



School of Law
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Prepare.
Connect.
Lead.

Digital Commons @ University of Georgia School of Law

[Other Law School Publications](#)

[Digital Archives](#)

1-31-1989

Strategic Plan for the School of Law

C. Ronald Ellington

University of Georgia School of Law

Repository Citation

Ellington, C. Ronald, "Strategic Plan for the School of Law" (1989). *Other Law School Publications*. 74.
https://digitalcommons.law.uga.edu/lectures_pre_arch_archives_other/74

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Digital Archives at Digital Commons @ University of Georgia School of Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Other Law School Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of Georgia School of Law. [Please share how you have benefited from this access](#) For more information, please contact tstriepe@uga.edu.

STRATEGIC PLAN
FOR THE
SCHOOL OF LAW

C. Ronald Ellington
Dean

January 31, 1989

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. Executive Summary	1
II. Introduction.	5
A. The Silver Anniversary of a Remarkable Commitment.	5
B. The Crossroads.	8
C. Investing in Success.	11
III. Current Demands on the Law School And Why They Must Be Met.	12
A. Additional state resources are necessary to get the Law School's budget into equilibrium to fund the current level of operations and to make up the shortfall caused by the reduction in income available from private endowments.	12
B. Unless the Law School receives substantial additional resources to improve faculty salaries, the institution's ability to attract and keep the best mid-level and senior-level faculty members will erode, the phenomenon of salary compaction will worsen, and the School's Legal Research and Writing Program will be unable to attract competent instructors for this critical aspect of the first-year curriculum	14
C. The Law School must move aggressively, like many of its regional and national peers, to equip faculty members with the personal computing resources necessary to access electronic legal databases, analyze research materials, prepare papers, and experiment with emerging educational technologies such as interactive video systems.	19
D. The Law School should hire a fourth instructor for the Legal Research and Writing Program so that each of the instructors in this vital component of the first-year curriculum can provide individualized instruction.	22

	<u>Page</u>
E. The Law School should improve student counseling and placement services by adding an Assistant Director for Legal Career Services.	23
F. As a key component of the Law School's role as a national center for the study of international and comparative law, additional funding must be obtained for graduate assistantships for the LL.M. program.	25
G. The Law Library must be rebuilt to serve the needs of the Law School's faculty and students and the legal community in the Twenty-First Century	28
H. The Law School should upgrade instructional equipment to take advantage of new technology . .	37
I. The Law School should improve the present Law building by remodeling and renovation	39
J. A state appropriation should be sought to fund the planned addition to the Law School . . .	42
IV. New Directions	43
A. The Law School should refine its curriculum to achieve a better balance of theory, doctrine, and skills training to meet the needs of students who will be practicing law at the dawn of the Twenty-First Century . . .	43
B. The Law School should increase its emphasis on research by providing faculty members with additional research time during the nine-month academic year and by institutionalizing a Faculty Workshop.	45
C. The Law School should expand its student services by naming an Assistant Dean for Student Affairs and by creating additional opportunities for students to meet and come to know practicing lawyers and judges in contexts allowing for frank discussion of the obligations and rewards of membership in the profession	47

	<u>Page</u>
V. Sources of Funding to Meet Current Demands and New Directions	48
VI. Summary of Law School Priorities	52
A. No New Funding.	52
B. Five Percent Increase in New Funding.	53
C. Ten Percent Increase in New Funding.	54
D. The Law Library	55
Appendix.	

I. Executive Summary

The improvement of the Law School over the past twenty-five years has been a remarkable story of success. To preserve the Law School's hard-won progress and to achieve the goal of moving it into the front ranks of this country's great law schools will require a renewed commitment to its sustained excellence and a substantial enhancement of both private and state resources.

The Law School will need some \$125,000 in additional state funding for FY90 to get its budget into equilibrium and to maintain its present level of operations. Assuming funding then at the level currently projected, but no additional new resources, the Law School would concentrate its attention on enriching and reshaping incrementally its educational program to achieve an appropriate mix of both theory and skills courses with its already strong core of traditional doctrinal offerings to prepare its graduates for the demands of the legal profession in the Twenty-First Century. Simultaneously, the Law School would pursue the goal of institutionalizing a greater research ethos by seeking ways to meet instructional demands while offering faculty members more opportunities for research through release time from teaching.

Assuming a five percent increase in funding, the Law School would concentrate the new resources in excess of the \$125,000 required to balance the budget at the current level of operations on ameliorating the acute problem of faculty salary compaction, particularly at the mid-level range, and upgrading

the salaries of its legal writing instructors. The remainder of any new resources would be devoted to continuing the program of equipping faculty offices with personal computers and modems to access electronic databases.

With a ten percent enhancement of new funds, the Law School would meet the priority needs indicated above and concentrate the additional new resources to support its educational and research mission in three areas:

First, it would continue to devote a lion's share of new resources to improving faculty salaries to make the Law School's salary scale more competitive with peer institutions and to supporting faculty research efforts by expanding access to electronic legal research databases and other new information databases like Nexis.

Second, the Law School would increase from three to four the number of instructors working with the first-year class on Legal Research and Writing to reduce these class sizes and permit more frequent and more carefully critiqued written exercises to improve critical writing skills. The Law School would begin to tap the new instructional technology by acquiring for classroom use interactive videodisc equipment.

Finally, the Law School would respond to the many-fold increase in the demand for services and programs offered its students by its Office of Legal Career Services by adding as a new position an Assistant Director.

With applications to law schools again on the rise, the Law School can expect to enroll a highly-qualified group of students and meet its enrollment goal of an entering class of 200 students and a total J.D. enrollment of more than 600. The allocation of new resources outlined here at the level of a ten percent enhancement will enable the Law School to strengthen its educational program and compete for and retain a strong faculty. It will spur an improvement in the faculty's scholarly research productivity--a measure along with student quality--that largely determines a law school's national standing.

The Law Library presents a special case. It is the laboratory of the Law School and the centerpiece of its educational and research activities. One of the University's declared goals in the Special Funding Initiative and one of the Law School's goals in the Third Century Campaign is to add resources to stem the decline and then to restore the national standing of the Law Library. This will require new funding well above even the \$100,000 enhancement assumed by a ten percent increase in funding for the Law Library. At a minimum an additional \$50,000 each year for the next five years will be required to purchase books and provide the new information technology of expanded electronic databases for legal research. Moreover, some \$250,000 will be required over the next five years to add one bay each year of compact shelving to house the Library's growing collection. Finally, a grant from a private source or funds provided through the Special Funding Initiative

must be obtained to computerize the operations of the Law Library, beginning with the public catalog. As a matter of fairness and equity, the salary scale of the law librarians must be improved if we are to retain the services of these dedicated employees. None of these needs can be left unmet because they are all critical if the Law Library is to improve on its current ranking and serve the educational and research mission of the Law School and the University of which we are a part.

Several of the aspirational goals expressed in the Strategic Plan will require either reallocation of existing instructional resources or major restructuring of the curriculum. These changes, as well as a discussion of the nature of the legal educational program, are presented in the Appendix.

II. Introduction

A. The Silver Anniversary of a Remarkable Commitment

In 1964, the leaders of the state, the University, and the Law School pledged themselves to the attainment of an ambitious goal: "The University of Georgia School of Law is . . . to be one of such excellence that no citizen of Georgia need ever leave [the] state because a superior legal education is available elsewhere." These founders of the modern Law School began with bricks and mortar, giving the school an elegant and functional physical plant. They then increased substantially the public and private resources available for attracting a strong faculty and talented student body, for building an impressive library collection, and for establishing student periodicals, lawyering skills programs, and the other vital ingredients of a first-rate educational program. Over the years, the founders and those who have come after them have remained faithful to the original objective, continuing and enhancing public and private support for the school.

The Law School has used the resources well. The 1964 faculty of ten has become a faculty of more than thirty, with a record of research productivity eclipsed only by the nation's most prestigious schools. In a 1983 study, the Journal of Legal Education ranked the University of Georgia law faculty twentieth among all schools in the nation in contributions to the ten most respected journals, and eighth in the nation among state-assisted

schools. No endowed professorships supported the faculty in 1964. In 1988, most of the senior members of the faculty hold named professorships at least partially supported by endowment income.

Twenty-five years ago, the Law School received 256 applications for enrollment, virtually all from Georgia residents. Last year the school received 1,559 applications, including 927 from nonresidents, and enrolled a class of 249 with a median LSAT score of 37 and a median undergraduate GPA of 3.28. National survey figures are not yet available for the 1988 entering class, but the class that entered the Law School in the fall of 1987 ranked in the top 20 percent nationally, measured in terms of median LSAT score.

The 1988 entering class is 27 percent nonresident, 37 percent female, and 10 percent black.

In 1964, no scholarship money was available for the student body. This year the Law School will distribute \$378,000 in scholarships to 139 students.

Although many respected law schools never have sent graduates to serve as law clerks for United States Supreme Court justices, three University of Georgia law graduates have clerked on the Court in the past decade.

The Law Library currently ranks twenty-seventh among all American law school libraries in holdings.

Now in its twenty-third year, the Georgia Law Review has become a nationally respected professional journal, especially in

the field of legal philosophy, and its younger sister, the Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law, has emerged as a leading periodical in its field. The moot court and mock trial programs give hundreds of students experience in lawyering skills. The Law School's competitive teams routinely finish at the top in regional and national competitions. Last week, the University of Georgia finished among the top eight schools in the country in the New York finals of the National Moot Court Competition, and law students from the University of Georgia have reached the final four in the competition three times since the early 1970s.

In 1964, Georgia's destiny as a major participant in an increasingly interdependent world economy remained largely unrealized, but in the intervening years, as that destiny has become reality, the Law School has kept pace through the establishment of the Dean Rusk Center for International and Comparative Law. The School has reshaped its Master of Laws degree into a highly selective program of advanced study for foreign legal academics and lawyers, and for American law students who want to understand better both American law and its relationship to the legal systems of other nations.

The Law School might properly be called a law "center" because, in addition to the Rusk Center, it is home to a legal aid clinic, a prosecutorial clinic, a prisoner legal counseling program, and to a pair of independent but affiliated organizations--the Institute of Continuing Legal Education and

the Institute of Continuing Judicial Education--that provide continuing professional education to Georgia's lawyers and judges.

In 1977, the great progress achieved by the Law School since 1964 received important national recognition when the School was awarded a chapter in the Order of the Coif, the national honorary organization often described as the Phi Beta Kappa of legal education. In 1985, after completing a sabbatical inspection of the Law School, a site evaluation committee representing the Section of Legal Education of the American Bar Association wrote that "there is little room for doubt that Georgia has arrived."

B. The Crossroads

Today, after twenty-five years of hard-won progress, the Law School stands at a crossroads. Without substantial additional state and private resources, the School cannot move permanently into the front ranks of American legal education, standing with the University of Virginia and the University of Texas as the preeminent state-supported schools in the South. Instead, the School's steady improvement since 1964 will come to an end, and its competitive position will begin quickly to erode.

In some areas, slippage already has begun. The Law Library is the only one in the nation's top thirty that is not computerized. Moreover, the Law Library's national ranking has dropped eight places in nine years because its annual budget for acquisitions ranks well down the list of American law schools.

President Knapp has responded to this urgent need already by adding \$50,000 to the Law Library's original budget for this year and adding another \$50,000 by amendment to try to arrest the decline.

The Law School's ability to attract and keep the best teachers and scholars in the 1990s will depend on its ability to offer competitive faculty salaries. In absolute terms, law faculty salaries have improved dramatically since 1964. But the salaries offered by the Law School's regional and national competitors have improved as well, and the relative standing of the Law School's salary structure remains disturbingly low.

A new salary problem--salary compaction--has emerged in the 1980s. Because of a bidding war initiated by private law firms for the most talented new law school graduates, the Law School will be forced to pay unprecedented salaries to attract the ablest starting assistant professors. These salaries will be roughly equal to the salaries earned by senior associate professors and young full professors--veterans of a decade or more in teaching.

To meet the expectations of the University and its sponsoring society, this Law School like its peers must operate as a microcosm of the University, with its own offices for student recruitment and admissions, registration and student records, career counseling and summer and permanent job placement, alumni relations and development, and public information. With no help any longer from the Graduate School,

the Law School provides four graduate assistantships for its LL.M. students. Tens of thousands of dollars must be spent each year to support the activities of the student periodicals and other co-curricular activities. These functions, and other operations that mean the difference between an ordinary institution and a law school of real distinction, require more resources each year than the Law School's original operating budget provides, forcing the school to count on vacant faculty positions or the University's willingness and capacity to make additional funds temporarily available through budget amendments to make up the difference. Among the chronic problems caused by this budget disequilibrium is the school's inability to bring in distinguished visitors from other institutions to cover courses when law faculty members take leave to visit elsewhere.

