
ALAN A. MATHESON

Dear President Schwada:

The College of Law's twelfth year was an active and productive one. Developments included the selection of a new Dean, establishment of a Distinguished Professorship at the law school, expansion of the library collection, faculty scholarship, improvement of facilities, and achievement by both students and alumni of the school.

As an introduction to the annual Dean's Report, I include a brief history of the law school which recounts the growth of this institution and the national stature which it has achieved in a relatively short period of time. From the beginning, the University has been supportive of the law school, and this backing has permitted the school to move ahead rapidly. The forward momentum of the College remains dependent upon sufficient resources to maintain and attract a first-rate faculty, to build a research library collection, and to support increasingly expensive law instruction. With your assistance, the College will continue to be a source of pride to the University and to the State of Arizona.

I. Arizona State University College of Law — A Brief History* 

Founding. Officially approved by the Arizona Board of Regents in 1964, the law school was conceived by Dr. G. Horner Durham, President of Arizona State University from 1960-69. It was he who conducted the surveys and assembled the data necessary to convince the Regents that a second law school should be established in Arizona. The fact that the Board had recently awarded a medical school to the University of Arizona in Tucson after a somewhat bitter political struggle between those who preferred a location in Tucson and those who favored Phoenix may have eased approval, although in no sense did Arizona State University consider the law school a "booby prize" in the competition.

The decision to have a law school was matched with a determination by the University and the State to launch the enterprise in grand fashion. A search for a founding dean was the first order of business, and the University was fortunate to convince William H. Pedrick of the Northwestern University School of Law that the challenge of establishing a quality new law school in the Southwest was an appropriate mission for his considerable talent. He was appointed in 1965 and was in residence beginning July 1, 1966. Moving on all fronts at once, he spent the first year of his Deanship securing a librarian, Richard C. Dahl, assembling a library collection, planning a law building, recruiting a faculty, organizing a Law Society of supporters for the law school, and selecting an office staff. In spite of the whirlwind pace of activity, he later observed that his first year — without faculty, student or alumni — was one of the happiest of his tenure. From the standpoint of results, it was also one of the happiest for the law school. A distinguished founding faculty was assured when Dean Pedrick was able to persuade Edward W. Cleary of Illinois, Richard W. Thimmesch of Wisconsin, Harold E. Hutchison of Northwestern, and William C. Canby to come to Arizona. I was appointed Assistant Dean and joined the faculty at mid-year, along with John P. Morris. These faculty members greeted a charter class of 117 students who began their law study in September, 1967. For the first semester, the law school was temporarily located in Matthews Center, a structure that served formerly as the general library on the Arizona State University campus.

Armstrong Hall, the beautiful building housing the law school, was dedicated on February 26, 1968. The law building was named after John S. Armstrong, the legislative father of Arizona State University who introduced a bill in the Arizona Territorial Legislature establishing the Tempe Normal School in 1885. A special dedicatory program on the subject "Innovations in Legal Education" brought representatives from many of the law schools in the country, and the papers presented appeared in the first issue of Law and the Social Order, the school's law review. Included in the ceremonies was an academic procession of university delegates, state officials, members of the judiciary, students, and others which stretched from Gamache Auditorium across the campus to the law school.

The dedicatory address was given by the late Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. In his remarks, the Chief Justice stated: "The changing times in which we are living call not only for a sharpening of the mind but also for a broadening of it. This simply means that a well-grounded lawyer should have a concrete philosophy, one of law that has been interpreted up to the present time, but he must also be able to face change with it. In other words, he must have a perception of the law as it should be as well.

*This comment appears in the 1979 Arizona State University Law Journal issue noting the tenth anniversary of the publication.
as a knowledge of present law and of its application in the past.

These words were a fitting description of the law program established by the new law school.

Curriculum. From the beginning, the law school was committed to the best in traditional legal education, but special features of the curriculum marked the school as innovative in its approach. Believing that the third year of law study—often met with apathy by students—could be rejuvenated, the faculty adopted a program that provided for a conventional required first year, a prescribed second year of ten "core" courses, and an elective third year devoted to small courses, seminars, internships, and independent study. The theory of the program was that the students would gain a solid foundation from conventional courses in the first two years of study and would then enter an entirely different educational setting during the final year of law school instruction. By prescribing a limited number of courses for two years, the law school could free teaching power for the third year of professional study, permitting the students to select from among several distinctive instructional experiences. Other features of the third-year program were the use of "quadrants," half-semester length periods within which courses were taught intensively in two hour segments, and a credit-no credit grading system designed to encourage students to participate in the special offerings of the final year.

