

1-25-1977

Clinical Education: A Report to the Faculty

University of Georgia School of Law

Repository Citation

University of Georgia School of Law, "Clinical Education: A Report to the Faculty" (1977). *Other Law School Publications*. 75.
https://digitalcommons.law.uga.edu/lectures_pre_arch_archives_other/75

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

CLINICAL EDUCATION:
A REPORT TO THE FACULTY

January 25, 1977

Ad Hoc Committee on
Clinical Education

Albert M. Pearson,
Chairman
Emily M. Calhoun
Paul M. Kurtz
Robert D. Peckham

CLINICAL EDUCATION:
A REPORT TO THE FACULTY

INTRODUCTION

The increased student interest in clinical education at the University of Georgia, as manifested by the Symposium held here last spring, lead to the formation of the ad hoc Faculty Committee on Clinical Education. The Committee's basic purpose was to examine clinical legal education at the University and to formulate clinical programs which would improve and in some instances increase student opportunities in this phase of the law school's curriculum.

This report presents the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee. The report consists of a brief description of the major trends in American legal education over the last 100 years and the disputed role of practical experience or clinical training in that period; a discussion of the educational goals furthered by clinical education along with criticisms of the clinical concept; an examination of the present clinical offerings at the Law School with an eye to determining the educational goals advanced by these programs and ascertaining what changes, if any, might be made in them to increase their educational value; and finally, a discussion of possible additions to the present clinical program. Consideration of the proposed new programs will center on the relative educational benefits of each, problems of supervision and evaluation of student performance, costs of program implementation and administration, and the success of comparable programs, if any, at

other law schools.

The Committee wishes to note at the outset two important limitations on the scope of this report. First, in terms of its effect on the law school curriculum, the report will have only a limited impact. It does not challenge the underlying philosophy of the existing curriculum which of course already embraces the concept of clinical education. To the extent that curriculum changes are recommended, they involve only clinical course offerings and are designed to upgrade the quality of clinical instruction here at the Law School. Second, the Committee through this report is making recommendations for change and identifying areas within which the clinical program can develop. Many of the proposals therefore will be presented in general terms or outline form. If the faculty sees merit in any of these proposals, it will be the task of others to fill in the details.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The history of legal education in the United States reveals a continuing debate on the relative merits of apprenticeship type training versus academic legal training. Under the apprenticeship system the aspiring young person studied in a law office under the supervision of an older lawyer until the "student" attained sufficient legal proficiency to pass the bar examination. Little or no formal education was required for admission to the bar. While law schools offered the alternative approach --- classroom oriented legal training --- it was not

until the late 19th and early 20th centuries that they began to establish their supremacy in the field of legal training. Finally, in 1921 the American Bar Association (ABA) resolved that attendance at law school should be a prerequisite for admission to the bar. After the law schools prevailed as the primary institutions of legal instruction, the clinical debate shifted to what role, if any, apprenticeship or practical experience should play within the dominant educational scheme of the law schools. The answer until recently had been that clinical or practical training has little to offer to the academic curriculum. Although protests against purely academic legal training have been raised through the years, the notion of integrating practical experience into the law curriculum through clinical education is now undergoing a strong revival.

The failure of law schools to recognize the legitimacy of practical experience in legal education can be attributed to at least two important factors. First, and perhaps foremost, was the nearly universal adoption by the law schools of the Langdell case method of legal instruction. Langdell's method rested on three basic assumptions: first, law is a science; second, the entire study of law is to be built exclusively and directly upon study of separate cases; and third, the number of cases required to show the historical development of the law is rather small. Obviously, clinical methods of learning had no place in a program of instruction built solely upon these principles. A second reason for rejection of clinical education arose from the battle for legal education supremacy between the law school

and apprenticeship advocates. As the law schools fought to establish their legitimacy, the practicing profession (in large part themselves products of the apprenticeship method) refused to concede that law school training was indispensable to the education of a lawyer. This refusal by the practicing lawyers to concede the value, if not the necessity, of law school training fostered among the law school advocates an unwillingness to recognize any training, other than academic instruction at the law school, as an essential or proper element of legal education.

Examination of these two factors in the context of the contemporary legal climate casts considerable doubt on their continuing validity as a basis for rejecting the clinical training concept in the law school environment. First, while Langdell's case method is still almost universally viewed as the heart of legal education because it forces students to weave their own synthesis of the law through case readings and Socratic classroom discussions, it is no longer regarded as the exclusive method of instruction by the law schools themselves. Seminars, courses in legal research and writing, appellate advocacy and trial practice all clearly demonstrate that legal instruction is no longer inextricably bound to the case method. The second reason for rejecting clinical education, the battle scars of the war for legal education supremacy, also has little or no relevance today. Few would seriously argue now that the law school is not the best and most efficient method of producing competent lawyers. The legitimacy of the law school is no longer in balance. Indeed, the question now is how law schools can best meet their educational responsibilities. Hence, it seems likely that the recent

resurgence of interest in clinical education can be credited in large part to recognition by the law schools that practical legal training and the study of legal theory are not mutually exclusive activities, but rather are quite compatible with each other and in fact tend to be mutually beneficial.

THE CLINICAL EDUCATION CONCEPT

In light of the fact that the case method is viewed today as a vital, but not exclusive, method of legal instruction, the focus of the report will be an examination of clinical education as a complementary method of legal instruction. In short, it will be suggested that clinical programs add a dimension to the law school curriculum and at the same time can enrich the educational value of the traditional classroom experience. The advantages of this approach can best be seen through an assessment of the goals of clinical legal education. Although he undoubtedly would agree that these goals can probably be formulated in many different ways, Mr. John Ferren, former Director of the Legal Services Program at Harvard Law School, concludes that there are fundamentally only two. The first is the teaching of practical and essential legal skills. The second is the opportunity for the student to gain an understanding of the behavior of judicial and other governmental officials in areas where there exist sizable delegations of discretionary power to these officials. While a clinical program may be justified if it substantially furthers either goal, many programs will advance various elements of each.

With regard to the first goal, the advancement of legal skills, it is important to understand that this goal encompasses a broad spectrum of attributes which are essential to the successful practicing lawyer. Skills which can be furthered in the clinical context include fact gathering and investigation, interviewing and counseling, negotiation, legal research, drafting and brief writing, advocacy before tribunals and decision making. The development of these skills, however, has more than the obvious utilitarian advantages to recommend it.