Many law schools, recognizing the profound impact of the personal computer on the way work gets done, both in the academy generally and in the legal profession in particular, have moved aggressively to provide their faculty members with these modern tools of research, writing, and teaching. At many of the Law School's peer institutions, faculty members routinely access the two important legal databases, Lexis and WestLaw, from their office desks. The Law School has made only the most modest start toward computerizing faculty offices.

The Law School also must do better in providing faculty members with the time to be productive scholars, following the lead of the School's regional and national competitors by

reducing average teaching course loads so that faculty members can devote themselves more fully to research.

Like other schools, the Law School teaches well the doctrinal materials that form the core of the discipline. The Law School's peer institutions have expanded their offerings to include interdisciplinary, theoretical perspectives and enhanced training in lawyering skills. Both as a matter of sound educational practice, and to keep pace with its competitors, the Law School must act more aggressively to broaden and enrich its educational program and to devote greater resources to upgrading and strengthening instruction in writing.

C. Investing in Success

The time has come for a renewed commitment to the goal that animated the founders of the modern Law School. Over the past quarter century, the School has demonstrated that investments in its future are wise investments that will pay dividends well into the future as class upon class of its graduates leave Athens to go on to positions of leadership and importance in the state and nation in both private practice and public service. Additional resources in amounts that would have little relative impact if divided equally across the whole of the University can transform the Law School and enable it to become a preeminent regional and national center of legal education.

III. Current Demands on the Law School and Why They Must Be Met

- A. Additional state resources are necessary to get the Law School's budget into equilibrium to fund the current level of operations and to make up the shortfall caused by the reduction in income available from private endowments.

The Law School's top priority and most pressing need is to get its budget into equilibrium to meet the realistic costs of funding its current level of operations without continued dependence on faculty taking leave and to replace with new state dollars the private dollars that are no longer available from endowment income but are counted in the present salaries of senior faculty.

For years the Law School has depended on savings generated from vacant faculty positions to meet its actual current operating expenses that are nearly double the amount initially allocated annually in the budget for operating supplies and expenses. These are the intrinsic costs that the Law School must meet to sustain the vital operations of admissions and student recruitment, career counseling and placement, student records, alumni relations and development, public information, student scholarly journals, a graduate program, and a program of student co-curricular skills training and endeavors.

Compounding this problem is the reduction in private income available to pay faculty salaries as a consequence of the University of Georgia Foundation's decision in the spring of 1987 to set a spending ceiling on endowment income (based on a

declining percentage of the amount of the corpus of each endowment account) so that the annual earnings above this figure can be plowed back into the corpus to preserve the value of the endowment over time against inflation. With a ceiling on spending set at six and one-half percent of corpus for FY90 and six percent of corpus for FY91 and beyond, it is projected that a total of \$140,000 in new funds will be needed to replace fully the private dollars for salary that will no longer be available.

About one-half of this amount can be obtained by drawing down accumulated income in certain of the endowment accounts. In other accounts there is no accumulated income to utilize to supplement the available current income, and for these professorships some \$72,000 in new state funds will be needed to meet present salary obligations.

To cover the immediate shortfall of \$72,000 in private income available for faculty salaries and to meet the actual costs of operating the Law School at its present level will require at a minimum \$125,000 in additional state support in FY90. This figure is not any higher because of internal reallocations already planned by the Law School for FY90. With the plan that was approved this fall to hire two new assistant professors for next year to replace several senior faculty members who are slated to retire, the Law School will be reallocating from faculty to non-personnel support the savings resulting from the replacement of senior, higher-paid faculty with entry-level, lower-paid faculty along with the net reduction

of one faculty member when compared to the number of faculty five years ago. This internal reallocation is a significant step toward curing the chronic budget deficit otherwise projected and which last year reached \$200,000.

It is simply imperative to bring the Law School budget into equilibrium so that a dependable base of resources is in place to meet the actual costs of the present programs and so that in the future vacant faculty positions can be used to bring in visitors and new faculty rather than to fund essential services. And, in the longer term it is highly desirable, if the Law School is to realize its goal of preeminence, to add to the state bases of all the existing chairs and special professorships so that the private income available from endowment accounts can really be used as salary supplements to attract and retain top faculty and not merely as components of a basic salary that such faculty could command at any good school.

- B. Unless the Law School receives substantial additional resources to improve faculty salaries, the institution's ability to attract and keep the best mid-level and senior-level faculty members will erode, the phenomenon of salary compaction will worsen, and the School's Legal Research and Writing Program will be unable to attract competent instructors for this critical aspect of the first-year curriculum.**

1. The Salary Revolution and Its Consequences

In the 1980s, a bidding war initiated by private law firms for the best young law school graduates transformed the market for entry-level faculty. Law schools must be prepared to offer

new assistant professors salaries roughly double the salaries that would have been competitive a decade ago, or risk losing the brightest teaching prospects to the private sector. Statistics compiled by the Law School's placement office illustrate the unprecedented escalation in starting salaries. In 1978, the highest starting salary reported by a member of the graduating class was \$28,000. In 1988, the figure was \$55,000, an increase of 96 percent in ten years.

The Law School cannot afford not to keep pace, but offering new recruits salaries competitive with the salaries they would earn in private practice causes a serious compaction problem. The median salary for associate professors in the Law School is \$55,650. The median for law faculty members who received their degrees between six and fifteen years ago is \$57,500. To compete for the best young talent, the Law School must offer starting assistant professors nine-month salaries only slightly below these medians, so that in their first year the recruits will be making approximately the same salaries as faculty veterans with a decade or more of service. Avoiding this compaction problem by improving mid-level and senior-level salaries must be a high priority if the Law School is to keep its most talented veterans.

2. The Law School and Its Peers

Despite substantial improvement in faculty salaries over the past decade, accomplished primarily through a redistribution of

state dollars made possible by the infusion of new endowment resources at the senior level, the Law School's overall salary structure is relatively low when measured against the salaries offered by peer institutions.

The following tables illustrate the Law School's competitive disadvantage:

**Median Salaries for Full Professors
1988 American Bar Association Survey**

Virginia	\$94,000
Vanderbilt	90,000
Illinois	90,000
Duke	87,000
FSU	82,000
Florida	81,500
Tulane	81,000
UGA	76,200

**Median Salaries for Associate Professors
1988 American Bar Association Survey**

Duke	\$68,000
Vanderbilt	67,150
Virginia	65,300
Florida	64,500
Tulane	61,750
FSU	61,000
Illinois	56,000
UGA	55,650

Unless resources can be found to increase the median salary for full professors at the Law School by approximately \$8,000 and for associate professors by approximately \$10,000, the Law School will begin to lose outstanding faculty members to other schools and will find increasingly out-of-reach the strategy of strengthening the faculty by selective lateral hiring.

3. Legal Writing Skills Instructors

An especially disturbing feature of the Law School's salary structure is the very low salary paid to legal research and writing instructors. The University of Georgia ranks seventy-third among the seventy-seven reporting schools in this area in the most recent survey by the American Bar Association. The Georgia median salary of \$20,500 falls \$6,500 below the national median. Legal research and writing courses teach skills vital to success in law school and in practice. The Law School cannot afford to continue paying its instructors salaries well below what the instructors might earn at other institutions and less than one-half the salary available for young law graduates in the private sector and hope to retain or hire well-qualified instructors.

4. Summer Research Support

One way to make salary packages more competitive and to keep pace with peer schools in supporting research is to provide greater support for summer research grants. The effective salary gap between the Law School and its peers is wider than the tables of median salaries would suggest because the tables exclude summer compensation. The Law School's summer stipends for research and teaching, with standard amounts of \$4,000 for research and \$7,500 for eight weeks of teaching, fall far short of the most generous programs at other schools and considerably short of the average.

At the University of Florida, for example, every faculty member may choose to teach or not to teach in the summer. State money is used to provide summer research stipends of 15.3 percent of the nine-month base (\$9,180 for a professor earning \$60,000 for nine months). For teaching, the rate is 22 percent of the nine-month salary (\$13,200 for a professor earning \$60,000 for ninth months) as compensation for a six-and-a-half-week summer term.

At the University of Illinois, faculty members are paid \$9,000 for teaching a five-week course in one half of the summer term. Summer research stipends of \$6,000 are awarded for eight weeks of research in residence. The bulk of the research stipends are financed by private endowment income and alumni annual giving. This past summer, for the first time, the University of Illinois was unable to provide summer teaching or research to all who applied, but covered twenty-one of twenty-five requests.

Vanderbilt pays \$7,000 for summer research. Faculty members must submit research proposals, and future awards are tied to summer productivity. All full-time faculty members on the tenure track are eligible, and this past summer 80 percent of the faculty received summer research stipends.

Among other law schools in the region, the University of Alabama and Emory University offer members of their law faculties \$6,000 research stipends, and the University of North Carolina provides \$5,000 per project.

Summer research grants or summer teaching opportunities are today commonplace at good law schools. A program of providing summer research grants underscores the institution's commitment to research and protects against the danger that faculty on nine-month contracts who must go to private firms for employment each summer will become enmeshed in lucrative private consulting to the detriment of the long-term good of the educational program of the School.

- C. The Law School must move aggressively, like many of its regional and national peers, to equip faculty members with the personal computing resources necessary to access electronic legal databases, analyze research materials, prepare papers, and experiment with emerging educational technologies such as interactive video systems.

In the 1980s the Law School made considerable progress in computerizing the administrative operations of the School with the acquisition of an IBM System 36 and software designed specially to handle its budgetary needs and microcomputers and off-the-shelf software for database management, spreadsheet work, and word processing for other operations like admissions, placement, and student records. The administrative offices of the Law School will continue to rely primarily on microcomputers in the years ahead to meet these internal needs rather than on minicomputers or the University's mainframe.

Over the next few years the Law School will have to allocate funds within its budget to upgrade the capabilities of the microcomputers already in place. Such peripherals as optical scanners for more efficient data input should be acquired and

additional hard disk space already may be necessary in some offices. Some of the older machines will undoubtedly have to be replaced in the next five years by more powerful, 386-based machines. The Law School must continue work on a plan to install a local area network linking the microcomputers in various administrative offices such as admissions and student records together.

The most pressing hardware and software needs of the Law School now, however, lie outside the administrative domain. The Law School must give priority to addressing the computer needs of faculty and students in such areas as word processing, computer-based research, computer-assisted instruction, and electronic communications.

At present, the Law School lags behind peer institutions in providing computer resources for faculty and students. Over the next few years, the Law School should complete a program of purchasing microcomputers for faculty offices and add to the number of microcomputers available for student use in the Law Library.

In the longer run, the Law School should realize some savings in personnel costs by providing law faculty members with computers. Faculty members who use computers should have less need of secretarial support. Thus, the Law School over time should be able to reduce at least marginally the size of the secretarial support staff as faculty members come to rely on

their computers as word processors for the preparation of manuscripts.

In today's world, it is critically important to provide law faculty members with the means of accessing conveniently the now vital computer-based electronic research services like Lexis and WestLaw. With computers in their offices, faculty members will be able to dial up these services as the need arises, rather than having to wait in line for the limited terminal facilities now available in the Law Library. Moreover, computers will allow law faculty to access the Nexis service and other more general databases in order to conduct research in areas where the law has not yet developed.

In the 1990s, electronic mail will become a valuable means of communication for research collaborators. Faculty members should be given the means to use electronic mail easily.

Student computing requirements generally mirror faculty requirements, particularly in the areas of word processing and legal research. But students also will need access to computer stations to make use of computer-assisted instructional materials, including interactive video, to carry out class assignments as well as self-teaching exercises. This goal is discussed more fully in the Appendix as a function of how current instructional demand justifies the expansion of faculty and student computer services.

- D. The Law School should hire a fourth instructor for the Legal Research and Writing Program so that each of the instructors in this vital component of the first-year curriculum can provide individualized instruction.

For a number of years the Law School has employed three full-time instructors who are law graduates to train first-year students in legal research and to work to improve their writing skills. This year, with an entering class of 249 students, each instructor was called on to work with a group of more than eighty students in a program that ideally should involve frequent writing assignments, detailed critiques and feedback, and re-writing. The class interaction necessary to improve writing skills and analysis is simply not possible when teachers must work with groups of eighty students, or even with sixty-five to seventy students, in a normal first-year section.

