certain limits, all are legitimate. Among the organizations there should be at least one with a set of very important characteristics. This one indispensable organization must, first of all, be inclusive. It must make membership available to all students on a non-discriminatory basis. There must be no discrimination and I am not speaking on the basis of race, creed, color, or economic factors; dues must be reasonable. Second, it must be democratic, its leadership responsive and responsible to the membership. Third, it must be vital, carrying out its programs with vigor. Fourth, it must be committed to the best interests of the School and the legal profession.

The one organization at least that possesses these essential characteristics has an important range of functions to perform. It will provide the important student component in the internal government of the School. It will serve as the channel to the faculty for student viewpoints on the needs of the School, and the needs and interests of the student body. And finally, it will sponsor and organize a number of activities of general student interest.

I have tended to think of the Student Bar Association as this primary organization. Ultimately, however, it is up to you, the student body

in the School, to determine whether this is the case. I would suggest that you ask whether it has the four essential characteristics that I suggested. Is it inclusive, democratic, vital and committed? If it is, it can play a major role in the School, and I will lend it every possible support and assistance.

I have made these observations concerning student organizations because of certain complaints about SBA activities that have come to me recently and because of questions about the School's attitude toward the SBA and the legal fraternities. May I say in further response to these complaints and questions that in my view the role of the Law School with respect to student conduct outside the School is very limited indeed. I am not and I don't think my colleagues are called upon to police the private conduct of our students. If, therefore, a student acts in his private capacity, or if he acts as a member of a private group or organization, then it is my view that his activities do not fall within the purview of the School's responsibility. I or the faculty may have reactions on the basis of taste or good manners. There may be questions of groups compliance with the law by individuals or groups. But these standards do not call upon the School for enforcement. If an organization claims for itself a special role within the School, however, then I think the School is entitled to ask the organization whether it possesses the essential characteristics I mentioned earlier. Is it inclusive, democratic, vital, and committed? When I use the term "committed" in this context, I mean committed to high standards of professional conduct, integrity and responsibility. If such standards are not met by a particular group, it cannot claim exculpation on the ground that its questioned activities are hallowed by tradition.

In conclusion, may I say that we have great aspirations and great ambitions for this School - aspirations and ambitions that I hope very much you will share with the faculty and strongly support not only while you are here but after you become alumni. We look to the improvement of a sound program of basic legal education - one that will qualify the graduates of this School for distinguished practice in any jurisdiction in the country. We look to the development of new programs only insofar as they do not prejudice our basic objective and can be related to the needs of a rapidly changing society in a shrinking world. The School has needs, some of them great. We must continue to enlarge the faculty as candidates of top-quality can be found. Our student body must be and, I can assure you, will be improved. The curriculum is being subjected to a searching examination and will be significantly improved. Our physical plant is now being used at capacity, and we have begun the planning of new facilities to accommodate a growing library, additional faculty offices, and seminar rooms. Our objective is a School of which the State of Indiana, this University, our alumni, students, and faculty can be proud. In order to attain that objective, we need the understanding and support not only of the faculty but of you as well.

Thank you very much. If you have any questions, I would be glad to try to respond to them.

(A question and discussion period followed.)