As an integral part of the skill development process, the law student is forced to analyze and apply substantive legal principles in a practice context. He must use his knowledge to make the system responsive to his client's interests and needs and hopefully to produce a desired result. This experience, in a way that could rarely, if ever, be duplicated in the classroom, can and should lead to a deeper appreciation of our legal system and its processes. On a less expansive plane, but equally important, the student should also sharpen his sense of professional responsibility, an aspect of clinical education that is often overlooked. And finally, as the interplay between theory and practice on the clinical side proceeds, the classroom experience should take on increased significance. The subject matter of lecture and discussion in class one day may well be the crux of a client's case the next. The emphasis then ought to be on the potential for a reciprocal relationship between clinical and traditional classroom education. While either approach by itself can doubtlessly produce adequately trained lawyers, the point is that

the job can be done better when the two approaches are combined. The lawyer cannot be all scholar or all technician; he needs the qualities and skills of both.

The second major goal of clinical education, like the first, has its distinctly practical side. It entails giving the student an opportunity for observation and study of government in at least four important respects: a) the functioning of the legislature, governmental agencies and the courts as rule making and policy making bodies; b) the impact of governmental agencies and the courts on various classes of people; c) the effectiveness and efficiency with which governmental institutions implement laws and the underlying policies that they are responsible for carrying out; and d) prospects for reform of these institutions and laws where needed. Although a sophisticated grasp of governmental processes in these respects should make one a more able legal practitioner, broader concerns are involved as well. Lawyers have traditionally played a leadership role at all levels of society, a fact which law schools must continue to recognize. To the extent that clinical education exposes students to government and its problems, it can serve to prepare them for general intellectual, political and social leadership in our society. While this justification for clinical education may seem to stress somewhat intangible factors, such intangible factors may well have more long term significance than all others considered. They should not be dismissed out of hand.

Clinical education is not without its detractors. Perhaps the most often stated criticism is that while clinical education

does perform valuable legal training, primary responsibility for this training ought to rest on the shoulders of the practitioners, not the legal educators. Although law schools cannot shoulder the entire burden of legal training, this suggested division of responsibility has problems. First, on a general level, it seems reasonable to maintain that experience in any profession enhances the study of the body of knowledge or theoretical principles on which the profession is based. For example, medicine, the sciences and engineering have all integrated that approach into their curriculum. A similar approach, as has been emphasized, is both justified and feasible in law. Second, from the viewpoint of teaching non-academic legal skills, the practicing profession simply is unable to offer adequate opportunity for all to obtain the necessary training. At a time when more law graduates than ever are going out on their own, the result is that many are left to acquire experience at the expense of his first clients. Finally, even if such training were available from the practicing bar for all graduates, one function of the formal educational system is to "shortcut the long hard road of experience." Law schools should not shirk this responsibility.

A second criticism of clinical education is that the costs are excessive, that the moneys supporting it could be used more effectively elsewhere in the law school's educational program. While clinical programs, like all programs, should withstand scrutiny in terms of money spent and benefits derived, a charge that clinical education is, per se, too expensive is misleading. The costs of clinical programs vary widely; funding, therefore, should be considered separately for each program. Also it must

be borne in mind that the relative cost of clinical education depends in large measure on the standard of comparison used. As opposed to the cost per law student in the classroom setting, the cost of clinical education may be high. But what would a similar cost comparison with graduate students in other fields such as medicine, veterinary medicine, forestry and engineering show? Though this committee has not compiled statistics on the matter, it is unlikely that the cost of clinical legal education will prove to be "high" with respect to costs in all of these fields.

The basis for a sweeping criticism of clinical education is not to be found. Rather, the concept of clinical education offers a variety of educational benefits to complement traditional methods of instruction. While specific clinical programs may be criticized for their failure to achieve desired learning results or for their excessive costs, that fact should not relegate the clinical concept to the lowest priority in the law school curriculum. Instead, each clinical program deserves to be rationally and individually evaluated -- its educational benefits determined and its costs and problems ascertained. Only when these factors have been analyzed can it be decided whether a particular program merits adoption and implementation. Likewise, an existing program should be reexamined periodically to see whether its educational benefits are in fact being realized and to determine whether the costs of the program have become too great in light of the program's record of effectiveness.

EXISTING CLINICAL PROGRAMS

There are currently two clinical programs here at the Law School, the Legal Aid and Defender Society and the Prosecutorial Clinic. In this section of the report, the Committee will review the background of these programs and their educational goals. This discussion will conclude with the suggestion of some modifications intended to improve the educational quality of both programs and in certain instances increase the level of student participation. It is the belief of this Committee that the Legal Aid and Prosecutorial Clinic programs are fundamentally sound in conception and that any expansion or renewal of the law school's commitment to clinical education should begin with them. Additional programs or curriculum offerings should build from the existing foundation.

Legal Aid

The Legal Aid and Defender Society has experienced substantial growth over its ten years of existence. Starting as a small organization of volunteers who performed legal services for Clarke County indigents with no compensation or academic credit, Legal Aid has grown into a program providing clinical training for over 250 law students a year. Presently, Legal Aid consists of two major components: representation of Clarke County indigents in both civil and criminal matters and counseling of Georgia prisoners on post-trial and habeas corpus matters under the auspices of the Prisoner Legal Counseling Project (PLCP). Most student participation is in the first component

with students handling over 650 criminal and 400 civil cases last year. In addition, students handle a large number of prisoner matters out of the Athens office. The PLCP, however, has four student positions available each quarter that require full time work at the PLCP Center in Jackson, Georgia. Duties include interviewing and counseling prisoners, handling prisoner administrative problems and, when necessary, instituting legal action on the prisoner's behalf. The present academic credit allowed for the program is only 3 hours; therefore, the student positions frequently go unfilled except in summer quarter because the student is required to sacrifice a quarter of law school for only 3 credit hours.

?

Legal Aid receives its financial support from various sources. The Clarke County Board of Commissioners has a contract with Legal Aid for defending indigents in criminal cases. Funds from this source pays the rent for office space in downtown Athens. The University of Georgia pays for supplies, the salary of the Director of the program, the Deputy Director and one secretary. The PLCP is funded by two sources: the State Crime Commission and the State Department of Offender Rehabilitation. This program currently employs four full time attorneys and two secretaries. The principal educational objective of Legal Aid is to afford the student an opportunity to develop legal skills and a sense of professional responsibility. Student duties include interviewing and counseling, fact gathering and investigation, the drafting of various legal documents, memoranda of law and appellate briefs. In addition to this

training, the student has the opportunity to observe at close range the civil and criminal processes of the State.

Despite its potential, Legal Aid has been burdened with a number of problems. If anything, these problems have grown more serious of late rather than diminishing. First, and surely the most important of these problems, Legal Aid is understaffed and over subscribed. Presently, six attorneys work in the entire Legal Aid and PLCP programs, including Professor Peckham who serves as Director. These attorneys are responsible for the ultimate supervision of all cases handled by either Legal Aid or the Prisoner Legal Counseling Project. Some staff members, however, must spend a part of their time at correctional units around the state (mainly at Reidsville and Jackson). The Athens full time staff thus is the working equivalent of only three attorneys. As noted earlier, approximately 250 students per year participate in Legal Aid or an average of about 62 per quarter. The faculty student ratio is slightly less than 21:1, which is well above the 10:1 ratio believed to be optimal by CLEPR.