One of the Law School's priorities must be to improve the first-year writing program by increasing the number of instructors from three to four. If the targeted entering class of 200 is met, then each instructor can work with a section of about fifty first-year students, making more frequent written exercises feasible. This additional position should also make it possible to realign responsibilities internally to designate one instructor to work closely with students who have been identified as having academic difficulties as well as to continue the current program of providing instruction in legal research techniques and sources of law for our foreign-trained graduate students in the LL.M. program.

Without encumbering any new resources, the Law School has already worked to improve the students' research and writing skills. After their first year, students must complete a significant research and writing project overseen by tenure-track faculty, as a condition of graduation. This requirement can be met through an existing seminar or through a supervised research offering. Given the other instructional demands on the tenure-track faculty and the need to continue to call on these faculty members to supervise the research and writing projects of students in the second and third years of law school, it is necessary to obtain additional resources to increase by one the number of instructors working with the first-year class. This goal is discussed more fully in the Appendix as a function of how current instructional demand justifies expansion of personnel in the legal research and writing program.

E. The Law School should improve student counseling and placement services by adding an Assistant Director for Legal Career Services.

Activities at the School of Law related to student job placement, a service uniquely required of all law schools by the American Bar Association for accreditation, have increased tenfold in the past eleven years. This remarkable feat has been accomplished with no addition to the school's placement staff. The ever-increasing workload created by the popularity and successes of our placement programs endangers, however, the office's continued effectiveness. The Law School now needs an

Assistant Director for Legal Career Services, a new position, to assure continued program success and growth.

Justification for this new position is based on sheer volume of services now provided and on the reasonable expectation of future growth based on the history of the office's development. Ten years ago, for example, the law placement office concerned itself only with third-year students seeking permanent jobs after graduation. Today, as more and more law firms make permanent job offers based on student performance in summer clerkships with their firms, the law placement office is concerned with the second and even first-year student job market as well, doubling the number of "in-house" clients served by the office.

As the number of student clients increased, services provided by the placement office increased to meet their needs. For example, more than 3,305 job notices were posted by the office last year, including almost 200 on-campus interviews, compared to the 282 job notices posted and 70 on-campus interviews scheduled in 1976-77.

When the Placement Office, now the Office of Legal Career Services, was created eleven years ago, the Law School participated in only one "special program," the Southeastern Law Placement Consortium (SELPC). Today, in addition to continued active participation in and chairmanship of SELPC, the Office of Legal Career Services supports nine other special career recruiting programs, including recruitment programs designed specifically for the minority student. The office has also

instituted numerous other services including the operation of student message boxes (which provides the student and potential employer an efficient means of communication), the publication of a Placement Directory (which is sent to potential employers of second and third-year students and provides an academic resume and photograph of each student), and the publication of a periodic Alumni Job Placement Newsletter for our graduates who may be seeking a change of employment. In addition, the office issues detailed quarterly placement office reports (updates on student employment statistics) and prepares an Orientation Booklet for second and third-year students.

More than 600 current students and hundreds of our recent law graduates have come to depend on the excellence of our placement program to provide assistance in negotiating the "rite of passage" between school and employment. The addition of a full-time Assistant Director of Legal Career Services is long overdue and would lessen the strain on the current staff and director created by the extraordinary growth of this very important program and service.

- F. As a key component of the Law School's role as a national center for the study of international and comparative law, additional funding must be obtained for graduate assistantships for the LL.M. program.

The Law School's justifiably proud claim to stand as a nationally-acclaimed center of excellence in international and comparative law rests on a number of related factors. The first

factor is certainly the reputation of its faculty working in this area dating back to the appointment of former Secretary of State Dean Rusk to the faculty in 1969 and further strengthened by the appointment of Dr. Louis B. Sohn as Woodruff Professor. Another factor has been the establishment of the Dean Rusk Center for International and Comparative Law, now under the direction of Thomas J. Schoenbaum, that operates a variety of programs in this area. The Rusk Center publishes monographs, articles, books, reports and newsletters on various aspects of international law and trade, and provides a source of expertise, documentation, and up-to-date knowledge concerning matters relating to international business law, public and private international law, international trade and investment, maritime law, international environmental law, international security, and comparative law.

The mission of the Rusk Center includes conducting research and preparing policy studies on specific problems facing governmental officials and private sector leaders to promote economic development through international trade and to increase our citizens' understanding of the world by organizing conferences, seminars, study courses, and lectures. Increasingly, the Rusk Center has become a vehicle for bringing to the Law School distinguished visiting scholars to teach mini-courses of less than a full semester and to engage in research. It has sought to arrange opportunities for the faculty of the Law School to visit for short stays at foreign universities in Great Britain and on the Continent.

The Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law is another reason that the Law School enjoys an outstanding reputation in the area of international law. The Law School underwrites through its budget the annual cost of about \$14,000 to publish this scholarly journal, over and beyond budgeted secretarial support.

The final dimension that must exist to maintain our national standing in this area is a strong graduate program leading to the Master of Laws (LL.M.) degree. Under the direction of Professor Gabriel Wilner, the Director of Graduate Legal Studies, the Law School has developed a program of study that brings a small number of exceptionally well-qualified academics and lawyers from other countries who have been trained in other legal systems to the Law School for an intensive year of work in American law and the preparation of a thesis. These foreign students help to "internationalize" the experience of American students in the Juris Doctor program and their presence here begins to build bridges of contact between young lawyers across national boundaries.

Despite the success of this program in attracting highly-qualified applicants and in helping in a vital way to establish the Law School's claim as a real center of excellence for the study of international law, the Law School no longer receives any graduate assistantships from the Graduate School to support its LL.M. program. All four graduate assistantships awarded during the 1988-89 academic year were funded out of the Law School's

budget for non-personnel support. The Law School will continue to try to allocate resources at its disposal to support the LL.M. program at the current level, but additional graduate assistantships are needed if we are to compete for the most able of the applicants, and these additional assistantships will require new sources of funding and cannot be met in the current Law School budget.

G. The Law Library must be rebuilt to serve the needs of the Law School's faculty and students and the legal community in the Twenty-First Century.

The Law Library is the Law School's laboratory and is vital to its research and educational programs. Those who acted twenty-five years ago to set the Law School on its present course were correct in recognizing the need to establish a first-rate law library. Since the Law Library was separated from the University Libraries to be administered and funded as part of the Law School, however, funds allocated for book acquisitions have not kept pace with the rapidly-escalating costs of legal materials. Thus, the relative standing of our Law Library among other law libraries has steadily declined from nineteenth in the nation by size of collection to its current place at twenty-seventh.

While the University Libraries have computerized catalog, acquisitions, and circulation systems, our Law Library is now the only law library ranked in the top thirty that is not computerized. The Library's equipment budget (which includes

money for acquisitions) has been stretched thin in recent years to cover the cost of installing computer terminals and paying the annual costs of accessing electronic databases for legal research. The Law Library presently provides only the absolutely essential level of such services; wider access to the new information technology that is increasingly a standard feature of law libraries at peer schools is financially out of reach. Accordingly, raising a substantial private endowment to support the Law Library is one of the priority items in the planned Third-Century Campaign and increasing the funding for book acquisitions was named a priority in the University's Special Funding Initiative proposal. For this year President Knapp responded to the urgent need to stem the rapid decline of the Law Library's ranking by allocating \$100,000 to the book acquisition budget (\$50,000 in the original budget and \$50,000 by amendment). The University has allocated Quality Improvement Funds for several years to allow the critical need of shelving the Law Library's collection to be met within the present facilities by installing bays of compact shelving in the basement of the main Law Library building.

The present needs of the Law Library are demonstrably real and can be grouped in six basic areas: book acquisitions, new information technology, computerization, compact shelving, facilities, and salaries of law librarians and support staff.

1. Law Library Book Acquisitions

Statistics compiled by the American Bar Association rated The University of Georgia Law Library twenty-seventh in holdings (382,619 volumes), but fifty-second in book acquisition expenditure (\$459,568)¹ at the end of 1987. As outlined in the Special Funding Initiative document, our goal for the Law Library is to move the Law Library back into the top twenty law libraries in the country in terms of size and comprehensiveness of its collection and to gain the position as one of the top three law school libraries in the South, along with the University of Texas and the University of Virginia.² To do so, however, we must overtake several other regional schools which have recently moved aggressively to upgrade their law libraries in successful efforts to enhance their academic programs.³

The \$529,499 budgeted for equipment for the Law Library for FY89 should enable us to acquire about 8,000 new volumes,⁴ while

¹Complete comparative data are available only through June 30, 1987. More recent figures reported by other law libraries are not yet available.

²The University of Virginia Law Library was ranked tenth nationally in holdings with 563,736 volumes; the University of Texas was ranked fifth with 710,463 volumes in FY87.

³For example, the law library at Louisiana State University ranked nineteenth with 438,225 volumes; the University of Florida twenty-second with 411,219 volumes; and Tulane University twenty-sixth with 387,209 volumes in FY87.

⁴The approximately \$529,499 budgeted for equipment for the Law Library during FY89 must also cover the approximately \$30,000 expended each year on accessing electronic legal research data bases (WestLaw and Lexis) and other equipment needs and be further divided between continuations (roughly 93 percent) and new treatises (seven percent). Thus, the final purchasing power

the law libraries we aspire to overtake, on the average, spend \$575,000 a year on book acquisitions alone and add approximately 9,300 new volumes each year to their already larger collections.

The \$100,000 in Special Funding Initiative monies directed to the Law School in FY89 for the book acquisition (equipment) budget must be continued each year to enable us to match the acquisition rate of the excellent law libraries now developing in the region. Although the Law School will continue to seek private funding sources to purchase a portion of the nearly 60,000 volumes we need to regain our position in the nation's top twenty law libraries in holdings, additional special funding increases of \$50,000 each year for the next four years, representing an increase of \$200,000 in spending over the current year's figures, will be needed.

2. New Information Technology

As desirable as it might be to channel all new book acquisition money from our equipment budget into purchasing books to propel the Law Library's collection back into the top twenty standings, an increasingly large share of available Library funds must be allocated to providing the Law School faculty and students with access to electronic databases for legal research

of this amount translates into fewer available dollars for book purchases than the reported figure comparatively would suggest. For example, during FY87 when the Law Library was ranked fifty-second in the nation by book expenditures (without regard to how this amount is internally allocated) our best estimate is that the funds actually available for adding books to the collection would have ranked Georgia sixty-second or sixty-third in the country.

and information. The Law Library will spend about \$30,000 this year on the two main databases for electronic research, WestLaw and Lexis, and accessing through terminals in the Law Library the University Libraries OCLC Catalog.

The Law Library has recommended enhancement of our present level of student access to electronic databases for legal research by adding a second subscription to WestLaw. This addition will cost approximately \$6,000 a year, but the West Publishing Company will, in turn, upgrade our present Walt I terminal and printer to a new Walt II and add a second Walt II terminal and printer without additional charge. Then, the Law Library should add a second Lexis subscription (\$12,000 per year) and begin a subscription to Nexis, a computer-based information system that allows information searches of leading newspapers and magazines at an additional cost of \$12,000 annually.

First-year students are now trained on WestLaw and Lexis in temporary learning centers on terminals loaned by the program's developers. Similar but more specialized databases for upper-level courses in Federal Taxation and Securities Regulation are also available. As students become more familiar with electronic research techniques and new sophisticated databases, the demand for library services of this kind will dramatically increase and change the face of the traditional library to one increasingly featuring this new information technology rather than just books. Thus, we project that the \$30,000 we now spend currently on these electronic databases must be incrementally

increased to approximately \$75,000 annually. The Law School must keep pace in this area because students who do not receive a solid grounding and training through use in electronic research techniques will be at a competitive disadvantage when they enter practice where such tools are already becoming commonplace. This goal is discussed more fully in the Appendix as a function of how current instructional demand justifies expansion and updating of computerized legal research databases.

3. Library Computerization

The University of Georgia Law Library is in danger of becoming technologically obsolete. Ours is the only library in the nation's top thirty in size that is not yet computerized.

Computerization or automation of the Law Library will be an expensive but largely one-time undertaking. It will entail three major components: computerizing the public catalog and accessing it through a number of terminals situated throughout the Library; computerizing acquisitions and serials; and computerizing circulation.