After experimenting with the core curriculum concept for a few years, the school began to move away from the required core. In the face of considerable student interest in a wider variety of subjects, the faculty modified the program in 1972 by adding additional courses to the second-year listing and allowing students to select from among the increased offerings. Subsequently, the list of second-year courses was expanded to nineteen, and law students after the first year, were permitted to enroll in either second- or third-year courses or seminars. With these alterations, the curriculum for the school moved to a much more conventional model, and the original features of the third year of instruction became less distinctive.

Many members of the faculty found that the quadratic period of instruction was simply too short for the development of some subjects, particularly seminars requiring extensive research and writing. Originally conceived as a means to assist the clinical education program of the law school, the quadratic period of instruction was found to be unsatisfactory for that purpose, and the clinical offerings were soon expanded to semester length. As a consequence of these developments, the quadrennial system has been abandoned by the school, although a few courses remain in the pattern. The virtues of the shorter time frame for instruction remain, however, and I am hopeful that the law school will use the quadrant or other flexible schedule periods in the future to accommodate "mini" courses on special subject matter not requiring an entire semester.

The pass-fail grading system for third-year courses was adopted by the faculty as a positive educational device and in the absence of any student pressure or demand. As might be expected, however, law students have found the ungraded format to their liking, and suggestions for change to an all-graded system have been met with overwhelming objection. The issue of abandoning the third-year grading procedure has divided the faculty on several occasions, and there is strong sentiment for modification. Those who favor retention of the credit-no credit method consider student performance in the third year comparable to that in graded courses and believe that evaluation under a numerical grading scale of skills training, clinical experiences, and courses with heavy writing components is difficult and imprecise. The proponents of change adhere to the view that grades can be an incentive to better academic effort and that students who excel should be recognized. A compromise between the two positions, one which I personally favor, would be to grade all courses and materials courses under the numerical scale, but to continue utilizing a credit designation for internships and selected seminars where student activity does not lend itself to a more precise grading assessment.

From the beginning, the College of Law recognized the value of a well-supervised, integrated, and carefully structured clinical education program as a part of the curriculum. The faculty is committed to the principle that the law school is an educational enterprise where the primary concern of the instructional effort is to stimulate thinking and to hone the powers of analysis. At the same time, however, there is a realization that skills training at law schools can be a significant complement to course instruction and that clinical experiences, if incorporated into the academic program, offer an important opportunity for law students to observe the necessary transfer from concept to application.

Originally, a branch office of the Maricopa County Legal Aid Society was housed in the law building, and third-year students were assigned as interns under the direction of legal aid attorneys. With a grant from the Council on Legal Education for Professional Responsibility, the College of Law was able to expand the program and to establish an independent Law Clinic with a full-time Supervising Attorney appointed by the law school. Serving indigent clients throughout the state, the clinic is housed in the law school, located in the town of Guadalupe, an impoverished Chiricahua and Yaqui Indian community. The Law Clinic has become a year-round operation, with ten law students working under the direction of the Supervising Attorney each semester.

Other clinical programs approved following careful study by the faculty now operate outside the law school: (1) the Student Defender Project, operating as a cooperative venture with the Public Defender's Office and providing representation for indigent defendants in the Phoenix Criminal Court; (2) the Prosecutors Internship, in which law interns are placed with the Maricopa County Attorney's Office and the Tempe, Phoenix, and Casa Grande City Attorney's offices. Each of the internships includes an academic component taught by a regular member of the law faculty. In these sessions, the students receive skills instruction of high quality, with videotaping of client interviews and court appearances as standard fare. A grant from the Arizona Justice Planning Agency launched the Student Defender Project which now includes a full-time Supervising Attorney who is a member of the College's staff.

The curriculum of the school has been enriched by special programs, visiting faculty members, and speakers. In 1976, an experimental Appellate Advocacy Seminar, financed by the American Bar Association ofed on instruction to law students and practitioners for the improvement of oral advocacy and brief writing skills, culminated in a model appellate argument between Erwin Griswold and Charles A. Wright which attracted a large audience to the school. A year later, a second Advocacy Seminar was offered by the law school, this time with Dean Erwin Griswold as instructor. Over the years, the school has sponsored a Holmes Devine Lecture; conferences on Indian Law, Evidence, and Capital Punishment; and other speakers, conferences, and programs. In cooperation with the State Bar of Arizona, several continuing legal education programs are held at the law school each year.

In the Fall of 1977, an accreditation visitation team representing the American Bar Association and the Association of American Law Schools came to the campus, reviewed the program, and recommended that the new school be provisionally accredited. The program was accredited in time for the charter entering class to graduate from an institution which met the standards of the two national organizations which evaluate the law schools of America. A second visit by an ABA-AALS team in the Fall of 1977 resulted in renewal of the school's accreditation for seven additional years.
of the charter class in 1967 gambled somewhat by their commitment to a new and unknown enterprise, but, even then, the class was a much larger pool of applicants than could be accommodated. Thereafter, the number of applicants grew to a maximum of 2,000; 1,500 applicants were now received annually. The student body numbers 450.