Far more important than the simple statistical comparison, however, is the way in which this poor ratio actually affects the educational quality of Legal Aid as a clinical program. The staff attorneys are so pressed with their primary caseloads that they can do little more than approve or disapprove recommendations for action made by students working on their own groups of assigned cases. The students, as a result, get less first hand supervision from the staff attorneys than is desirable

in the clinical setting. The teaching of skills such as interviewing is done by third year students. As long as Legal Aid operates under the existing handicaps, there is little likelihood that the educational quality of the program can be improved upon.

A second weakness in the program is that student participation in Legal Aid is limited to one quarter in each of the second and third years. Students are required to put in a minimum of six hours office work per week during the quarter. The fact that students are in the program only for a quarter and then move on adds to the problems of inadequate supervision already discussed because it tends to disrupt the flow of work at Legal Aid and to create pressures which undermine the goals of the clinical experience. During the course of each quarter, a fixed amount of time must be set aside for transitional matters. For one thing, incoming students must be introduced to Legal Aid procedures, exhausting at least the first week of the quarter. Substantial time is also consumed in the assigning of cases to the students who then must begin to familiarize themselves with a file initiated and developed by someone else the preceding quarter. The combined effect of these quarterly start up procedures means that the student spends proportionately too much time finding out what he is supposed to do and not enough carrying out his responsibilities. Increasingly, the educational purposes of the clinical program have become subordinate to the more immediate need to service Legal Aid's many clients.

Another weakness of the Legal Aid program is its lack of a formal instructional component. Presently, some training is available to help the incoming second year student develop specialized clinical skills such as interviewing, counseling and field investigation. As pointed out earlier, however, the drawback is that third year students perform this training function and do so on a limited and fairly informal basis. Although students do consult with the staff attorneys from time to time, these conferences of necessity are perfunctory in nature. Legal Aid is making the best of a difficult situation, but it must be acknowledged that the program is currently unable to concentrate fully on the basic goals expected of a sound clinical program. While additions to the clinical faculty and organizational changes in Legal Aid would be improvements, they should be accompanied by the development of a seminar or laboratory component as a required part of the Legal Aid course. Even though many of the lasting benefits of clinical education derive from the practical experience, that experience alone is not sufficient. The student needs the classroom component as well in order to insure that he is acquiring the fundamental skills. In addition, the classroom component should serve as a place for students to discuss their cases with the faculty supervisor and with each other. Such discussions would enable the supervisor to identify problem areas and to clarify the educational purposes of the clinical program to the students. Finally, the classroom setting would be a place where substantive legal issues of common

interest could be thrashed out.

Although the preceding comments apply to the Prisoner Legal Counseling Project fully inasmuch as it is an arm of Legal Aid, the PLCP operates under certain disabilities which are unique to that program. The legal problems of prisoners represent a major source of case work for Legal Aid students. But unlike Legal Aid matters which arise in Clarke County, the PLCP caseload comes from a number of correctional institutions around the state. An integral but time consuming part of PLCP work is interviewing prisoners, a process which obviously must take place outside Athens. Currently, the interviewing is handled in the following manner: 1) staff attorneys and students based in Athens spending a portion of each week traveling to the prisons; 2) a full time staff attorney supported by four students serving as resident interns working at the prison in Jackson, Georgia which has generated a substantial amount of PLCP work in the past. These internships, however, are usually not filled because few students can afford to sacrifice an entire quarter doing PLCP work in Jackson while receiving only three hours academic credit. It seems then that as far as the PLCP student internship is concerned, the law school ought to terminate the program or else make it sufficiently attractive so that students can realistically be expected to have an interest in pursuing it.

The Committee recommends as a matter of policy that the Law School strive to accommodate student demand for clinical education at existing levels. At the same time, it seems clear

that there is a need for the allocation of more resources for supervision and instruction at the initial stage of involvement in clinical. If a sound introductory clinical course is developed, the Committee believes that the student's capacity for independent work later on will be appreciably greater and in turn the need for close supervision much less. Therefore, in the Committee's view, the following proposals merit the serious consideration of the Law School faculty:

1) The enrollment of new students in Legal Aid should be limited to 30-35 students per quarter.

Any second or third year student in good academic standing would be eligible. These students would be required to take an introductory clinical education course which would familiarize them with Legal Aid procedures, the courts in which they would be working and finally the basic skills which they must possess in order to be an effective practicing attorney. It is the Committee's expectation that this course would be fairly structured and would have a seminar component that would include regular discussions of ongoing cases and simulation of various practice situations. Supervision would be close and the faculty member would be expected to monitor the progress of his students, periodically offering criticism and evaluation of their performances.

In the final analysis, it is hoped that the student who has had this intensive introductory training will be able to make the transition very smoothly into the more advanced phases of Legal Aid or some other clinical program.

2) The Law School should increase the maximum number of credit hours for Legal Aid or a comparable program from six to twelve. Any student who has taken the introductory course would be eligible to take nine more hours of clinical without being committed to any particular time or course sequence. For example, a second year student could take the introductory course in the fall and then if desired work in Legal Aid again in the spring. The following year he could participate in Legal Aid under the third year practice act for as many as six hours. If he could not get one of the third year practice slots, which are limited to fifteen per quarter, he could still do the case work just as he did in his second year. Some consideration was given by the Committee to a structured two quarter clinical course in Legal Aid for the second year, but the idea was rejected because it lacked flexibility from the student's perspective and also because most of the funda-

mentals about clinical work can be taught in a single quarter.

3) During the next three years, the Law School should add at least two persons to the clinical staff. The qualifications of these individuals should be sufficiently distinctive that they can have faculty status and be on the tenure track. Ideally, these individuals would teach substantive courses from time to time in addition to their clinical responsibilities. The Committee believes that the responsibility between clinical personnel and the academic faculty should be better than it has been and that this proposal might result in an improvement along that line. One of the additions to the clinical faculty should have the job of directing or co-ordinating clinical programs for the law school. A special responsibility of this position would be development of seminars and accompanying teaching materials and techniques to improve the overall quality of clinical instruction as well as to meet the practical needs of the students.