A 1987 study initiated by the School of Law outlined the feasibility, mechanics, and costs of placing all of the on-line cataloging, acquisitions, accounting and circulation systems (i.e., technical services) in a computer system.⁵ The estimated \$814,000 one-time conversion cost could be distributed over three

⁵Report by James L. Hoover, Law Librarian and Professor of Law, Columbia University, April 2, 1987.

phases of implementation, each building on the acquisitions of the previous phase.⁶

It is possible that a grant to support full-scale computerization of this kind could be obtained from a Georgia Foundation. To initiate this essential project, equipment and software should be purchased to put new book acquisitions in the computer system as they are acquired, and as more funds become available, other parts of the existing catalog could be included. Establishing a computerized public catalog on the Innovacq system in use at more than forty law schools, including the University of Virginia, could be begun with an initial, one-time expenditure of less than \$125,000. A computerized catalog system has many advantages over the present card catalog file and access to it could be made easy and convenient by locating terminals at different sites around the Law Library and Law Building.

Computerization/automation would also enable us to upgrade the equipment available to law students to engage in electronic database research. This goal is discussed more fully in the Appendix as a function of how current instructional demand justifies expansion and updating of Law Library technical services.

⁶Phase I implemented at an estimated cost of \$337,900; Phase II at \$259,375; and Phase III at \$216,775. Hoover's report suggests the automation system he described would also require additional annual maintenance funding of \$36,000 once all components are in place.

4. Library Shelving Needs

Ninety-four percent of the Law Library's shelf space is now occupied. With finite space and almost limitless additions, space constraints bear on the Law Library with special urgency. Compact shelving installed in the basement of the Law Library is easily the most cost-efficient method of acquiring additional library shelving. The alternative, of course, is the construction of new library facilities or microfilming on a massive scale.

Although installation of compact shelving in the basement of the Law Library every year for the past three years has alleviated the immediate crisis in Library shelving space, five more bays of regular shelves must be converted to compact shelving if the Library is to expand at even the current rate of acquisition over the next seven to ten years. The conversion of these five bays to compact shelving would nearly triple our shelf space in those bays--from 5,586 linear feet to 15,834 linear feet--at an estimated cost of \$233,000.⁷

⁷The following table indicates the bays in which compact shelving can be installed and the cost for converting each bay:

Bay	Present Capacity	Compact Capacity	Estimated Cost
1	1,512 feet	4,158 feet	\$60,000
6	1,344 feet	3,696 feet	\$48,000
7	1,344 feet	3,696 feet	\$48,000
8	546 feet	1,974 feet	\$37,000
9	840 feet	2,310 feet	\$40,000

5. Library Space Needs

The only solution in the long run to providing adequate facilities to house an expanded electronic research center and computer labs for students and sufficient work space for library staff is the construction of the new Law School Addition. Plans call for this new building to feature a library reading room with tables and chairs, a state-of-the-art electronic research facility and office space for faculty and the Georgia Law Review whose relocation from the Library Annex can free badly needed additional work space for the library staff.

6. Librarian and Support Staff Salaries

Just as the Law Library must increase in size and services to enable the Law School to remain competitive with peer schools in the region and nation, salaries for library personnel must be increased to meet regional salary standards for qualified law librarians. At current salary rates, staff members of the Law Library who have law degrees are paid less than staff members employed by the University Libraries who hold only library science degrees. Thus, not only is the Law Library at a competitive disadvantage when compared to the other thirty-four law schools in this region, it is at a salary disadvantage compared to our own University Libraries.

Statistics compiled for the thirty-five law schools in the Southeast for FY88 show that the salary paid a full-time librarian at the University of Georgia Law School Library

(exclusive of the Law Librarian) ranked sixteenth in the region; the salary paid full-time supporting staff ranked twenty-eighth. In fact, recruiting records for Spring 1987 show our Law Library offered approximately \$10,000 below what other schools were offering a beginning full-time law librarian with both library science degree and a law degree.

To rectify this situation and to allow the Law School to be competitive when hiring the librarians needed to support the amplified research mission of the Law Library, approximately \$44,500, in addition to normal pay raises, will have to be added to the Law Library salary budget.^a

H. The Law School should upgrade instructional equipment to take advantage of new technology.

Legal education today is just beginning to make use of new instructional technology in the classroom and as an adjunct to the classroom. Some of our peer law schools such as the University of North Carolina have already added an interactive video lab and converted a regular classroom to a master classroom with state-of-the-art computer and video projection capabilities. Plans for the Law School Addition call for the construction of an electronic, teaching courtroom and master classroom equipped

^aDistribution of the \$44,500 salary enhancement would be made as follows: \$20,000 to raise the salaries of professional librarians who hold law degrees or library degrees, or both, to a base of \$30,000; \$5,000 to raise to a base of \$20,000 the salaries of staff now earning between \$15,000 and \$20,000; and \$19,500 to raise to a base of \$15,000 the salaries of staff now earning less than \$15,000.

with cameras, monitors, and video projection units that will employ this new technology in the classroom as well as for construction of a computer lab where students can engage in electronic research and participate outside the formal classroom setting in computer-assisted instructional exercises. Some of this new instructional technology can and should be introduced into our educational program before the Law School Addition is ready to be occupied by purchasing some necessary equipment like an industrial quality VCR, an interactive videodisc player, computer, appropriate monitors, and other related items for a cost of approximately \$6,775. An existing classroom now used in our skills training courses for videotaping can be upgraded by adding better lighting and microphones at a cost of \$800. Finally, a video projection system capable of high resolution for a large classroom setting could be installed in an existing classroom at an estimated cost of \$9,000 to allow instructors to make use of the videotapes now becoming commercially available. There is a great advantage in being able to simulate a courtroom experience as part of the Law School's courses in Civil Procedure, Criminal Procedure, Evidence, and Trial Practice, and the Law School should begin now to bring this equipment on line as other law schools are currently doing. This goal is discussed more fully in the Appendix as a function of how current instructional demand justifies expansion and updating of computer instructional technology.

I. The Law School should improve the present Law building by remodeling and renovation.

Some remodeling, renovation, and repairs are needed in the present Law School physical facilities to allow the School to operate more efficiently and more safely based on current enrollments and present faculty size. These one-time improvements to the physical plant can be divided into several areas:

1. Renovation in the basement of the Law School \$ 32,500

Removing the wooden student lockers now in stairwells and replacing them with metal lockers and moving all the existing metal student lockers in the current student locker room to another storage room in the Law School basement would provide space needed for a computer laboratory and administrative offices. In addition to better utilization of its available space, this replacement of lockers would rid the Law School of the fire and security hazards created by wooden lockers in the current arrangement.

2. Create workroom in Law Library Annex \$ 5,000

Minor remodeling of an area in the Law Library Annex to house a copier and other equipment for faculty housed in that building could free an office currently used for those purposes for a faculty member.

3. Replacement of exterior doors in Law Annex
and Main Law Building \$ 25,000

Five exterior glass doors need to be replaced with doors that will permit quick exit but offer maximum security when closed after hours. The Fire Marshal requires these doors remain unlocked when the Law Library is open, but leaving these doors--which are in areas of the buildings not heavily trafficked after normal business hours--unlocked has resulted in increased incidents of theft from student lockers, some acts of vandalism, and occasional overnight occupation of the student lounge by vagrants and other non-students. We expect that the University Physical Plant will undertake this important renovation and security project.

4. Law Building Security System \$ 30,000

New security measures must be taken at the Law Library since it is nearly impossible to secure any area of the Library (offices, work places, documents) at the present time because so many nonauthorized persons have acquired access to keys to the building over past years. Moreover, it long has been the policy of the Law School that any law student should have access to the Law Building at any given time, so some measure must be devised that will provide building access only to law students, faculty, and other authorized personnel. A magnetic card system installed on the five exterior doors to the main Law Library and the five exterior doors to the Law Library Annex would be the

best method of security and would allow for better control of access to the building after hours and on weekends.

5. Refurbish Student Lounge \$ 3,500

The heavily-used Student Lounge outside the Office of Legal Career Services needs new furniture and a general face-lift. Much of the furniture is broken and shabby. The Law School will seek private funds for this project.

6. Replace Classroom Furniture \$ 3,000

Approximately forty classroom chairs are needed to replace broken and missing chairs.

7. General Maintenance, Repairs, and Replacements \$ 10,000

Various other general repair and maintenance projects around the Law School include replacement of the clock system, new lighting for the Hatton Lovejoy Courtroom, installation of new tile floors in the Law Library basement as new bays of compact shelving are completed, and repair and/or replacement of existing wall coverings in some areas of the building. Most of this expense should properly be borne by the University Physical Plant as part of general repair and upkeep of University property.

- J. A state appropriation should be sought to fund the planned addition to the Law School.

The proposed Law Center South will give the Law School the facilities necessary to provide students a superior legal education well into the Twenty-First Century. The Law Center South will provide not only the space necessary, but also the permanence and national visibility afforded only by bricks and mortar, to support the Law School's claim to be a preeminent center for the study of international law. This important addition to the physical plant of the School will be the permanent home of the Dean Rusk Center for International and Comparative Law, and will provide faculty office space and a conference room for the Rusk Center. The Law Center South will also provide adequate program space and study carrels for graduate students in the Law School's LL.M. program in international law.

As discussed in previous sections, the addition will also include a state-of-the-art master classroom, an "electronic" courtroom, and expanded facilities for electronic research and word processing, physical resources that will afford our students legal study assisted by the new information and computer technology. Other programs sponsored by the Law School will benefit from construction of the Law Center South as well, since office space for the Institute of Continuing Judicial Education, Prosecutorial Clinic, and the Georgia Law Review are included in the addition's design. Relocating the offices of the Georgia Law

Review to the Law Center South can free up badly needed library staff workspace in the present Law Library Annex.

The construction of the Law School addition will require a one-time state appropriation in the range of \$3.5 million.

IV. New Directions

- A. The Law School should refine its curriculum to achieve a better balance of theory, doctrine, and skills training to meet the needs of students who will be practicing law at the dawn of the Twenty-First Century.

1. Interdisciplinary Perspectives

Leading law schools have moved aggressively in the past decade to enrich their educational and research programs by adding perspectives from other disciplines. Through joint appointments and less formal arrangements, these schools have brought the insights of economists, historians, sociologists, philosophers, scientists, and other scholars into law classes and the legal literature. The Law School has begun to address the need to enhance its first-rate doctrinal teaching and research by tapping the intellectual resources of the rest of the academy, but the School has not kept pace with its peer institutions and should do more, as the sabbatical inspection team from the American Bar Association and the Association of American Law Schools noted in its 1985 site evaluation report.

2. The International Dimension

Perhaps the single most distinctive feature of the educational and research program of the Law School is the emphasis on international and comparative law. The Law School should capitalize more fully on the presence of the Dean Rusk Center here by calling on the Center's resources and visiting scholars to teach minicourses and to enrich and broaden the larger educational program in other ways. The Center can also serve an important need by organizing a non-degree program of short courses on campus during the summer for lawyers and executives from other countries who are now based in the Southeast, particularly Atlanta, and who want an orientation and basic understanding of American law and the legal system.

In recent years, the Law School has established fledgling faculty exchange relationships with law schools in Great Britain, France, and Italy. These relationships should be nurtured. Moreover, the Law School should exploit more fully the important existing ties between some faculty members and members of foreign legal communities, including Professor Gabriel Wilner's ties with Brussels and the European Community, and Professor Thomas Schoenbaum's connections with Japan and Asia.

3. Clinical Directions

For many years, the Law School has maintained three successful clinical programs that have provided important community services and have served as training grounds for

students--the Legal Aid Clinic, the Prisoner Legal Counseling Program, and the Prosecutorial Clinic. The Law School should explore opportunities to create an additional clinical setting. For example, the School might establish a clinic to serve the legal needs of the elderly, tapping the resources not only of law students, but also of other campus departments, such as the Department of Gerontology, that are familiar with the needs of elderly citizens. An initial outside grant for such a clinic could be obtained, but the clinic would require a permanent source of funding as well before its establishment would be feasible.

- B. The Law School should increase its emphasis on research by providing faculty members with additional research time during the nine-month academic year and by institutionalizing a Faculty Workshop.**

1. Research Time

Unlike many of its peer institutions, and unlike other departments on the campus, the Law School regularly allocates no time to faculty members during the academic year specifically for research. Over the next few years, the Law School should seek ways to ensure that faculty members periodically are given reduced teaching loads to accomplish their research objectives. One promising strategy would be to use a combination of public and private funds to bring distinguished visitors to the School to teach the courses of faculty members doing research. Another strategy, and one that has been adopted in recent years by such

peer institutions as the University of Virginia and Emory University, would be to make faculty course load reduction an important goal, but not the only goal, of a thorough-going restructuring of the Law School's educational program. By combining some courses, streamlining others, and teaching others only every other year or every third year, it may be possible without adding new faculty positions to make room for research time during the nine-month academic calendar. Because it deals with reallocation of instructional resources and major curriculum reform, this objective and the means by which it can be achieved are discussed more fully in the Appendix.