Each year, the academic statistical profile of the entering classes has remained constant, and the process of selection remains a difficult one. Indeed, the law school sought a class of 126 students, but in 1976 the number was raised to 150.

The student body of the law school has come largely from the state of Arizona. Since most of the citizens of the state are relative newcomers, however, there are remarkably disparate backgrounds and experiences in the classes. Initially, the number of women in the school was small, but the percentage has grown dramatically, and in the Fall of 1976, women constituted forty percent of the class. In the second year, approximately sixty institutions of higher education are represented, and in entering class ranging in age from nineteen to the sixties, there are representatives of most racial and economic segments of the population.

There are nearly 1,200 graduates of the law school. A vast majority of these alumni remain in the state, but our graduates are found throughout the country and in all phases of the legal profession. Even though the women graduates have been few, alumni have served or are serving in such positions as Deputy Assistant Attorney General of the United States, United States Attorney, Superior Court Judge, State Legislator, County Supervisor, law clerks to state and federal judges, and successful practitioners.

New Dean. In the Fall of 1974, Dean Pedrick announced his resignation effective at the end of the academic year. A search for a successor was commenced, and Ernest A. Grollman of the faculty of the University of Virginia was selected as the new Dean. He assumed office in December, 1975, and served until his departure in March, 1976. Under his energetic direction, the law school’s fund raising effort was streamlined through the cooperation of the Law Society Board of Directors and the Alumni Association, a summer research program was introduced, and the administrative structure of the law school was reorganized, and an Assistant Dean was added.

The Future. In 1977, an article appeared in the Spring issue of the UCLA Educator entitled, "Measuring the Quality of Professional Schools." Based upon surveys conducted originally by Alan M. Carter, and subsequently by members of the staff of the Higher Education Research Institute, the study listed Arizona State among the top thirty law schools of the country in educational quality and first on the list of law schools most likely to improve within the next five years because of administrative leadership, quality of younger faculty, innovative programs, and resource availability. Obviously, the value of the ranking is limited by the accuracy of the information and the procedures of the survey, but it is gratifying to know that the law school is respected by those in legal education.

To fulfill the prediction of continued improvement, however, much must be done. A careful review of the curriculum must be a continuing priority for the school to ensure that the students receive a first-rate legal education that permits them to adapt to the dynamic changes taking place in the practice of law and the delivery of legal services. The educational programs of the school is sound, but needs further structuring and refinement. A modified core program with a return to two years of basic instruction and a final year of skills training has been proposed, as has a system of designated course specializations for law students interested in pursuing a subject matter emphasis. Whether the writing program would be more effective in the second or third year is another concern. The faculty is considering these and other proposals for the purpose of strengthening the curriculum of the school.

One of the challenges facing this law school and other law schools located in urban areas is the group of young law students who are employed in local law offices. Under the incentives of economic necessity and after-graduation placement, many law students are working, albeit in law-related activities, to an extent that has a negative impact upon their study of law. Absenteeism, inadequate class preparation, and part-time study are the occasional consequences. It is incumbent upon the law school to face this problem directly and in a positive way. In my opinion, this development underscores the necessity to ensure the continuing vitality of the educational program.

Whatever the format of the curriculum, however, it is clear that the law school needs additional teaching personnel to assist with the time-consuming and critical tasks of instruction in legal writing, drafting, litigation, advocacy skills, and clinical courses. A lower faculty-student ratio in these areas is an essential component. In short, the increased curricular demands upon the students are to be worthwhile, more teaching and instructional aide positions must be available.

The law school will improve no faster than the quality of its faculty. Adequate remuneration is mandatory and requires a primary concern if the school is to retain and sustain a faculty of exceptional quality. Other resources are also needed for critical, research assistants to encourage additional scholarly effort is of great significance. In the near future, a research center should be established at the law school with a subject focus based upon faculty competence and regional needs to serve as a vehicle for the promotion of interdisciplinary study and investigation.

A quality legal education requires facilities and equipment, and the present law building is filled to capacity—classrooms, offices, and service areas. Within five years, the library collection will occupy all shelf space, and the university must spend $180,000 per year to maintain a library of the same size as the school is now operating on a $70,000 per year budget. Planning for an addition to Armstrong Hall should begin immediately. Computer terminals for legal research are important for the instruction of students and must be secured for use in the library. To enhance the advocacy program, additional equipment for videotaping and recording is an obvious need.