4) Somewhat tentatively, the Committee suggests that consideration be given to the division of Legal Aid into criminal and civil sections. This proposal rests on the assumption that many students

might find it desirable to concentrate their clinical work in the general field in which their long range practice interests lie. If so, it follows that any introductory clinical course as well as any advanced offerings ought to be adapted to meet the needs of persons moving into the separate areas. A criminal trial practice course, for example, could legitimately differ in approach and emphasis from its civil counterpart. One major disadvantage of this proposal at least in conception is that it would mark the beginning of something like a bureaucracy with departments, chains of command and several layers of staff. If this initial reservation cannot be resolved satisfactorily, then specialization of clinical course offerings along civil and criminal lines ought to be considered in the context of the present organizational structure.

5) Academic credit for the PLCP resident internship at Jackson, Georgia should be increased to a level so that a student could accept it without having to make up for the lost hours by taking overloads in other quarters. The Committee does not think that 15 quarter hours credit is justified as some have suggested; 9 to 12 hours seems more reasonable. At this juncture, the Committee believes that the introductory clinical course should be a prerequisite to this internship.

Prosecutorial Clinic

The other major clinical program at the Law School is the Prosecutorial Clinic which was established in 1970 with funding from CLEPR. The Clinic has had an average participation of about 40 students each year. For the current academic year, the number is 43. Selection for Prosecutorial Clinic is based on a writing competition among rising second year students and the program involves a two year commitment. Students chosen to participate begin in the fall of their second year and continue work in the program until the quarter of their graduation. Academic credit is one hour per quarter with a maximum of six hours credit over the two year period. Until this year, the Prosecutorial Clinic was funded jointly by the Law School and LEAA. LEAA funding terminated this fall, however, and the Law School has now assumed financial responsibility for the salaries of the director and a secretary and in addition provides a small sum for operating expenses and travel. Office space for the Clinic is provided rent free by Clarke County.

Although Prosecutorial Clinic shares basically the same educational goals as Legal Aid, it does not labor under the same numerical burdens in terms of student involvement. The 43 students now in the Clinic are equally divided between second and third year. The second year students spend the preponderance of their time engaged in investigation and legal research to aid in the preparation of cases for preliminary hearings as well as for trial. Few second year students write appellate briefs. The third year students, in contrast,

concentrate most of their energies in the development of trial skills. They start with appearances in magistrate's court and move on quickly to grand jury proceedings, arraignments and the argument of pre-trial motions. Eventually, they get into State Court and Superior Court where they assist in the trial of misdemeanors and felonies and ultimately prosecute such cases on their own. In fact, during 1976, third year Clinic students conducted a dozen felony and many more misdemeanor trials. At the present, at least six individuals carry their own prosecutorial caseload and only minimal supervision over them is required. The only other significant responsibility for third year students is the writing of two appellate briefs.

The unifying feature of the Prosecutorial Clinic program is the weekly seminar/lecture meeting. There the students have an opportunity to discuss their experiences and to find help on problems arising in connection with their research or case work. In addition, there is lecture or discussion about substantive issues in criminal law and procedure and evidence. Trial practice issues are taken up as well. The general orientation of these sessions is toward the practical problems of trying a criminal case: elements of crimes; evidence that will establish these elements; limitations on admissibility; and constitutional considerations.

Overall, the Committee finds that Prosecutorial Clinic is doing a sound job in accomplishing the fundamental educational objectives of a clinical program. There is an abundance

of practical experience in all phases of legal work and a classroom component which helps the students to assimilate this experience and enables them to built on it. Although there are 43 students presently under only one person, Mr. Thomas Cook, that ratio does not accurately reflect the amount of supervision that the students actually receive. Other members of the District Attorney's office assist in working with them. Even so, the Committee believes that at some point the hiring of a second person with teaching responsibility should receive consideration. The major purpose of this addition would be to make more supervision available to the students and not to increase the level of participation in the Clinic in any significant way. Finally, in keeping with the recommendation made for Legal Aid, the Committee believes that maximum academic credit for Prosecutorial Clinic ought to be increased from six to twelve hours.

EXPANSION OF CLINICAL PROGRAMS

Although Legal Aid and the Prosecutorial Clinic can, if developed to their potential, provide clinical opportunities for a substantial number of students, the law school's commitment should not be considered satisfied at that point. First of all, the student demand for clinical education will still probably not be met. Second, neither program offers a full range of possible clinical experiences. Consequently, this Committee believes that the Law School should give serious thought to the following proposed additions to the existing clinical programs. In the pages to follow will appear a description of these programs and their purposes along with a discussion of the probable costs. The Committee wishes to emphasize its view, however, that no expenditures for new clinical programs should be incurred until Legal Aid and the Prosecutorial Clinic have been upgraded to more acceptable educational standards. The proposed programs are:

- 1) Legislative Law Center
- 2) Student Prepaid Legal Services
- 3) Externships with:
 - a) State and Federal Judges
 - b) Governmental Agencies
 - c) Legislative Committees
 - d) Law Firms

Legislative Law Center

The Committee recommends that the faculty work toward the establishment of a Legislative Law Center as a vehicle for students

to engage in legislative research and drafting as a clinical experience. Several types of benefits would accrue from such a program both to the students as well as the law school.

The first immediate benefit would be one common to all clinical programs: the students would have their legal education enhanced by "real world" experience. In this context, the students would be able to put to practical use their knowledge about various areas of substantive law as well as the course taught by Professor Sentell in legislation which ought to be a pre-requisite for participation in the Legislative Law Center.

A separate benefit would be the opportunity to learn a new skill, legislative drafting, which would help to round out the student's range of skills. In the first year of law school, the student is exposed to appellate advocacy through the moot court program and memoranda writing in the legal research course. Statutory draftsmanship is likewise a skill which can be taught and would be useful to the student in future years in his role as an attorney.

Too much emphasis in our curriculum is presently placed on the common law nature of the law, with legislative lawmaking overlooked to a great extent. In courses which do treat legislative enactments, the tendency is to treat the statutes as given. In the Legislative Law Center, the student would grapple with the problems of legislation from the very beginning. He would be required, in addition to doing research, to devise the best way to translate ideas and policies into statutes.

A third benefit to the student would be the broadening of his own educational experience through working with representa-

tives of other disciplines in formulating statutory solutions to currently perceived problems. In other words, the student would be required to learn to interact with and evaluate information from, e.g., law enforcement officials, sociologists, scientists, psychiatrists, planners, or whoever else might have input into the legislative process. The student's mastery of research skills would have to extend beyond the law library.

A final benefit for the student would be the opportunity to observe the legislative process from the inside. Regardless of whether he would be working for a legislative committee, an individual legislator, or an interested lobbying group, he would gain insight into the practical operation of the legislative process. Because most of our students come from this state and intend to stay here, this insight would be most valuable if it could be gained in the Georgia General Assembly.