2. A Faculty Workshop

Other law schools have created formal workshops or seminars at which members of the faculty and guest scholars from other institutions present works in progress. These seminars have proved valuable engines for the generation and honing of ideas. The Law School should establish its own Faculty Workshop as a means of creating the atmosphere most conducive to scholarly productivity. A series of seminars could be funded for approximately \$6,000 per year. Securing funds for the Faculty Workshop could be one objective of the Third Century Campaign. In the interim, the Law School could provide funds for it by taking resources from other areas, including travel and supplies.

- C. The Law School should expand its student services by naming an Assistant Dean for Student Affairs and by creating additional opportunities for students to meet and come to know practicing lawyers and judges in contexts allowing for frank discussion of the obligations and rewards of membership in the profession.

1. An Assistant Dean for Student Affairs

To meet the needs of the student body, including the special needs of minority students and students who have encountered academic difficulties, the Law School should name an Assistant Dean for Student Affairs. The post also should carry responsibilities in the areas of admissions and student recruitment. To cover some of the additional salary costs associated with the creation of the position, the Law School could name a current member of the faculty, simply converting the faculty member's nine-month academic contract to a twelve-month administrative contract and reducing to one-half the normal teaching load.

2. Links to the Bench and Bar

In 1988, the Chief Justice of the Georgia Supreme Court called leaders of the bench, bar, and academy together to discuss a perceived decline in respect for professional ideals and a troubling subordination of such ideals to financial concerns. The Law School should find ways to expose law students early on to the possibility of "living greatly in the law" by bringing to the campus practitioners and judges whose lives and careers embody the profession at its best. Students should have

opportunities, perhaps in small group social settings, to meet and come to know these men and women whose careers are worth emulating. The costs of such opportunities might be underwritten with funds generated during the Third Century Campaign. The new Assistant Director for Legal Career Services, along with an Assistant Dean for Student Affairs, might be given the responsibility of developing the opportunities.

V. Sources of Funding to Meet Current Demands and New Directions

The leaders of the Law School have long understood and wisely acted on the principle that the development of private resources would be essential to supplement even generous state support if the Law School were to achieve its goal of sustained excellence. The Law School must continue to move vigorously to seek private funds to increase the number and amount of scholarships available to attract top students and those demonstrating potential and financial need, to build an endowment to support the Law Library, to provide salary supplements for the faculty, including completing quickly the program of providing personal computers for faculty offices, and to replace with private funds a portion of the state funds now allocated in the Law School's operating budget for the support of its two student scholarly journals and its extensive student extracurricular programs like Moot Court and Mock Trial. Private funds feasibly can be sought in the Third Century Campaign to create

Distinguished Visiting Professorships to bring to the Law School on a rotating basis teachers or practitioners of distinction to enrich the educational program for students and contribute to a more lively intellectual atmosphere for the faculty. The presence of one or more visiting faculty each year could assist in the goal of allowing the permanent faculty to take periodically a reduced teaching load to devote more time to research. Private funds can also be sought to add to state funds to provide summer research grants to our faculty like that provided by peer law schools in the region. Private money can be sought to endow or fund a faculty workshop program to stimulate innovative and creative research. Finally, there is some possibility that a one-time grant can be obtained to underwrite the enormous cost of fully computerizing the Law Library or that this project could be undertaken through the competitive equipment portion of the Special Funding Initiative.

The Law School has already begun in its plans for FY90 to reallocate internally resources from faculty to non-personnel support to help bring the projected budget into equilibrium. The impending transformation of the faculty with several senior-level faculty retiring to be replaced by lower-paid, entry-level faculty members will result in a loss of seniority but will assist in reaching, with the support promised from the University, our top priority of balancing the budget at a realistic level without continued dependence on faculty taking leave.

Similarly, a net savings was accomplished for this year by reassigning a tenured member of the faculty from instructional duties in the traditional program to serve as the Director of the Legal Aid and Defender Clinic rather than filling that position with a new appointment from the outside. The effect of this reassignment and the changes planned in the faculty for the coming year will result in a reduction of one faculty position as compared to five years ago.

The position of computer specialist was left unfilled for the current year to attempt to allocate funds from this vacant position to make a substantial start on providing faculty offices with personal computers and modems to access electronic databases for research. We were able to operate without filling this position during this year because we were fortunate in employing an extraordinarily well-versed graduate assistant who could troubleshoot equipment hardware failures and assist the secretarial staff in learning standard software operations. Our best assessment is that the position of computer specialist should be filled to keep the existing computers in the Law School operating and to carry out a plan to create a local area network linking various administrative offices.

In sum, the Law School has already done what it can do realistically to reallocate resources from faculty and staff positions to non-personnel support. While we expect that completing the program of providing personal computers in faculty offices will lead to a savings from a reduction in the number of

secretarial positions, it is difficult to project accurately how great the amount of savings will be without more experience. It is likely that any such salary savings will be offset by the costs of increased repairs and maintenance to the equipment and subscription charges for the faculty to access newer and more sophisticated information databases for research.

Internal reallocations of present resources can be used to accomplish the goal of further "internationalizing" the educational program by continuing to draw on the resources of the Dean Rusk Center to bring teachers and scholars from other countries to the Law School to teach short courses in areas of their specialty and to engage in research. And, until private funds can be obtained to underwrite a series of faculty workshops, a modest beginning could be made from savings enforced on the current budget for travel and operating supplies.

A careful study should be made of the cost and benefits of phasing out summer school instruction. After the conversion from the quarter to semester calendar, summer school has become less attractive to our students and enrollment generally numbers about fifty students. In light of our faculty salary scale, we can ill afford to eliminate this source of faculty compensation, however, without further detriment to our competitive position. Therefore, we would favor eliminating summer school only if it were possible to convert the resources now devoted to it to increase the faculty salary bases or to provide a better program of faculty summer research grants. The potential of converting

the instructional budget for summer school to meet other categories of need must be weighed carefully against the loss of the professional credit hours and tuition income that are generated for the University.

VI. Summary of Law School Priorities

This section will summarize how the needs resulting from current demands as well as anticipated new directions would be met selectively under various conditions. Section V discussed the likely sources of funding to meet these needs, and unless otherwise indicated it is expected that additional state funds must be obtained to meet these priority objectives.

A. No New Funding

As planning for next year with the Vice President for Academic Affairs has revealed, the Law School will need some \$125,000 in additional state funding to get its budget into equilibrium and to maintain its current level of operations. Assuming funding then at the level currently projected, the Law School could undertake to refine its educational program to meet the needs of its graduates who will enter the legal profession at the dawning of the Twenty-First Century and simultaneously pursue the goal of institutionalizing a greater research ethos by seeking ways to meet instructional demands while offering faculty members more opportunities for release time from teaching for

research. Funding at this level would allow the Law School to bring in visitors to replace faculty members who take leave. Such visitors not only can cover the courses taught by the faculty on leave but they frequently can be a source of new areas of expertise and pedagogy that stimulates and enlivens the intellectual life of a school. As discussed previously, it should be possible to continue to "internationalize" the Law School's educational program by drawing on the resources of the Dean Rusk Center to continue to bring to the school officials and legal academics from other countries to teach minicourses of less than a semester in length on various topics of comparative law or foreign law. And, finally, it is sufficiently important to promote an atmosphere conducive to creative and innovative research that the Law School would begin to support through an internal reallocation of funds for travel and supplies a series of faculty workshops or seminars where scholars could be invited to visit the school and meet with interested faculty to exchange ideas and discuss works-in-progress.

B. Five Percent Increase in New Funding (\$204,000)

With a five percent increase in new funding, roughly \$204,000, the Law School would selectively meet the following priority needs:

1. Allocate state funds necessary to balance the budget projected for fiscal year 1990 \$ 125,000

2. Ameliorate the acute problem of faculty salary compaction and upgrade the salaries of Legal Writing Instructors \$ 67,000

3. Continue the program to equip faculty offices with personal computers and modems to access electronic databases \$ 12,000

C. Ten Percent Increase in New Funding \$ 407,000

With a ten percent increase in new funding, roughly \$407,000, the Law School would first meet the priorities listed above and then seek to accomplish the following objectives:

4. Continue to improve the faculty salary scale to make it competitive with peer institutions \$ 100,000

5. Increase from three to four the number of first-year Legal Writing Instructors \$ 25,000

6. Replace wooden lockers and relocate the present locker room to other storage space on the first floor of the Law Building to create room for a computer lab \$ 32,250

7. Add an Assistant Director for Legal Career Services \$ 24,000

8. Cover the increased costs of subscriptions to allow more faculty to access legal research databases and other information databases like Nexis \$ 15,000

9. Purchase (one-time) interactive videodisc instructional equipment, along with an appropriate computer, for classroom use \$ 6,775

D. The Law Library

The Law Library presents a special case. One of the University's declared goals in the Special Funding Initiative and one of the Law School's goals in the Third Century Campaign is to add resources to stem the decline and then to restore the national standing of the Law Library. This will require new funding well above even the \$100,000 enhancement assumed by a ten percent increase in funding for the Law Library. At a minimum an additional \$50,000 each year for the next five years will be required to purchase books and provide the new information technology of expanded electronic databases for legal research. Moreover, some \$250,000 will be required over the next five years to add one bay each year of compact shelving to house the growing collection. Finally, a grant from a private source or funds provided through the Special Funding Initiative must be obtained to computerize the operations of the Law Library, beginning with the public catalog. As a matter of fairness and equity, the salary scale of the law librarians must be improved if we are to

retain the services of these dedicated employees. None of these needs can be left unmet because they are all critical if the Law Library is to improve on its current ranking and serve the educational and research mission of the Law School and the University of which we are a part.

Finally, the construction of the Law School addition will require a one-time state appropriation in the range of \$3.5 million.

APPENDIX

Rationale for the Enrichment of the Legal Education Program at the University of Georgia

I. Introduction

Analysis of instructional demand and methods of meeting it addresses two central questions:

How does current instructional demand justify the addition of new programs, or expansion of current ones?

How can the current profile of personnel (faculty, graduate teaching assistants, and any other instructional personnel) be modified to achieve instructional ends?

Before these questions can be meaningfully answered in relation to the School of Law, some basic assumptions about legal education must be understood. The School of Law, unlike most other academic units within the University, is a professional school whose mission is to train students for entry into the legal profession, whether in the private practice of law, governmental or other public service, the academy, or the growing world of policy-making in which legal skills can be a valuable asset. Because the Law School is a professional school, many of the components of its program of legal studies are viewed as necessary to the achievement of its mission, whereas the same components in another setting might be viewed as luxuries. These components, basic to an understanding of the instructional methodology and resources in the Law School, are more fully discussed in Part II below.

II. Instructional Methodology and Resources

A. General Description of Instructional Responsibilities

Virtually all faculty in the Law School are budgeted 100 percent for instruction, although all faculty are expected to make significant contributions to research and public service commensurate with our identity with the legal profession and with the mission of the University as a land grant institution. The Law School has no research professorships. All faculty teach and do so without the assistance of graduate teaching assistants or graders.

With the exception of three instructors who are responsible for teaching legal research and writing to first-year students and a clinical instructor who is responsible for directing the Prosecutorial Clinic and teaching certain skills courses to second and third-year students, all faculty are tenure-track faculty with full-time teaching responsibilities, including preparing for and meeting each and every class in every course offered in the Law School. The Law School employs very few adjunct professors and on these rare occasions usually does so for the purpose of offering special enrichment to the curriculum. What we do, as a general rule, we do ourselves with little internal or external assistance.

B. First-Year Instruction

The first-year curriculum, which is mandatory for all students, is the basic building block in legal education. The

first-year curriculum currently consists of the following:

Fall Semester	Spring Semester
Contracts I	Contracts II
Property I	Property II
Civil Procedure I	Civil Procedure II
Torts I	Torts II
Criminal Law	Legal Research & Writing II
Legal Research & Writing I	

In these first-year courses the emphasis is on process rather than substance. At the core of first-year instruction are the teaching of sophisticated analysis of legal problems rather than the teaching of legal doctrine, and the improvement of communication skills, oral and written. The instruction methodology is intensive and interactive, employing a Socratic dialogue between teacher and student to teach fundamental legal analysis and effective communication.