With the advancement of technology, the heart of the school, has grown from 60,000 volumes at the end of the first year to 100,000 volumes or volume-equivalents. Primarily a working tool for the educational needs of law students and faculty, the library is now making selective acquisitions to ensure that the facility is a research center as well. With a special appropriation from the University and under a plan approved by the faculty, the library is strengthening its resources throughout the collection, with particular emphasis in the areas of intellectual property, antitrust and regulated industries, and international law. Designation of federal law for the federal district courts in the state of Arizona and, in writing, and the law schools are urged to provide a wider experience in honoring advocacy and writing skills.

The College of Law, with most law schools of the country, is not satisfied with the writing component within the curriculum, but improvement requires a reassessment of resources. Whether writing instruction should be provided by law professors or be a separate study, whether the resident faculty should provide this instruction, and whether additional major writing assignments should be required among the major courses to be resolved. At present, the law school divides the first-year class into five small sections, and the research and writing instruction is offered in these sections in combination with substantive law courses. A series of legal memoranda is required during the first semester and a moot court appellate brief in the Spring. Full-time faculty members and law student writing assistants or practitioners, critique the assignments in individual conferences with the members of the small section classes.

Questions for change include offering a three-hour legal writing course during the second semester of the first year taught by resident faculty members and requiring substantial writing and drafting assignments. Adoption of this option would require additional teaching commitment from the faculty and would reduce the number of regular courses now being taught. Under this proposal, the most
Under the chairmanship of Jarrell F. Kaplan, members of the Board came to the law school on April 11-12, attended classes and seminars, met with students, faculty and received reports on clinical instruction, budget, academic programs, library, appointments, continuing legal education, and admissions. Following the presentations, the visitors participated in a general discussion with members of the faculty and submitted a written report of comments and recommendations. Members of the Board of Visitors included F. Hare Burch, managing partner of the firm of McNutt, Dungan, Michael I. Gallagher, Justice Frank X. Gordon, Jr., Roger W. Kaufman, Ruth V. McGregor, John J. Bouza, Robert E. Brown, James E. Brophy III, Judge Walter E. Craig, Paul F. Eckstein, Gary G. Keltner, Philip E. Von Ammon, and Ted F. Warner.

On May 7, 1979, the Arizona Court of Appeals held a session in the Great Hall of the law school before a large audience of students and faculty. Judges participating included Mary M. Schoener, Emo M. Jacobson, Joe W. Contreras, and Jack L. Oza.

Mr. Sidney W. Mandel of Scottsdale donated nine valuable English parchment documents to the College of Law Library. The documents, a variety of indentures, are in excellent condition and still retain their original wax seals and revenue stamps. Each has been framed so that both front and back can be studied. The indentures, dating from 1744 to 1883, will be hung on the main floor of the Library.

At the February Bar Examination, all graduates of the law school taking the examination for the first time passed all sections. This is the first time that one hundred percent of the class has met initial success.

Under the sponsorship of the Department of State, law students from the University of the District of Columbia and of the University of Papua in New Guinea visited the law school to observe the programs in clinical education. Dean Herminio Valencia Villa and Michael Chocal Cho- bil came to Arizona State in May to participate in the clinical program with students, visited the Civil Clinic and the Student Defender Project, and attended a student appellate argument.

Judge Mary M. Schoener and Phoenix attorney John P. Frank conducted an Advanced Civil Procedure Seminar during the Fall Semester on the subject of the proposed changes in the Federal Rules governing discovery. In the course of the seminar, Mr. Joseph Ball, Chairman of the American Bar Association Committee dealing with the rules of discovery, and Professor Charles Alan Wright participated in the discussion.

An Arizona State University Discovery Conference was held November 19-20 in connection with the Seminar. The conference, held under contract with the Office of Improvements in the Administration of Justice of the U.S. Department of Justice, responded to changes in the Rules advocated by the Litigation Section of the American Bar Association in its Report of the Special Committee for the Study of Discovery Abuse and the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

As another special conference, a Training Seminar for the State Judiciary was held during the Fall Semester, under the direction of Professor Robert L. Miner, on the subject of the new Arizona Criminal Code. Sixty-eight Superior Court Judges and eight Judges of the Court of Appeals participated. Lecturers included, in addition to Professor Miner, Professors Gary Lowenthal and David Kaye, and Stephen Twist of the Attorney General's Office. The seminar focused on the practical issues that the new Code poses for the judiciary of the state.