The Law School would benefit from such a program also. In addition to broadening the educational program here, the Legislative Law Center would result in enhanced placement prospects for our graduates and in improved relationships with the General Assembly. Professor Richard Dole, of the University of Iowa Law School, who conducts a similar program reports that because of the outstanding work done by the students in the program, his school has had much greater success than before in placing its graduates in staff positions with the Iowa legislature. In fact, he reports, that many staff positions are being created because of the favorable impression being made by the student work. He also reports that the appropriations

for the law school do not suffer because of the increased contact between law school faculty and students and the legislators through the program.

The Committee is aware of legislative drafting programs which are currently operating at four schools: Iowa, Vanderbilt, Michigan and Yale. Relatively detailed descriptions of each of these programs is included because they reflect varying approaches to the concept and provide a good background from which to select a program for Georgia.

IOWA

The Iowa Legislative Workshop program is a year-long course in which a student can earn two course credits as well as three of the five "student writing hours" which are needed for graduation. Under the direction of Professor Richard Dole, the program is limited to 18 students per year. Second and third year students are eligible for the seminar.

The fall semester at Iowa is devoted to several practice drafting exercises, guest lectures by legislators, staff people and professionals in other disciplines, and readings in the legislative process. Professor Dole reports that he has had more success in using political science materials than traditional law school readings. During the fall, the individual students also select the major drafting work they would like to do for the year. They make this selection in consultation with Professor Dole who reports that he maintains a catalogue of possible topics. This catalogue is compiled by periodically writing state legislators, Congressmen, scanning legislative develop-

ment newsletters from the Council of State Governments, and scanning major circulation newspapers. Dole also is a member of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and develops some ideas through this service.

Once the topic is selected, the students in the Legislative Workshop do their preliminary research, outlining and other work in the fall with the major writing and drafting of the legislation in the spring. In accordance with an Iowa faculty rule, the three hour paper, which the spring drafting assignment is, consists of approximately 45 pages of text and manuscript. The actual draft of the legislation is in addition to this 45-page paper.

A separate, but related program at Iowa is the Legislative Intern program in which second year law students are permitted to work as legislative interns at the state capitol for legislators on a full or part-time basis. According to Professor Dole, these assignments are made only to lawyer/legislators who usually are committee chairmen. The interns must do law-related work and are under the supervision of Professor Dole or another faculty member.

The supervision takes the form of bi-weekly return trips from the state capitol to Iowa City, where the law school is located, for two to three hour discussions with the faculty advisor. The student is required to keep a journal of his activities, bring samples of his written work to these meetings and also is required to do outside reading on the legislative process. The student receives twelve hours of classroom

credit for a full-time one semester internship with three hours of credit toward completion of the writing requirement. He must do a major paper similar to the paper in the Legislative Workshop in order to get the paper credit.

MICHIGAN

At Michigan student work in the area of legislation is possible in three separate programs: the legislative research center, the legislative drafting seminar and the course on legislation. All three programs are under the direction of William Pierce, who was a candidate for the deanship at Georgia this past fall.

The legislative research center is purely voluntary for under-graduates in the J.D. program. No academic credit is given. Dean Pierce reports that approximately 3-8 students volunteer to do work in this project each year. It is a continuous program without regard to the semester calendar. Usually, the center includes approximately three graduate students who are pursuing the S.J.D. degree at Michigan. There are no course pre-requisites and there is no classroom component. Topic ideas come from both outside sources, like the legislature or interest groups, and inside sources, such as faculty members or the students themselves.

Dean Pierce also operates a legislative drafting seminar for three hours credit. This is limited to 15 upperclass students who work on one legislative drafting project each semester. Because Dean Pierce is intimately involved in the Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, that group usually provides the research project. The students do both legal and empirical

research with the end product being one piece of justifying research and a statute. No formal drafting exercises are presented to the students, but the beginning of the course is devoted to the drafting of short provisions dealing with one problem within the overall project. These drafts are exchanged anonymously and critiqued by Pierce in the seminar session.

Pierce's course on legislation is run as a three hour single semester course. There is a varying enrollment with, for example, 85 students in the current class. There is an examination for half of the credit in the course with two other written projects required: one of these is usually an analysis of a problem of federal statutory interpretation and consideration of the role of legislative history in providing an answer. The other written exercise is a short drafting assignment.

VANDERBILT

The Vanderbilt Legislative Reference Bureau began several years ago as a purely voluntary extra-curricular activity. It was designed to provide an outlet for students to work on legislative drafting in an atmosphere comparable to a law review. The organization includes three major student offices: Student Director, Research Coordinator and Managing Editor. Professor Donald Hall is the faculty advisor.

The director is comparable to the editor-in-chief of a law review. Among other things, he allocates projects which come in, appoints project managers for complex drafting projects, assigns editing responsibilities and personally reviews all pieces of legislation prior to distribution outside the bureau.

The research coordinator is the link with the "outside" world. It is his job to receive communications from groups seeking the Bureau's services. The Managing editor is responsible for supervising the editorial process within the Bureau.

An individual or group from outside the law school will contact the research coordinator, who confers with the "client" to clarify the scope and nature of the request. The research coordinator will do a brief, general analysis of the subject matter, including a synopsis of the problem, relevant case law and statutory law. He must satisfy himself that it is a feasible project. He then passes it on to the director who announces the project and determines who, if anybody, would like to work on it. If there is no interest or available people, the project is postponed.

If the project is undertaken, it goes through an editing process under the direction of the faculty advisor and the student officers, both as to substance and style. The final action of the Bureau, before sending the finished product to the "client," is reviewed by the executive committee, which includes the three student officers and the faculty advisor. The faculty advisor serves a public relations role with the bureau, seeking to get input and requests from lobbyists, public interest groups, individual legislators and referrals from the legislative counsel's office in the state legislature.

The students all get one hour credit per semester on a pass/fail basis for their participation in the legislative research bureau. The faculty advisor awards the credit. Approx-

mately 10-12 students per semester participate in the program.

Legislation produced by the Vanderbilt Bureau in the past several years has included model legislation on the financing of public schools, compensation of victims of crime, a comprehensive consumer protection code, creation of a statewide food stamp program in Tennessee and legislation dealing with computers and the right to privacy.

YALE

The Yale program, which is now 10 years old, is possibly the oldest drafting service operating at an American law school. The group is completely student operated, with one student director and an executive board of five other students serving as the capstone of the organization. Requests are briefly researched by the directors and then offered to students working alone or in teams of two for research and drafting.

Approximately 20 students are working on projects at any one time. They are given one or, perhaps two, credits for a project, depending on the complexity of the problem. Most of the requests, reports faculty advisor Geoffrey Hazard, come from individual legislators, the Connecticut legislature itself and good government types of groups. The students can earn a maximum of 5 credits for their work in the bureau over a 2 and 1/2 year period. An additional two credits can be earned for participating on the executive board.