An important pedagogical component of first-year instruction is the requirement that it occur in a setting employing a relatively low faculty-student ratio. For this reason all first-year courses are taught in three sections of sixty-five to eighty students. The small, interactive setting fosters growth in analytical and communication skills and also promotes the beginnings of a sense of professionalism, a quality critical to students' continued development as highly qualified, ethical members of the legal profession. In the dynamic of the first-year experience impressions are formed and attitudes are developed that will carry the student through the remainder of his or her legal studies into practice. It is vital to the success of the Law School that this experience be one of very

high quality, for only in this way can we be assured of producing lawyers with keen insight and sound judgment, the kinds of lawyers that possess openmindedness and objectivity but at the same time are effective advocates for a client or a cause. All of these attributes are formed in and develop during the critical first year of study.

C. Second and Third-Year Instruction

Beyond the first year of law study only one course is required, JUR 430 Legal Profession, the course in professional responsibility or as it is more commonly known, legal ethics. A block of courses, once required, is now designated the "Core Curriculum." Most law students, in fact, take these courses. The Core Curriculum consists of:

- Trusts and Estates I and II
- Constitutional Law I and II
- Evidence
- Federal Income Taxation
- Corporations

The core curricular courses, in fact, are electives, despite the fact that most students take them. In addition, numerous other courses are available to students in the second and third years of study. The first-year required courses provide a critical introduction to these upper class electives in that they furnish an entree into various "tracks" or specialties that a law student might wish to pursue. For example, the first-year course in Property provides a necessary foundation for the student who in the second year would take Trusts and Estates I and II and in the third year would take Estate and Gift Taxation and Estate

Planning, all essential for one interested in an estate planning practice. The same Property course would also serve as the foundation course for the student who wishes to take Land Use Planning, Land Finance, Natural Resources, Environmental Law and Taxation of Natural Resources.

In the same fashion, the first-year course in Contracts serves as introduction to a Commercial Law curricular track. Criminal Law is the introductory course for a student pursuing a Criminal Practice track. Civil Procedure is the foundation course for a Civil Practice track. Torts is the entry level course for a student interested in the Litigation track.

Various skills courses and clinics (more fully described below) are offered in the second and third years of law study. These consist of courses in Trial Practice, Advocacy, Constitutional Litigation, Environmental Litigation, Negotiation and Dispute Resolution, Pretrial Litigation, Prosecutorial Clinic I and II, Legal Aid and Defender Clinic and Criminal Defense Clinic. These courses and clinics are designed to instruct students in practical lawyering skills through use of simulation as well as actual representation of live clients.

Unlike in the first year, in the second and third years of law study the emphasis shifts from process to substance. The purpose is to impart to students in-depth knowledge of a wide range of subjects, for example, Bankruptcy, Copyright, Legal History, Labor Law, International Law, Women and the Law, Administrative Law, and Law and Medicine. Again, all of these courses are taught by full-time tenure-track faculty unaided by

graduate teaching assistants or graders. Class presentations are not merely lectures. The class presentation itself is a demonstration of lawyerly skills, for example, gleaning the relevant facts from a problem and fashioning legal arguments in support of a particular theory.

Class size among the second and third-year electives varies dramatically. Several years ago, for the purpose of developing grading guidelines to assist faculty in assigning grades, the faculty categorized courses as small (1-23 students), medium (24-47 students) and large (48 or more students). The table below illustrates the range in class sizes over the last two and a half years:

Law School Enrollment by Course

NAME OF COURSE	FALL 1986	SPRING 1987	FALL 1987	SPRING 1988	FALL 1988
Administrative Law		10	24		
Admiralty	39		18		
Advocacy	40		14		22
Agricultural Problems				11	
American Leg. Hist. Sem.			19		7
Antitrust	30		30		58
Arbitration Seminar		13			
Bankruptcy	76		74		103
Business Probs. Seminar	6	31	9	16	9
Capital Utilization		45	25		57
Children in the Leg. System		78		74	
Commercial Paper	63		85		
Communication Law		26		42	
Comparative Crim. Proc.					9
Comparative Law		13		19	
Complex Litigation				11	7
Conflicts of Law	38			59	34
Constitutional Law I	A77 B60		A115 B 80	35	A114 B 90
Constitutional Law II		A55 B61		A88 B92	12
Constitutional Litigation		20	14		
Copyright		23		52	
Corporate Probs. Seminar		23		22	

NAME OF COURSE	FALL 1986	SPRING 1987	FALL 1987	SPRING 1988	FALL 1988
Corporate Reorg.		38		30	
Corporate Tax		109		68	
Corporations	104	65	156	21	
Criminal Defense Clinic			13	13	9
Criminal Procedure I	39			121	
Criminal Procedure II	31	28	62		98
Domestic Relations	61			142	88
Environmental Law		20			
Environmental Lit. Sem.			8		17
Equitable Remedies	36		31		14
Estate and Gift Tax	25		24		37
Estate Planning Seminar		9		9	
Evaluating Tax Shelters Sem.		17		13	
Evidence	20	172	33	165	81
Export/Import Trade Reg.	5			39	
Federal Courts	10	28	41		53
Federal Income Tax	A99 B12 C63		A64 B27 C97		A82 B60 C80
Future Interests		6			
Georgia Practice	93		124		
Human Rights Seminar		18			
Insurance		183			33
International Law I	116		72		80
International Law II		17		14	
Int'l Law & Econ. Devel.		15		19	
Int'l Legal Trans.	30		38		40
International Tax		13		16	
International Trade		43		50	
Jurisprudence	20			35	
Labor Law	53		41		49
Land Finance	11		34		
Land Use	22				50
Law and Medicine	40		30		
Law and Society			25		33
Law of Legis. Gov't	10		36		42
Law of the Sea				17	
Legal Aid Clinic			21	28	28
Legal History	9	82		102	
Legal Profession	32	115	62	111	99
Municipal Corps.		18		28	
Natural Resources				18	
Negotiation & Disp. Resol.		21			
Partnership Tax	24		14		30
Perspectives on Law				16	
Postconviction Relief	12		19		27
Pretrial Litigation				25	21
Probs. in Const. Law		10			
Prosecutorial Clinic I	40	35	34	28	

NAME OF COURSE	FALL 1986	SPRING 1987	FALL 1987	SPRING 1988	FALL 1988
Prosecutorial Clinic II					17
Real Property Seminar			5		
Rights of the Confined			33		
Secured Transactions	126	42	95	50	110
Securities Regulation	37		46		28
Securities Seminar		5		4	
State and Local Tax		1	5		4
State and Loc. Tax Sem.	8	4		3	
Taxation of Natural Res.				1	
Torts Seminar				12	12
Trial Practice Seminar	16	13	A21 B22	A23 B20	A18 B11 C17
Trusts & Estates I	A92 B72 C44		A103 B47		A83 B95
Trusts & Estates II		A39 B28		A32 B 5	
Unfair Trade		12			
Wills and Trusts					26

Of the 221 courses offered in the Law School during the period covered by the above Table, eighty-seven, or 39 percent, would be classified as small; sixty-six, or 30 percent, would be classified as medium-size; and sixty-eight, or 31 percent, would be classified as large classes.

D. Clinical Programs

The Law School operates two clinical programs, the Legal Aid and Defender Clinic and the Prosecutorial Clinic. Through participation in the clinics law students perfect interviewing, counseling, research and drafting skills and gain valuable experience through representation of live clients in a courtroom setting. Each clinic also includes a classroom component that

serves the dual function of instruction in basic procedures and feedback from the clinic to the classroom.

The Legal Aid Clinic operates out of an office downtown and is an integral part of the Office of the Public Defender. The Director of the Legal Aid Clinic is the Public Defender for Clarke County, charged with the responsibility for representing indigent defendants in criminal proceedings in Clarke County. Students are expected to spend at least two hours each day in the office interviewing and counseling clients and assisting staff attorneys in legal research and drafting of legal documents. As third-year students, participants in the clinic who are admitted under Georgia's third-year practice act are allowed to represent defendants in committal hearings and to participate in the defense of cases tried in Superior Court.

The Prosecutorial Clinic, unlike the Legal Aid Clinic, does not operate in Clarke County. Rather, under an agreement with the District Attorneys in Hall, Gwinnett and Barrow Counties, students travel to the offices in these three counties and participate in the preparation and presentation of cases that are to be prosecuted in these counties. Second-year students begin their clinical work in the spring of the second year but are limited to the classroom in preparation for their work in the field as third-year students. As third-year students, those who are admitted under the third-year practice act may actually try cases in the participating counties.

Traditionally, students registered for a clinical program during each of the four semesters of the second and third years.

Students received two hours credit per semester for a total of eight credit hours. Recently the faculty approved a proposal to increase the credit hours for the clinics in the third year, commensurate with the time commitment required of students and the concept of a clinic as a practicum in law. At the discretion of the director, on an individual basis, students admitted under the third-year practice act may now receive three to six hours credit per semester in the third year. The credit-hour structure of the clinics is now as follows:

Legal Aid Clinic

Second Year		Third Year	
Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
2 hrs.	2 hrs.	3-6 hrs.	3-6 hrs.

Prosecutorial Clinic

Second Year		Third Year	
Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
0 hrs.	2 hrs.	3-6 hrs.	3-6 hrs.

The clinical programs add a practical dimension to the training of young lawyers. They provide an important bridge between the academy and the profession, between the world of theory and the world of application. For the supervising professors the task is labor-intensive, although for participants the experience of doing the kinds of things lawyers do, under the guidance of a supervising attorney, can be very rewarding. Clinical education remains a vital and dynamic part of the educational program of the Law School.

E. Minicourses and Adjunct Offerings

Occasionally the Law School offers minicourses for one semester hour of credit. These minicourses typically focus on a narrow specialty and are offered as an enrichment to the regular curriculum. Minicourses meet for fifteen hours total and may start and finish at any point during the semester.

Some of the specialties covered in recent years include courses in Immigration Law, Law and Technology, and European Communities Law. A minicourse on The Origins of the Constitution and another on Medical Malpractice are planned for Spring Semester 1989.

Several minicourses have been taught by visiting faculty who are in residence at the Law School because of an informal faculty exchange agreement between the Dean Rusk Center and the law faculties at Reading University and the University of Southampton in Great Britain. Others are taught by faculty from abroad who have come to us as a result of our association with the summer program at the Free University of Brussels. Still others are taught by distinguished visitors from this country. During Spring Semester 1989, for example, a minicourse on the Origins of the Constitution will be taught by Mr. Morris Abram, a distinguished Georgian, recently retired as a senior partner at the Paul Weiss firm in New York City, former President of Brandeis University, a man who has served four Presidents of the United States by special appointment.

As an added enrichment to the regular curriculum, the Law School frequently offers courses taught by adjunct faculty.

These courses have included Employment Discrimination, The Law of Sports, The law of the Entertainment Industries, Comparative Environmental Law, and Law, Science, and Technology. These courses are full semester-long courses offered for two or three semester hours of credit. They usually are taught by distinguished visitors from abroad or accomplished members of the Atlanta or Athens Bars. In at least one instance the course is taught by a member of the history faculty at the University as part of our design to broaden interdisciplinary course offerings.

F. Additional Faculty Responsibilities

In addition to classroom responsibilities Law School faculty have supervisory responsibilities over various kinds of student writing requirements. First, in 1986 the faculty inaugurated an advanced writing requirement as an additional requirement for graduation from the University of Georgia Law School. The purpose of this new requirement is to assure that every law student, subsequent to the first-year writing assignments, will have engaged in a supervised research project resulting in preparation of a substantial research paper of high quality.

Student members of the Georgia Law Review and the Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law who fulfill the writing requirements of those journals in so doing fulfill the advanced writing requirement as well. Students who take seminars and in connection therewith prepare research papers under supervision of their professors also fulfill the advanced writing requirement. Toward this end the Law School has increased the

number of seminar offerings and created a more even balance of such offerings between fall and spring semesters.

Students who do not fulfill the advanced writing requirement in one of the above two ways must do so by registering for Supervised Research under the tutelage of a faculty member. Supervised Research is a one-on-one tutorial between faculty member and student in an area of the faculty member's expertise. Faculty are limited to supervision of no more than seven such research projects per year, but, even so the commitment of time can be onerous indeed. Students require considerable guidance and direction in their research efforts, and the faculty member must review outlines of the proposed paper, rough drafts and, of course, the final draft.