An important complement to instruction in substantive courses at the law school is the clinical internship program. In the program, third-year law students certified for limited practice, Rule 28(e) of the Arizona Supreme Court perform legal services under the supervision of staff attorneys in Civil, Student Defender, and Prosecutors Internships. Mr. Lynwood Evans was appointed as the Director of the Civil Clinic and commenced his service in July of 1978. For the Student Defender Internship, Mr. William Tofe continued to serve as Director, and the Defender's office was supported once again by the Public Defender's Office, which furnished office space and secretarial services. For the Prosecution Internship, the law school placed law interns with the Cities of Case Grande, Phoenix, and Tempe and with the Maricopa County Attorney's Office. Three students worked in Washington, D.C. as interns with the Subcommittee on the Improvement of Judicial Administration of the United States Senate through the office of Senator Dennis DeConcini of Arizona.

A seminar onazz viewed by the law school included Governor Bruce Babbitt; Mr. Don DeConcini, candidate for the office of Attorney General; Professor Benjamin Aaron, Phi Beta Kappa Scholar from the UCLA Law School; Manfred Richter of Zürich University; Professor Victor L. Stolyar of Stanford Law School; Leonid Janovskiy, President of the American Bar Association; Gale McGee, U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States; U.S. District Court Judge Carl A. Mueckel; and Justice Roberto MacClane of the Supreme Court of Peru.

The Student Body. Although the interest in law school studies is a decline in the nation as a whole, Arizona State University College of Law continued to receive an abundance of applications. In August, 1978, 158 members of the class of 1981, composed of their legal training at the law school, 99 males and 60 females. For the class, the grade point average was 3.4, and the median law school Admission Test score was 612. Among members of the class, 99 received their degrees from the three Arizona universities and 60 from 45 other institutions. Political Science, History, Accounting, English, Psychology, and Sociology were the undergraduate majors most frequently followed. The entering class was selected from some 1,400 applicants.

At the College of Law Graduation Day Ceremony, James A. Bahl, a 53-year old Professor of Law at Northwestern University, addressed the 115 members of the Class of 1979. The class included those students who completed requirements for the Juris Doctor degree at the end of the Summer Sessions 1978 and the third of the Fall Semester in December, 1978 as well as those who finished their law school in May, 1979. Mr. Ron Kliger spoke in behalf of the class and received the Armstrong Award as the outstanding graduate by vote of the law faculty.

With the members of this graduating class, the alumni of the law school total 1,140.

Annually, the Placement Office of the College of Law surveys members of the previous year's graduating class for a report on employment. Of the 101 graduates who responded this year, 85 (84.5%) are employed. Two additional members were still job hunting; two were not seeking employment; and one who had not passed the bar examination was not working. Starting salaries for those employed ranged from $10,000 to $21,000. Over fifty percent of the graduates were employed in private practice and another twenty-seven percent in government service. As in the past, the vast majority of Arizona State graduates are located in the Southwest, primarily in Phoenix. Considering the fact that law graduates are facing increased competition in finding law-related employment in many areas of the country, the statistics for the Class of 1978/79 were favorable.

During the year, the Arizona State Law Journal editorial staff completed the 1978 volume and the first issue of 1979. The publication is due to schedule for the next Board. Ron Kliger served as Editor in Chief. One of the features of the volume was a "Survey of Federal Cases Arising in Arizona in 1977-78," and the project will be repeated. In addition, the latest Journal issues include case notes written by candidates for the editorial board. For the summer of 1979, the law school received a research grant from the ASU Provost's Office to fund a special project for the Journal. First-year members of the staff conducted an
The Law Library. With a special appropriation from the University for book acquisition, the law library was able to purchase books to continue strengthening the collection. Under a plan prepared by the Library Committee and approved by the Faculty, the library has purchased most of the books recommended by the American Association of Law Schools. A number of volumes and missing volumes were replaced; the collection of microfilms was increased by the addition of the Federal Register, some legislative histories, and records and briefs of the U.S. Supreme Court; the Mexican law collection was augmented; and some new services and periodicals were added. The volume equivalent count for the law library is now 161,639, including 13,318 additions this year.

During the summer of 1978, much of the library's collection was rearranged. Federal materials were moved to the main floor of the library, freeing a large room on the third floor to house the tax law materials. The treatise collection was transferred to the basement west wing. Two revision guides now serve as a master guide to the uncataloged materials.

The main emphasis in the government documents section of the library was placed on organizing the collection and acquiring basic reference tools. In this fiscal year, the library received 12,750 pieces of depository material including 6,511 titles on fixed media. The designation of the library as a Government Documents Depository and the employment of an experienced Documents Librarian have materially enhanced the research facility of the law school.

For 1979-80, the University has generously supplied additional space in the new extension, and has approved additional clerical positions to assist with the processing and cataloging of new additions to the collection.

Community Relations. An annual fund drive was conducted during the year through the Law Society of Arizona State University and the ASU Law Alumni Association. With the Merrimac endowment gift, the fund drive has substantially increased the funds available to the law school; the year has been a positive one in terms of financial support. The drive is primarily to benefit those law students in financial need whose continuation in law school is made possible by grants and loans from these organizations.