Professor Hazard states that because of the quality of the work done in the past, there is always more demand on the bureau than can possibly be handled. He also does not play a very detailed supervisory role, because the pressure of professional

competence is a motivation all by itself. As he explains it, "If they want to get more business, they have to do good work on this project."

After discussion and examination of the alternatives suggested by the experience and programs of other schools, the Committee recommends the following steps be taken toward the establishment of a Legislative Law Center at Georgia:

- 1) Assign to the clinical education director or a faculty member with special training or interest in the project the responsibility of exploring the possibilities for the creation of a legislative drafting and research program. Although this may not be possible at the beginning, the long range goal of such a program should be to provide drafting and research services to outside clients like the legislature, public interest groups and lobbyists.

- 2) As a part of this exploratory phase, develop an experimental, one quarter seminar in legislative drafting to be taught during the 1977-78 academic year, preferably in the fall. The purpose of this seminar would be to take a problem area in which legislation is required, research it thoroughly, draft the appropriate statute and prepare commentary on it. Three hours credit should be awarded and the course in

legislation should be a prerequisite.

3) The next step would be for the director of clinical education to take the work product of this seminar and distribute it to individuals and groups, including the Georgia General Assembly, to show them what services the Law Center would be able to provide.

4) If sufficient interest in the program appears to exist, the faculty should then make the decision whether or not it wants to implement plans to create the Law Center. The costs of adding this program might well be less than with any of the other proposed changes sought by this Committee since it is likely that a faculty member with special interest in the legislation field could assume responsibility for the Law Center as a part of his full time teaching load.

Student Prepaid Legal Services Program

The typical prepaid legal services program is designed to provide affordable personal legal services to individual members of a group. Numerous universities have organized prepaid legal services programs for the benefit of their students, most of whom cannot individually afford attorneys' fees. A nominal portion of the traditional, mandatory student activities fee is utilized to finance the prepaid legal services program. The

activities fee pays the salaries of the attorney(s) and clerical staff who service the students' legal needs. By spreading the cost of legal services among a large number of students, affordable legal services are made available to the student body.

The proposal made here for consideration and adoption of a prepaid legal services program follows the traditional model with three important variations: (1) the proposed program will not operate independent of the Law School, but will instead be directly supervised by Law School personnel; (2) law students will furnish a substantial portion of the legal services needed by the general student population; and (3) law students will receive academic credit for their work. These variations on the traditional model result from the proposed integration of the prepaid legal services program into the Law School curriculum. In other words, in addition to making professional legal services available to students who currently have inadequate or no access to legal counsel, the program will serve as a clinical tool for the education of law students.

Unlike many other proposals for expanding the clinical education opportunities at the University of Georgia, this proposal has the advantage of establishing a clinical education program which will be self-supporting, financially, after the first year of operation. With the exception of the first year, funding for the program and supervisory staff will be drawn from student contributions, rather than from limited legislative appropriations or grant monies. The proposal also has the advantage of having already received the support of the Student

Government Association, in the form of \$10,000.00 for immediate use. President Davison has also expressed approval of a prepaid legal services program staffed by law students.

Before a commitment is made to the prepaid legal services program however, it is suggested that a survey of the students at the University of Georgia be undertaken. (See sample questionnaire, attached) First, the extent of student support for mandatory contributions to a prepaid legal services program must be ascertained. Although the SBA obviously supports the program, it would be helpful to know what the student body, as a whole, thinks of the prospect of an ongoing program supported by student fees. In addition, before the precise scope and membership of the program can be defined, the types of students most likely to need the services of a prepaid legal services program, and the types of legal questions which most frequently plague students, must be ascertained.

Although a rational recommendation of the feasibility of the program and its precise scope can be made only after a survey, some generalizations about the proposed program can be ventured. Because law students in the prepaid legal services program would be expected to receive clinical training comparable to that offered in the revised Legal Aid program, it is recommended that, as with Legal Aid, anyone enrolling in the program for the first time should be required to take an intensive, three hour introductory clinical education course. Such students should have attained at least second year status. Overall academic credit for student participation in this clinical

program should be no more than twelve hours, including the introductory course.

Second, it should be noted that other prepaid legal services programs often exclude from coverage part-time students, student organizations and students who qualify for other, perhaps indigent, legal services. They also exclude from the program cases which are expected to generate considerable attorneys' fees and would therefore probably be undertaken by the practicing bar, criminal cases in which appointed counsel is available, cases which because of their complexity and time demands are judged to be inappropriate for the program and cases which involve a possibility of a professional conflict of interest. It is recommended that the scope and membership of the University of Georgia program be similarly restricted.

Third, a referral service, incorporated into the prepaid legal services program, is generally maintained to assist those students with non-qualifying cases in finding legal counsel. It is recommended that a referral service be made a part of the prepaid legal services program so as to ensure that all students who contribute support receive at least assistance in locating legal counsel. Such a referral program, operated under the auspices of the law school, would increase contacts between the practicing bar and the law student.

Some generalizations can also be made about the organization of the prepaid legal services program. As an initial proposition, it must be stressed that the program should not function independently of the law school. Although on other

university campuses the prepaid legal services program is independent of law school influence or supervision, the proposed program for the University of Georgia cannot be. If academic credit is to be given students who participate in the program, adequate law school supervision is required. That supervision would be imposed in several ways. The clinical education director or coordinator at the law school would have ultimate supervisory authority over the program. More immediate supervision would be furnished by the staff attorney(s) who actually render the legal services to students. Staff attorney's would also be expected to teach the introductory three hour course which should be a prerequisite to student participation in the legal services program. In addition, the program should be supervised by a faculty committee which will set policies governing the program. There should also be a committee charged with monitoring the day-to-day operation of the program. It is believed that, at least for the initial year(s) of operation, supervisory and monitoring committees are essential although in subsequent years, as the program becomes more stable, these committees may be disbanded. In addition, during the initial year(s) of the program's operation, it is recommended that the legal services program not be combined with the current legal aid program. The two programs serve different constituencies, will, for that reason, be housed in different places, will be funded from different sources, and will handle different types of cases. The major attribute which the two programs have in common is their utilization of law students working for academic credit. That similarity is

not thought sufficient to attempt integration of the programs, at least during the initial, experimental year(s) of operation of the prepaid program. As a general plan of action, the Committee proposes:

- 1) In the spring of 1977, a survey of the University of Georgia student body should be conducted to determine the level of student interest in prepaid legal services.
- 2) In the 1977-78 academic year (assuming significant student interest), the University or the Law School should consider adding \$10,000 to the amount set aside by the Student Government Association for the purpose of hiring an attorney to set the program in motion. The background and academic credentials of this attorney should be high enough to justify appointment as a regular faculty member. In addition to handling student legal matters, this attorney would teach the introductory clinical course to a limited number of students in 1977-78 and also would work with the clinical director or coordinator to establish permanent curriculum and organizational framework for the program.
- 3) In 1978-79 with the collection of student activities fees, the prepaid legal services program should be self-sustaining. Assuming a charge of \$1.50 per student and 22,000 students, the revenue would be around \$33,000. Out of this money would

come the salaries of the prepaid legal services director and a secretary plus amounts to cover other expenses such as duplication and filing fees. Once the program becomes fully operational, limitations on student participation and academic credit can be set. It is recommended, however, academic credit and the introductory clinical course component for prepaid legal services be the same as for Legal Aid and the Prosecutorial Clinic.