A second supervisory responsibility of law faculty, although one that touches fewer faculty than the first, is that associated with assignment as thesis advisors for LL.M. students in the graduate program. In the mid-1980s our graduate program was restructured and revitalized, resulting in an enrollment of fifteen to twenty-two LL.M. degree candidates per year as contrasted with an enrollment of one to three students per year prior to that time. Virtually all of the LL.M. students are from other countries, primarily Western European countries but also countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

As a consequence of increased enrollment and the requirement of a thesis to complete the LL.M. degree, at least fifteen to twenty-two faculty per year have as an additional responsibility the supervision of LL.M. theses. The experience can be as

rewarding for faculty as for students, but proper supervision requires a substantial commitment of time, as in the case of students registered for Supervised Research.

III. Future Directions

A. Addition of New Programs and Expansion of Current Programs

1. Expansion of Legal Research and Writing Program

The Law School currently employs three Legal Research and Writing instructors, each of whom has a section of sixty-five to eighty first-year students. Legal writing teachers meet in regularly scheduled classes with their students three times each week during the fall semester, and twice a week during the beginning of the spring semester. These classes cover legal method, legal research, and both objective and persuasive writing. A variety of teaching methods is used including lecture, a Socratic approach, practice exercises to allow students to try newly-taught skills before they must produce a graded product, and extensive written feedback on all graded writing assignments. Each teacher must write his own practice problem sets for each of the research sources covered, as well as write and grade the final research and citation assignment and grade the other written assignments. In addition to scheduled classes, teachers meet individually with students throughout the year to discuss their progress or performance on various assignments.

These individual meetings are extremely important since each person's strengths and weaknesses in writing are unique. Unfortunately, these consultations are generally limited to discussion of errors made on previous assignments and informal, general discussion of the progress a student is making on the current assignment. It is difficult to teach a student how to write well by talking about how to write well. Writing is best learned by doing, by writing and then revising what has been written with the benefit of a teacher's constructive criticism. Contact with writing teachers from other law schools indicates that most recognize the importance of rewrites, and most use rewrites as an integral part of their writing programs.

However, the extremely high student-faculty ratio in the first-year course currently makes rewrites impossible. With seventy-five plus students (during the current academic year, eighty-three) there is simply not enough time for a teacher to turn around papers, giving any meaningful critique and then allowing the students to rewrite their first efforts. This shifts the emphasis in the legal writing course from writing as a process that results in a final written product, to writing as a final product itself. Students therefore feel tremendous pressure to produce a perfect written product in the one attempt they have at each writing assignment. They feel there is no margin for error and little opportunity for the practice necessary to become proficient writers. Thus, not only would the opportunity to revise and rewrite assignments improve the quality of learning, it would also decrease the level of anxiety

associated with writing assignments since the students would be working on more, but smaller projects, instead of the "one-shot" arrangement now used. Incorporating rewrites, however, would require a student-faculty ratio of no more than 50:1.

Assuming an entering class of approximately 200 students, to acquire a student-faculty ratio of 50:1 would require an additional position for a fourth legal writing instructor. The resulting reduction in class size would produce significant educational advantages, namely, addition of frequent written exercises as described above, reduction of "burn out" of young writing instructors from the present workload, and realignment of internal responsibilities to designate one instructor to work closely with students who have been identified as having academic difficulties as well as to continue the current program of providing instruction in legal research techniques and sources of law for our foreign-trained graduate students in the LL.M. program.

2. Expansion of Computer-based Technology

Current instructional demand warrants expansion of computer-based technology in at least three areas: individual faculty needs, law library research capability, and instructional technology. In the area of administrative services (admissions, placement, student records, and word processing) the Law School has made considerable progress and no major expansion is anticipated that would have a significant impact on instructional resources. In the three areas mentioned, however, the Law School lags behind its peer institutions, and until sufficient financial

resources are applied toward getting the Law School up to speed in the rapidly expanding area of computer services, we cannot lay claim to being among the preeminent law schools in the country.

a. Individual Faculty Computing Needs

The most pressing hardware and software need of the Law School now and in the 1990s is to accommodate the computer needs of faculty and students in such areas as word processing, computer-based research, computer-assisted instruction, and electronic communications. Over the next few years, the Law School should complete a program of purchasing microcomputers for faculty offices and add to the number of microcomputers available for student use in the Law Library.

In the longer run, the Law School should realize some savings in personnel costs by providing law faculty members with computers. Faculty members who use computers should have less need of secretarial support. Thus, the Law School over time should be able to reduce at least marginally the size of the secretarial support staff as faculty members come to rely on their computers as word processors for the preparation of manuscripts.

In today's world, it is critically important to provide law faculty members with the means of accessing conveniently the now vital computer-based electronic research services like Lexis and WestLaw. With computers in their offices, faculty members will be able to dial up these services as the need arises, rather than having to wait in line for the limited terminal facilities now available in the Law Library. Moreover, computers will allow law

faculty to access the Nexis service and other more general databases in order to conduct research in areas where the law has not yet developed.

In the 1990s, electronic mail will become a valuable means of communication for research collaborators. Faculty members should be given the means to use electronic mail easily.

Student computing requirements generally mirror faculty requirements, particularly in the areas of word processing and legal research. In addition, students will need access to computer stations to make use of computer-assisted instructional materials, including interactive video, to carry out class assignments as well as self-teaching exercises.

b. Library Computer-based Research Capability

The Law Library is the Law School's laboratory and is vital to its research and educational programs. In terms of utilization of modern computer technology, in this area, too, the Law School suffers in comparison with its peers.

While the University Libraries have computerized their catalog, acquisitions, and circulation systems, our Law Library is now the only law library ranked in the top thirty that is not computerized. The library equipment budget (which includes money for acquisitions) has been stretched thin in recent years to cover the cost of installing computer terminals and paying the annual costs of accessing electronic databases for legal research. The Law Library presently provides only the absolutely essential level of such services; wider access to the new

information technology that is increasingly a standard feature of the law libraries at peer schools is financially out of reach.

The University of Georgia Law Library is in danger of becoming technologically obsolete. Computerization or automation of the Law Library will be an expensive but largely one-time undertaking. It will entail three major components: computerizing the public catalog and accessing it through a number of terminals situated throughout the Library; computerizing acquisitions and serials; and computerizing circulation.

A 1987 study initiated by the Law School outlined the feasibility, mechanics, and costs of placing all of the on-line cataloging, acquisitions, accounting, and circulation systems (i.e., technical services) in a computer system. The estimated \$814,000 one-time conversion cost could be distributed over three phases of implementation, each building on the acquisitions of the previous phase.

It is possible that a grant to support full-scale computerization of this kind could be obtained from a Georgia Foundation. To initiate this essential project, equipment and software should be purchased to put new book acquisitions in the computer system as they are acquired, and as more funds become available, other parts of the existing catalog could be included. Establishing a computerized public catalog on the Innovacq system in use at more than forty law schools, including the University of Virginia, could be begun with an initial, one-time expenditure of less than \$125,000. A computerized catalog system has many

advantages over the present card catalog file, and access to it could be made easy and convenient by locating terminals at different sites around the Law Library and Law Building.

This computerization/automation would also enable us to upgrade the equipment available to law students to engage in electronic database research.

Under present budgetary constraints, an increasingly large share of available library funds must be allocated to providing the Law School faculty and students with access to electronic databases for legal research and information. The Law Library will spend about \$30,000 this year on the two main databases for electronic research, WestLaw and Lexis, and accessing through terminals in the Law Library the University Libraries OCLC Catalog.

The Law Library has recommended enhancement of our present level of student access to electronic databases for legal research by adding a second subscription to WestLaw. This addition will cost approximately \$6,000 a year, but the West Publishing Company will, in turn, upgrade our present Walt I terminal and printer to a new Walt II and add a second Walt II terminal and printer without additional charge. Then, the Law Library should add a second Lexis subscription (\$12,000 per year) and begin a subscription to Nexis, a computer-based information system that allows information searches of leading newspapers and magazines, at an additional cost of \$12,000 annually.

First-year students are now trained on WestLaw and Lexis in temporary learning centers on terminals loaned by the programs'

developers. Similar, but more specialized databases for upper-level courses in Federal Taxation and Securities Regulation are also available. As students become more familiar with electronic research techniques and new sophisticated databases, the demand for library services of this kind will dramatically increase and change the face of the traditional library to one increasingly featuring this new information technology rather than just books. Thus, we project that the \$30,000 we currently spend on these electronic databases must be incrementally increased to approximately \$75,000 annually. The Law School must keep pace in this area because students who do not receive a solid grounding and training through use in electronic research techniques will be at a competitive disadvantage when they enter practice where such tools are already becoming commonplace.

c. New Instructional Technology

Legal education today is just beginning to make use of new instructional technology in the classroom and as an adjunct to the classroom. The Center for Computer-Assisted Legal Instruction (CALI), headquartered at the University of Minnesota School of Law, is a consortium of law schools committed to development and expansion of computer-assisted instruction in law schools. Among other of their activities CALI has produced numerous software programs consisting of lab exercises for law students to perform as an adjunct to classroom instruction. Until recently our Law School was a member of CALI, but we were forced to discontinue our membership because of budgetary

constraints. We still have an extensive set of the CALI software, but our computer laboratory facilities are inadequate to utilize the CALI materials to the fullest extent. Most of our peer institutions (e.g., the law schools at Harvard, Michigan, Minnesota, Cornell, North Carolina, Texas, and Virginia) are members and most have extensive computer labs in which students perform the exercises.

In the mid-1980s Harvard Law School, in conjunction with other law schools, produced the first series of four interactive video exercises. This series is currently being distributed by Lawyer's Co-Op Publishing Company, and other series are planned. Some of our peer law schools such as the University of North Carolina have already added an interactive video lab and converted a regular classroom to a master classroom with state-of-the-art computer and video projection capabilities. Plans for our Law School Addition call for the construction of an electronic, teaching courtroom and master classroom equipped with cameras, monitors, and video projection units that will employ this new technology in the classroom as well as for construction of a computer lab where students can engage in electronic research and participate outside the formal classroom setting in computer-assisted instructional exercises.

Some of this new instructional technology can and should be introduced into our educational program before the Law School Addition is ready to be occupied by purchasing some necessary equipment like an industrial quality VCR, an interactive videodisc player, computer, appropriate monitors, and other

related items for a cost of approximately \$6,775. An existing classroom now used for videotaping in our skills training courses can be upgraded by adding better lighting and microphones at a cost of \$800. Finally, a video projection system capable of high resolution for a large classroom setting could be installed in an existing classroom at an estimated cost of \$9,000 to allow instructors to make use of the videotapes now becoming commercially available. There is a great advantage in being able to simulate a courtroom experience as part of the Law School's courses in Civil Procedure, Criminal Procedure, Evidence, and Trial Practice, and the Law School should begin now to bring this equipment on line as other law schools are currently doing.

B. Modification of Current Personnel Profile to Achieve Instructional Ends

One of the goals expressed in the strategic plan is that of systematic, institutional allocation of release time to faculty for research. As mentioned in Part I of this Appendix, budgeted responsibilities of our law faculty consist of 100% instruction. Unlike many of our peer institutions and unlike other departments on this campus, the Law School currently allocates no time to faculty members during the academic year specifically for research.

Despite this disadvantage, the law faculty has been highly productive in recent years, with a record of research productivity surpassed only by the nation's most prestigious law schools. In a 1983 study, the Journal of Legal Education ranked The University of Georgia law faculty twentieth among all law

schools in the nation in contributions to the ten most respected journals and eighth in the nation among state-assisted law schools.

Because of the increasing emphasis on and importance of scholarly research in legal education today and because of added responsibilities of law faculty due to expansion of the LL.M. program and addition of an advanced writing requirement in the mid-1980s, faculty will require release time if we are to maintain or increase our present level of scholarly production. Scholarly production is particularly important to the way in which our peer schools perceive the relative quality of our Law School. Such perception is not as critical to Harvard, Yale, or other such institutions with long-standing reputations for excellence in legal education, but it is critical to a law school, such as our own, that is in a growth mode and that is on the threshold of joining the preeminent law schools in the nation.

Over the next few years, the Law School will actively pursue ways to ensure that faculty members periodically are given reduced teaching loads to accomplish their research objectives. One strategy, with no change in our curricular structure, would be to seek addition of four new faculty positions to cover courses of faculty on release time. Another promising strategy would be to use a combination of public and private funds to bring distinguished visitors to the School to teach the courses of faculty members engaged in research. Still another strategy, one that has been adopted in recent years by such peer

institutions as the University of Virginia and Emory University, would be to make faculty course load reduction an important goal, but not the only goal, of a major restructuring of the Law School curriculum. By combining some courses, streamlining others, and teaching others in alternating years, it may be possible without adding new faculty positions to make room for research time during the nine-month academic year. It is the latter possibility that the remainder of this Appendix addresses.