Mr. Gary G. Kelnor of the Phoenix firm of Lensing, Strous and Salmon chaired the Fund Drive for the Law Society and utilized many members of the Board of Directors of the Society and other attorneys to solicit funds in behalf of the School. For the Alumni Association, James E. Brophey III, Kevin M. Kane, and Michael R. Roe, headed the campaign, assisted by several Class Representatives from each of the graduating classes.

The annual dinner of the Law Society, Alumni Association was held on April 29, 1979 at Mountain Shadows in Scottsdale. More than 300 persons attended the dinner to hear an address by the Honorable Dennis DeConcini, Senator from the State of Arizona, and reports from the Alumni Association and the law school. Officers for the Law Society were re-elected for another year and include

Jaron F. Kaplan as President, Clarence J. Duncan as First Vice-President, Gary G. Kelchner as Treasurer, and Louis McClenon as Secretary. New members elected to the Board include Steve Craig, William Maledon, and Tom Kenas.

Honor recipient at the Annual Dinner were two recipients of the University's Distinguished Service Awards — Mr. Philip E. von Ammon, Phoenix attorney, and Mr. Michael D. Hawkins, U.S. Attorney for Arizona. A partner in the law firm of Fennemore Craig, von Ammon and Udal, Mr. von Ammon has been a supporter of the law school since its inception. He is a charter member of the Board of Directors of the Law Society of Arizona State University and served as President of the organization for the years 1976-78. In addition, he has been Vice President, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, and a member of the Fund Drive Committee for the Society. He has appeared at the law school on many occasions to speak to students about the legal profession, to judge moot court appellate arguments, and to participate in various mental competency programs. Active in professional programs, he served as President of the State Bar of Arizona in 1968-69.

Michael Hawkins is a member of the charter class of the law school graduating in 1970. Following law school, he served as a Captain in the U.S. Marine Corps, practiced law in Phoenix, and was active in the Democratic Party. He was appointed as U.S. Attorney for the District of Arizona in 1977.

Elizabeth B. Finn was re-elected as President of the Alumni Association. The Association sponsored two legal seminars at the law school, arranged a placement program for law students, and contributed to the support of several student activities at the school.

Yours sincerely,
Alan A. Marois
Dean
The Care and Feeding of Judges

THE HONORABLE FRANK X. GORDON, JR.

The purpose of this article is to suggest some do's and don'ts that lawyers should Observe when dealing with judges. What lawyers treat a judge can be important, not only in terms of the judge's ability to do his job, but also in terms of his attitude and physical feel of the case. The judge is not only a person of authority, but also a human being, and as such, he has emotions and feelings that may be affected by the way he is treated. Therefore, it is important for lawyers to treat judges with respect and dignity.

Contacts With the Judge During Trial
Obviously, lawyers and judges interact most frequently in the courtroom itself, and there are many different aspects of that interaction that lawyers should keep in mind. I am going to offer you some suggestions for courtroom behavior that will stand you in good stead.

Rule One: Be Punctual. This is the very first rule because it may be the most important. A judge is most appreciative of punctual lawyers. It is very difficult for a judge to manage a crowded calendar when the lawyers, especially the prosecutor, arrive five or ten minutes late. Certainly, there can be legitimate excuses for being late, but if it happens frequently, you can expect the judge to become irritated. I recall in particular one county attorney who habitually arrived in my trial courtroom five or ten minutes after everyone else was present. Finally, one morning at 9 o'clock, when everyone but the county attorney was present, I asked the bailiff to open court, rapped the gavel, and instructed everyone to be seated. Then, in total silence, we waited. I had expected the county attorney to appear momentarily, but, in fact, he was ten minutes late. Of course, the jury became uncomfortable, and I became uncomfortable. Defense counsel, on the other hand, was delighted because he knew that every minute the county attorney was absent was another point in the defendant's favor. Finally, when the county attorney appeared, he was greatly surprised, and apologized humbly for being late. That county attorney was never late in my courtroom again.

Rule Two: Be Prepared. Like many of my other suggestions, this rule may seem obvious, but it cannot be overstressed. Be prepared. Be prepared not only on the facts—that is the absolute bottom line of the trial lawyer's obligation—but also on the law. You should not assume that the judge has had an opportunity to research the law applicable to your case, particularly when complex issues or criminal cases are involved. I was always grateful when, at the beginning of a trial, the lawyers presented me with trial summaries concerning the major legal issues or important evidentiary questions that were likely to arise. In a busy court, there may be as many as ten cases set for trial on a given morning. Obviously, the trial judge cannot predict which of those cases will actually go forward, and consequently, it would be unfair to him to review every one of those cases in detail. Instead, the judge waits to see which cases are resolved by plea or orders of dismissal, which cases are postponed or transferred to another division, and which cases will actually require his attention. Then he tries to familiarize himself as quickly as possible with the files of those cases that will actually be tried. Necessarily, therefore, he will not be as familiar as the attorneys with the facts or the pleadings. Nor will he necessarily anticipate the evidentiary questions or legal issues that may arise as the trial progresses. Consequently, a well-prepared trial brief can be extremely helpful in assisting the trial judge to rule quickly and correctly when it is necessary to do so.