Extern Quarter Program

The extern quarter allows the participating student to spend one quarter of his second or third year in law school away from the University campus participating in a faculty approved program of clinical legal education. The student would pay full tuition for this quarter and receive at least 12 quarter hours credit for satisfactory performance in the program. The student would also be entirely responsible for his expenses while participating in the extern quarter. The purpose of the extern quarter program is to expose the student to clinical legal education opportunities that are not physically available at the University.

Law schools around the nation have recognized basically four types of externships: a) judicial; b) governmental agency; c) legislative; and d) law firm. Generally speaking, the educational value of these externships lies in the student's opportunity to participate in various governmental processes --

judicial and non-judicial -- while still maintaining the perspective of the lawyer. The Committee has found that the potential for an educationally valid clinical experience exists with respect to each type of externship provided certain ground rules and supervision can be assured. Moreover, as clinical programs go, externships are relatively inexpensive since they can be established without necessarily hiring anyone new or seeking new sources of money. And finally, externships, according to the experiences of several law schools, offer increased access into the job market since it is not an unusual occurrence for an extern to be given consideration for a permanent position by the agency for which he worked as a student.

The Committee's major reservation about the externship concept is the propriety of awarding academic credit. There is precedent for such credit already in the form of the Prisoner Legal Counseling Project and Senator Sam Nunn externships, both of which carry three hours of credit per quarter. The present proposal involves increasing academic credit for such experiences to possibly 12 hours. Assuming enough work and student responsibility to justify that much academic credit, which is a substantial question, there is the further problem of supervision and evaluation.

The Committee is opposed to the awarding of as much as 12 hours of academic credit for a one quarter externship unless responsibility for supervision and evaluation of the students rests with someone having faculty status with this or some other law school. Furthermore, the Committee would require that the basis for evaluation would include all or some combina-

tion of the following:

- 1) the student's work product for the agency or institution;
- 2) a journal account of the student's activities such as participation or involvement in conferences, negotiations, hearings and court appearances;
- 3) a seminar paper concentrating in its discussion on issues relating to the agency or institution with which the student externed.

Since this section of the report is exploratory in nature, the Committee does not wish to prejudge any externship possibility. If adequate supervision can be provided for an externship with clear educational value from the Law School's perspective, the Committee believes that such an externship should be evaluated on its own merits. It is premature to formulate a general policy for or against this kind of educational program. Hence, the Committee recommends the following steps:

- 1) The clinical director or coordinator should spend a portion of his time developing externship opportunities for law students. Given the other demands which will be placed on this person, the Committee feels that for at least the next year externships should have lower priority than Legal Aid, Prosecutorial Clinic, the Legislative Law Center and Student Prepaid Legal Services. If the clinical director does have some time to devote to externships, he should devote it to the legislative

externship first and tie that program in with the
Legislative Law Center;

2) Externships should be arranged with agencies
or institutions that can provide an experienced
attorney to supervise the student while on the
job;

3) To the extent possible, externships should
be located in close enough proximity to the Law
School that the students can periodically return
to Athens during the quarter to consult with a
faculty advisor. Supervision by someone not a
member of the Law School faculty should be al-
lowed only in the exceptional case.

CONCLUSION

If this report accomplishes little else, it should disclose to the Law School faculty that there is considerable room for improvement in the existing clinical programs such as Legal Aid and Prosecutorial Clinic. It should also disclose that there are a number of fertile areas into which clinical education at the Law School might grow if the Faculty sees fit to make the commitment.

Commitment is the key word. The fact should not be overlooked that a substantial commitment to clinical education has already been made. The question for the faculty is what are we going to do with it. The Committee strongly urges the faculty to support the report's recommendations for strengthening Legal Aid and Prosecutorial Clinic. That recommendations is a minimum. It makes little sense to have Legal Aid and Prosecutorial Clinic programs serving almost 300 students without effectively accomplishing the goals traditionally recognized by clinical education standards. The first step toward improving existing clinical programs should be the appointment of a clinical director. He would be responsible for making those improvements a reality. Once this first goal is well on the way toward being met, the clinical director can turn his full attention to the prospects for expansion of clinical opportunities at the Law School and will give careful considerations to the further recommendations of this report.

1. SURVEY FORM USED BY DISTRICT COUNCIL 37, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY, AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO, NEW YORK

Would you be kind enough to complete the following questionnaire. Be assured the information requested will be strictly confidential.

1. Sex (Check One) Male Female

2. What is your marital status? (Check One)

single divorced
 married widowed
 separated other, specify _____

How many children have you under 19 years of age? _____

3. In what year were you born? _____

4. Where were you born? (Check One and complete)

United States. Specify which state _____
 Other, Specify country _____

5. Have you ever used a lawyer? Yes No

If yes, when? (Check One) presently pending case
 within last year
 more than 1 yr. ago but less than 5 years ago
 more than 5 years ago

For whom? (Check all which apply)

Self
 Spouse
 Child
 Other dependents

6.. Who was the most helpful person to you in locating a lawyer? (Check One)

family member
 a friend
 priest, rabbi, minister
 doctor
 union representative
 someone at work
 The Bar Association
 an official of a political party or club
 an elected official
 a community association representative
 social agency representative
 other, specify _____

7. If you have used a lawyer, what did you use him for? (Check all which apply)

- automobile or other non-work accident
- Workmen's Compensation
- divorce, separation, custody, support, or other family problems
- making or probating a will
- distribution of property after death of a family member
- tenant/landlord, housing or rent problem
- home purchase or ownership or other real estate problems
- debt, purchase on credit, fraudulent merchandise or garnishment on wages
- difficulty with medical care or medical bills
- tax or insurance problem
- criminal charges
- juvenile delinquency
- discrimination. Specify housing education employment
- other. Specify _____

8. Was the lawyer (Check One)

- self-employed
- member of a private firm
- from Legal Aid Society
- other. Specify _____

9. Even if you've never used a lawyer, you may have had a problem where a lawyer could help. Such problems are listed below. Think about the past few years and now. Check all problems you have faced for which you did not use a lawyer.