During the current academic year, thirty-two full-time faculty taught or will have taught a total of ninety-two courses for a total of 278 semester credit hours. These figures do not include four courses taught by the Dean and Associate Dean for a total of ten semester credit hours. Nor do they include a three-hour course and a two-hour course taught by adjunct professors, a two-hour seminar taught by the Law Librarian, or a three-hour course taught by the Director of the Dean Rusk Center. They also do not include twelve clinical and skills courses taught by two clinicians for a total of twenty-four semester hours. Finally, they do not include three courses taught by the first-year legal writing instructors for a total of twelve semester hours. The only faculty used in computing these figures are full-time, tenure-track faculty who would be eligible for release time in the event such a program were available.

In fact, six faculty members had a reduced teaching load for one semester during the 1988-89 academic year for research purposes, and an additional faculty member had a reduced load for both semesters. These arrangements are consistent with practice

in prior years and are made on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the Dean of the Law School. What is being proposed here is that such a system for release time be institutionalized so that every full-time faculty member periodically is entitled to release time for research.

Given a full-time faculty of thirty-two and an average teaching load of ten semester hours, if fully half of the faculty had a half semester off for research, some forty semester hours in the curriculum would be displaced. Again, given an average teaching load of ten hours, this figure represents the equivalent of four full-time faculty positions, without any change to the current curricular structure.

A graphic illustration will best demonstrate how the proposed objective could be accomplished without the addition of any faculty positions. The present course load is as follows:

1988-89 Faculty Teaching Load

Professor	Fall Semester		Spring Semester	
A	Const. Law II	3	Jurisprudence	3
	Environ. Litig. Sem.	3	Current Probs. Const. Law	2
B	Labor Law	3	Arbitration	2
	Const. Law I	2		
C	Fed. Inc. Tax	4	Eval. Tax Shelters	3
	Partnership Tax	3	Corp. Prob. Sem.	2
D	Civil Proc. I	2	Civil Proc. II	3
	Complex Litig.	2	Admin. Law	3
E	Criminal Proc. II	3	Evidence	4
	Trial Practice	2	Trial Practice	2
F	Trusts & Estates I	3	Trusts & Estates II	3
	Estate & Gift Tax	2	Estate Plan. Seminar	2

G	Contracts I	3	Contracts II	3
	Const. Law I	2	Const. Law II	3
H	Torts I	3	Torts II	3
	Tort Law Seminar	3	Workers Comp.	2
I	Fed. Inc. Tax	4	St. & Loc. Tax Seminar	2
	State & Loc. Tax	2		
J	Capital Utiliz	3	Export/Import Trade Reg.	3
	Law & Society	2	Bus. Probs. Seminar	2
K	Insurance	3	Civil Proc. II	3
			Nego./Disp. Resol.	2
L	Domestic Relations	3	Const. Law II	3
	Criminal Law	3	Current Probs. Con. Law	2
M	Equitable Remedies	3	Corporations	3
	Securities Reg.	3	Securities Seminar	2
N	Property I	3	Property II	3
	Trusts & Estates I	3	Trusts & Estates II	3
O	Contracts I	3	Contracts II	3
	Secured Transactions	2	Commercial Paper	3
P	Fed. Inc. Tax	4	Corporate Tax	4
			International Tax	2
Q	Legal Profession	2	Copyright Law	2
	Evidence	4	Patent Law	2
R	Bankruptcy	3	Legal Profession	2
	Bus. Probs. Seminar	2	Corp. Reorg.	3
S	Criminal Law	3	Corporations	3
	Antitrust	3	Communication Law	2
T	Civil Proc. I	2	Civil Proc. II	3
	Conflicts of Law	3	Federal Courts	2
U	Torts I	3	Torts II	3
	Law of Legis. Govt.	2	Municipal Corps.	2
V	Property I	3	Property II	3
	Land Use Planning	3	Real Est. Develop.	2
W	Internat'l Law I	3	Internat'l Law II	3
X	(on leave)		Land Finance	2
			Const. Litig. Sem.	4

Y	Property I	3	Property II	3
	Wills & Trusts	4		
Z	Torts I	3	Torts II	3
	Federal Courts	3		
AA	Postconv. Relief	3	Criminal Proc. I	3
	Comparat. Crim. Proc.	2	Legal History	3
BB	Int'l Legal Trans.	3	Int'l Law & Econ. Develop.	3
	Graduate Sem.	2	Comparative Law	2
TOTAL		<u>143</u>		<u>135</u>

The above Table represents the status quo, what is. The Table below represents a model curriculum calculated to achieve two dual purposes: (1) general curriculum reform, in particular revision of the first-year curriculum to reflect changing patterns in legal education that most of our peer institutions have already confronted, and (2) compaction of some courses and change in the frequency with which others are taught to permit faculty release time for research. This model is based in part on curriculum revisions undertaken recently at the law schools of Columbia University and the University of Virginia, both for the first purpose outlined above but serving equally well the second purpose.

As anyone acquainted with the process of decision-making in academe can attest, such a proposal would stir much debate and entail much compromise. While the final approved curriculum might look different from the model presented below, in principle the same concept would be carried forward. Our present curriculum resembles those at most major law schools with a notable difference. Here, the standard courses in Torts, Civil Procedure, Property, and Contracts are taught in six-hour,

year-long packages; most schools allocate only four hours. The proposal below adopts the four-hour, one-semester model as the paradigm for first-year law courses.

In some cases reducing the number of hours of first-year courses will create an immediate need for a new elective including the material no longer covered in the basic course. Since students will now be able to "opt out" of any of the basic courses at the end of the first semester, however, not every professor who now teaches a first-year basic course will be needed to teach the new elective. Fewer faculty will be needed, therefore, to staff the restructured curriculum. Where new electives have been added to the curriculum they have been identified only as, for example, New Property Elective.

Model Faculty Teaching Load

Professor	Fall Semester		Spring Semester	
A ¹	Const. Law II	3	Jurisprudence	3
			Current Probs. Const. Law	2
B	Labor Law	3	Arbitration Seminar	2
	Const. Law I	2		
C ²	Fed. Inc. Tax	4	Corp. Probs. Seminar	2
	Partnership Tax	3		
D ³	Civil Procedure	4	New Civ. Proc. Elective	2
			Administrative Law	3
E ⁴	Criminal Proc. II	3	Evidence	4
			Trial Practice	2
F	Trusts & Estates I	3	Trusts & Estates II	3
	Estate & Gift Tax	2	Estate Plan. Seminar	2
G ⁵	Contracts	4	Const. Law II	3
	Const. Law I	2		
H ⁶	Torts	4	Workers Comp.	2
			Torts Law Seminar	3

I	Fed. Inc. Tax State & Loc. Tax	4 2	St. & Loc. Tax Sem.	2
J ⁷	Capital Utiliz.	3	Export/Imp. Trade Reg. Bus. Probs. Sem.	3 2
K ⁸	Insurance Civil Proc.	3 4	Nego./Dispute Resol.	2
L ⁹	Domestic Relations Criminal Law	3 3	Const. Law II	3
M	Equitable Remedies Securities Reg.	3 3	Corporations Securities Seminar	3 2
N ¹⁰	Property Trusts & Estates I	4 3	Trusts & Estates II	3
O ¹¹	Contracts Secured Trans.	4 2	Commercial Paper New Contracts Elective	3 2
P	Fed. Inc. Tax	4	Corporate Tax Internat'l Tax	4 2
Q ¹²	Legal Profession Evidence	2 4	Copyright	2
R ¹³	Bankruptcy	3	Legal Profession Corp. Reorg.	2 3
S	Criminal Law Antitrust	3 3	Corporations Communication Law	3 2
T ¹⁴	Civil Proc.	4	Federal Courts Conflicts of Law	2 3
U ¹⁵	Torts Law of Legis. Govt.	4 2	Municipal Corps.	2
V ¹⁶	Property Land Use Planning	4 3	Real Est. Develop.	2
W	Internat'l Law I	3	Internat'l Law II	3
X	(on leave)		Land Finance Const. Litig.	2 4
Y ¹⁷	Property Wills & Trusts	4 4	New Property Elective	2
Z ¹⁸	Torts Federal Courts	4 3	New Torts Elective	2

AA ¹⁹	Postconv. Relief	3	Criminal Proc. I	3
			Legal History	3
BB	Int'l Legal Trans.	3	Int'l Law & Econ. Develop.	3
	Graduate Seminar	2	Comparative Law	2
TOTAL		<u>140</u>		<u>109</u>

* See Notes at end of text (Pages A-33, A-34)

Under the above model twenty-two out of thirty-two full-time faculty would have a half semester of release time for research. Under less than ideal conditions perhaps five or six of these faculty would be needed to teach additional electives. During the transition period no doubt there would be impediments to agreement within the faculty. These stem in part from the reluctance of individual faculty members to bear a disproportionate share of the burden of reforms--a burden reflected in larger classes or, more typically, in demands to teach new subjects. The ideal of complete versatility notwithstanding, most faculty are not equally well-equipped to teach Taxation, Torts, and Antitrust. The best teachers and scholars, just as the best practitioners, have made their marks in specific fields. It is wrong to suggest that they will be as good in other areas they have to prepare for the first time.

Nevertheless, the model illustrates that it is possible, through curriculum restructuring, to create release time for at least half of the full-time faculty during a given academic year. While creation of such release time is a legitimate end in itself, an equally important educational objective can be achieved at the same time, namely the first systematic evaluation of our curriculum in almost twenty years, resulting in changes to

the first-year curriculum that will bring our Law School into line with what most of our peer schools have already done. The restructured curriculum will allow students to move earlier into advanced sequences of courses in areas of their own choosing.

The next step, addressed to second and third-year students, is to develop a series of suggested course sequences in as many as a dozen areas of concentration. The student who expects a career in corporate law or litigation or administrative law should have available a reasonably detailed map of the courses available in his or her areas, some guidance as to which are primary, and in what sequence to take them. This guidance to students will impose greater discipline on the faculty, inducing greater uniformity among different sections of the same course and requiring that all "primary" courses in areas are offered every year.

The objective is not to create a "majors" program in the Law School. No student will be required to specialize in one or more areas. Through more careful coordination and planning, however, students who wish to explore one or two areas in depth will be provided the tools and the course offerings to do so. The result, hopefully, will rekindle student interest in second and particularly third-year courses. It surely will improve coordination among faculty and offer new incentives to collaborate. Finally, it will provide a coherence to the three years of legal education that has for some time been lacking, here as well as at other law schools.

NOTES

¹Delete Environmental Litigation Seminar--will be offered in alternating years.

²Delete Evaluating Tax Shelters Seminar--will be offered in alternating years.

³Change Civil Procedure to four-hour, one-semester course; delete Complex Litigation--will be offered in alternating years; add two-hour New Civil Procedure Elective in Spring Semester.

⁴Delete Trial Practice in Fall Semester--will be offered by this professor during Fall Semester every other year.

⁵Change Contracts to four-hour, one-semester course.

⁶Change Torts to four-hour, one-semester course; move Torts Law Seminar to Spring Semester to improve hours balance between fall and spring.

⁷Delete Law and Society--will be offered in alternating years.

⁸Change Civil Procedure to four-hour, one-semester course and move to Fall Semester.

⁹Delete Current Problems in Constitutional Law--will be offered by this professor in alternating years.

¹⁰Change property to four-hour, one-semester course.

¹¹Change Contracts to four-hour, one-semester course; add two-hour New Contracts Elective in Spring Semester.

¹²Delete Patent Law--will be offered in alternating years.

¹³Delete Business Problems Seminar--will be offered by this professor in alternating years.

¹⁴Change Civil Procedure to four-hour, one-semester course; move Conflicts of Law to Spring Semester to improve balance between fall and spring.

¹⁵Change Torts to four-hour, one-semester course.

¹⁶Change Property to four-hour, one-semester course.

¹⁷Change Property to four-hour, one-semester course; add two-hour New Property Elective in Spring Semester.

¹⁸Change Torts to four-hour, one-semester course; add two-hour New Torts Elective in Spring Semester.

¹⁹Delete Comparative Criminal Procedure Seminar--will be offered in alternating years.