Rule Three: Be Polite. A judge always appreciates counsel being polite, not only toward the court, but also toward opposing counsel and the witnesses. Being polite is important not only because it demonstrates the professionalism of the attorney and contributes to the dignity of the proceedings. For prosecutors, however, there are additional reasons to observe this rule. One reason relates to the dual nature of the prosecutor's responsibilities. He must be an advocate, of course, but he must also make sure that justice is done in each case. By conducting himself courteously, the prosecutor demonstrates that awareness of his responsibilities extend beyond the narrow goal of advocacy. Furthermore, in many cases, being polite is good strategy, particularly when the opposing attorney is being rude, sarcastic, or overbearing. Such traits are not only unnecessary in a court of law, but count against the actor in the eyes of the judge and the jury. By being polite, the prosecutor can emphasize the disarming nature of his adversary's behavior and maximize the tactical advantage that such disarming behavior provides.

The purpose of this article is to suggest some do's and don'ts that lawyers should observe when dealing with judges. What lawyers treat a judge can be important, not only in terms of the judge's ability to do his job, but also in terms of his attitude and physical feel of the case. The judge is not only a person of authority, but also a human being, and as such, he has emotions and feelings that may be affected by the way he is treated. Therefore, it is important for lawyers to treat judges with respect and dignity.
They may not like them, and they may be jealous of them. But the public does respect lawyers as articulate, intelligent people who are part of the judicial system.

one judge who, after a warning, hit his cane's fingers with his gavel when he placed them on the bench. It was a lesson quickly learned for the young attorney.

Last, it is important for lawyers to keep in mind why showing respect for the bench contributes to the administration of justice. You give a quote from a speech that I have made previously...
I want you to know that this is not a standard instruction. This is one that I made up, using it as a basis case. B. It is not directly out of that case. Tell the judge. He will appreciate your candor.

The format I used as a trial judge was a little unusual. Sometime before the close of all the evidence, perhaps a few hours before, I would call the attorneys together. I would tell them only those instructions that had tentatively been decided. At the other hand, the worst thing you can do is to criticize the judge in public when talking to court staff or other attorneys. The notes of the public records of your cases, your criticisms may be totally misconstrued and exaggerated.

About one year of practice, the best trial attorneys adopt the following viewpoint: "You win some and you lose some," and it is no use to rehash the ones you have lost. I think that attitude is salubrious. Whatever you do, do not take a case personally. You are a lawyer, and if you lose, you should be satisfied, and so should your supervisors and the court.

Although you may resist the temptation immediately to discuss the case with the judge, it is even worse to ask the judge months or years later why he ruled a certain way in that case. I put the judge in a very uncomfortable situation. You may remember the incident perfectly, but he may have absolutely no recollection of it.

If you really want to know the judge's opinion of your performance as a lawyer, ask him after the trial to discuss it with you afterward as a learning experience. Some judges will agree to do so after all post-trial motions have been completed. Other judges may prefer not to talk to you, or they may just be too busy. Always find out just interesting and profitable for both me and the lawyers to discuss cases in this fashion after they were over.

Contacts With the Judge on Social Occasions

Lawyers and judges seem to gravitate toward one another at all public occasions and also at private social affairs. This is natural, as both lawyers and judges are cut from the same cloth. They have shared the same experiences and principles of law. They love to talk to one another about law and social events. But in all events, the judge should know his law and not to just a personal relationship.

Too many drinks can cause a lawyer to assume that his client's case is hopeless. He may even tell the judge, "The judge is in a disadvantage here, for he has no recollection of the facts. The particular incident which the defendant is referring to is critical of his conduct. On the other hand, being human, most judges appreciate praise for a job well done."

What lawyers realize is that all judges are human. Some of them are very thin-skinned and do not take criticism well. You should keep this in mind before making comments during a discussion with a judge that are critical of his conduct. On the other hand, being human, most judges appreciate praise for a job well done. It is nice to hear a lawyer, especially one who has lost his case, say, "That was a tough case, Judge, but I thought you handled it well."