- automobile or other non-work accident
- Workmen's Compensation
- divorce, separation, custody, support, or other family problems
- making or probating a will
- distribution of property after death of a family member
- tenant/landlord, housing or rent problem
- home purchase or ownership or other real estate problems
- debt, purchase on credit, fraudulent merchandise or garnishment on wages
- difficulty with medical care or medical bills
- tax or insurance problem
- criminal charges
- juvenile delinquency
- discrimination. Specify housing education employment
- other. Specify _____

10. What has kept you or might keep you from using a lawyer? (Check all which apply)

- the expected cost
- didn't know where to find a lawyer
- didn't know how to choose a competent lawyer
- previous bad experience with lawyers
- distrust of lawyers
- no time to look for lawyer
- no time to follow through on legal case
- felt could handle problem myself or had other source of advice
- embarrassment at needing or using a lawyer
- other. Specify _____

11. If you had a legal problem and the union provided a legal service, do you think you might use it? Yes No

If yes, for what kinds of problems?

If no, why wouldn't you use this service? (Check all which apply)

- prefer my own lawyer
- don't expect to need legal advice
- distrust of lawyers
- never used a lawyer before
- no time to seek legal advice
- rather handle problems without a lawyer
- not sure what would be an appropriate problem
- question quality of service which would be available
- other. Specify _____

12. Do you feel there is a need for a legal benefit? Yes No

Would you care to explain?

13. Could you estimate approximately how much you spent for a lawyer.

last year? _____

totally, in the last five years? _____

14. Have you ever discussed the need for any other benefit with anyone in the union? Yes No

15. If yes, whom did you talk with? (Check all which apply)

- union representative
- member of negotiating committee
- friend at work
- other. Specify _____

16. What other benefits do you feel would be helpful?

17. Which health plan have you selected? H.I.P. G.H.I. Blue Shield

Thank you for your help.

If you wish you may supply your name and address.

2. SURVEY FORM USED BY NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, ALASKA

STUDY OF THE LEGAL NEEDS OF EDUCATORS

Part I = IDENTIFICATION

1. SEX

Male
 Female

2. TOTAL PAID EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE AS A TEACHER OR ADMINISTRATOR

1 year
 2-3 years
 4-5 years
 6-10 years
 11 & over

3. AGE

<input type="checkbox"/> Under 25	<input type="checkbox"/> 45-49
<input type="checkbox"/> 25-29	<input type="checkbox"/> 50-54
<input type="checkbox"/> 30-34	<input type="checkbox"/> 55-59
<input type="checkbox"/> 35-39	<input type="checkbox"/> 60-64
<input type="checkbox"/> 40-44	<input type="checkbox"/> 65 & Over

4. PRESENT ASSIGNMENT

Teaching
 Administration/Supervision
 Pupil Personnel/Special Services
 Other

5. LEVEL OF PRESENT ASSIGNMENT

<input type="checkbox"/> Kindergarten-Primary	<input type="checkbox"/> Community College (J.C.)
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Elementary	<input type="checkbox"/> Higher Education (4 year institution)
<input type="checkbox"/> Junior High	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input type="checkbox"/> High School	

6. CURRENT MARITAL STATUS

Single
 Married

Widowed
 Divorced

7. NUMBER OF MARRIAGES (Include current one if presently married)

0
 1
 2

3
 4 or more

8. NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS (Excluding spouse)

Number	Children	Other Than Children (example: parents, other relatives)
<input type="checkbox"/> 1		
<input type="checkbox"/> 2		
<input type="checkbox"/> 3		
<input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> 5		
<input type="checkbox"/> 6 or more		

9. TOTAL FAMILY INCOME (All sources)

_____ Under \$7,500	_____ 30,000-39,999
_____ 7,500-9,999	_____ 40,000-49,999
_____ 10,000-19,999	_____ 50,000 & over
_____ 20,000-29,999	

10. CONTRACT SALARY

_____ Under \$7,500	_____ 15,000-19,999
_____ 7,500-9,999	_____ 20,000-24,999
_____ 10,000-14,999	_____ 25,000 & over

11. IS YOUR SPOUSE GAINFULLY EMPLOYED OR SELF-EMPLOYED?

_____ Yes
_____ No

If YES, please check the appropriate response under either professional or non-professional.

Professional: _____ Self-employed _____ Salaried or wage earner
Non-Professional: _____ Self-employed _____ Salaried or wage earner

12. PLEASE CHECK YES OR NO TO THE FOLLOWING ITEMS

ITEM	YES	NO
Do you own any business?		
Do you hold a second job?		
Do you own your own home?		
Do you own other non-income real estate?		
Do you own any other income producing real estate (e.g., rentals)?		
Have you ever filed a workman's compensation claim?		
Do you carry automobile insurance?		
Do you carry homeowners insurance?		

13. IN ORDER TO DETERMINE GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION OF THE RESPONDENTS, PLEASE INDICATE THE ZIP CODE NUMBER OF YOUR RESIDENCE.

_____ Zip Code.

Part II - LEGAL NEEDS

INSTRUCTIONS:

- Col. 1 - Please check those areas for which you had a problem during the past five years. Check regardless of whether or not an attorney was consulted.
- Col. 2 - Please check those problem areas for which you spoke with an attorney during the past five years.
- Col. 3 - Please check those problem areas for which you retained an attorney to perform services during the past five years.
- Col. 4 - For each problem area listed, please check your opinion as to whether or not you anticipate a problem in the next three years.

	Column 1 PROBLEM OCCURRED (past 5 yrs)	Column 2 SPOKE WITH AN ATTORNEY (past 5 yrs)	Column 3 RETAINED AN ATTORNEY (past 5 yrs)	Column 4 DO YOU ANTICIPATE A PROBLEM IN ANY OF THESE AREAS IN THE NEXT THREE YEARS? Unlikely Possible Certain
Preparation of a will				
Probate				
Sale and/or purchase of home				
Investment real estate				
Difficulty with landlord or tenant				
Consumer problems (defective goods, service warranties)				
Loans & other debtor problems				
Salary attachments				
Bankruptcy				
Business planning & operation (excluding real estate)				
Personal income taxes (Audits and/or disputed returns)				
Divorce				
Adoption				
Criminal law other than minor traffic (not arising directly from employment)				
Juvenile court proceedings (not arising from educational employment)				
Civil action as plaintiff or defendant (not arising from educational employment)				
Administrative law benefits, selective service & military, licenses, immigration(not from ed. employment)				

The MEA-Alaska is interested in establishing a prepaid legal services plan enabling you to secure an attorney's services for problems similar to those outlined above.

If such a plan were implemented, how much would you be willing to pay per month:
 ___ Not interested ___ \$1-3 ___ 4-6 ___ 7-10 ___ 11-20 ___ Over 20