Lawyers must also realize that friendships between judges and lawyers can cause the judge special problems. Canon 2 of the Code of Judicial Conduct reads as follows:

A. A judge should avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all his activities.
B. A judge should not allow his family, social, or other relationships to influence his judicial conduct or judgment. He should not lend the prestige of his office to advance the private interests of others, nor should he convey or permit others to convey the impression that he is a special position to influence him. He should not testify voluntarily as a witness.

A careful reading of the Canon may help lawyers, especially new lawyers, understand what some judges appear to be doing, but it may not be all that good. What lawyers realize is that all judges are human. Some of them are very thin-skinned and do not take criticism well. You should keep this in mind before making comments during a discussion with a judge that are critical of his conduct. On the other hand, being human, most judges appreciate praise for a job well done."

What lawyers realize is that all judges are human. Some of them are very thin-skinned and do not take criticism well. On the other hand, being human, most judges appreciate praise for a job well done."

Conclusion

The purpose of this article has been to describe some do's and don'ts concerning the "care and feeding of judges." These suggestions represent my personal views and are not necessarily those of the justices of all courts. Nor are they all inclusive. However, the suggestions will help to overcome the stereotype that many new lawyers have of judges. If the lawyer thinks of the judge as a human being, one who is frequently overworked, who certainly has his faults, and whose position in society subjects him to special demands, then most of my suggestions are just common sense. If the lawyer treats the judge as a human being, taking into account the factors that I have just mentioned, the judge will certainly be grateful; and the process of administering justice, to which lawyers and judges are all dedicated, will become more efficient and perhaps even more pleasant.

Notes

1. This article employs the masculine pronoun throughout, purely for reasons of simplicity and style. The writer acknowledges that many lawyers and judges are women and intends no disrespect by this stylistic convention.
2. Rule 15(b), Rules of the Supreme Court of Arizona.
Alumni News

CLASS OF 1970
Michael L. Gallagher has been awarded the Defense Research Institute’s Exceptional Performance Citation “for having supported and improved the standards and education of the defense bar and for having contributed to the improvement of the administration of justice in the public interest.”
Sarah D. Grant was sworn in as a Judge of the Superior Court of Maricopa County on July 2, 1979.
John E. Herrick, Tempe practitioner, was appointed to a four-year term on the 12-member Maricopa County Board of Health.
Robert L. Schafer, Major, USAF, is Assistant Professor of Law, Chairman for Elective Courses, and Director for Government Contract Law at the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs. He received an LL.M. degree from George Washington University in 1977. He previously served as Chief of Procurement Law for Spain from 1973 to 1976.

Elizabeth R. (Ellie) Finn, Law School Alumni Association President, is now a Municipal Court Judge for the City of Phoenix. She is the immediate past president of the Maricopa County Young Lawyers Section and a member of the Executive Council of the Young Lawyers Section of the State Bar and the Steering Committee for the Arizona Association of Women Lawyers. She serves as a director of Community Legal Services and of the New Times Weekly newspaper.

Karl E. Wochner, Tempe practitioner and assistant city attorney, is president of the ASU Alumni Association Board for the 1979-80 term. Wochner, who served as secretary of the Board from 1976 to 1978, is also a member and past president of the Board of Directors of the ASU Law Alumni Association and is a director of the ASU Law Society. He was named Outstanding Young Man of America in 1974.

CLASS OF 1971
Guy David Knoller is a partner in the new Phoenix firm of Finkelman & Knoller, Ltd. The firm specializes in labor relations matters.
Ron Lee, a Flagstaff attorney, was elected president of the Coconino County Legal Aid Society.

CLASS OF 1972
David C. Kennedy was recently appointed Chief Hearing Officer of the Arizona Corporation Commission.
Irene Lashinsky is a college director of the ASU Alumni Association representing the College of Liberal Arts.
John W. Wall has become a member of the Phoenix firm of Ryley, Carlock & Rafton.

CLASS OF 1973
Mike Carragher has opened a law office in Clio, Arizona, and is attorney for the Duncan Township Council.
David L. Case is a member of Ryley, Carlock & Rafton of Phoenix.
John Holman is an at-large director of the ASU Alumni Association.
Jerome B. Schultz has become director of the Phoenix firm of Finmermore, Craig, von Ammon & Udal. He is the chairman of the Professional Liability Litigation Committee of the American Bar Association Section of Litigation.

CLASS OF 1974
Franzula M. Bacher has been made a partner in the Phoenix firm of O’Connor, Cavanagh, Anderson, Westover, Kilgore & Beshers.
James E. Brophy, III, has become a member of the Phoenix firm of Ryley, Carlock & Rafton.
Art Garcia is an at-large director of the ASU Alumni Association.

CLASS OF 1975
Richard W. Kostant, a lawyer in Yuma, Arizona.

George Forster is the supervision of the Phoenix City Prosecutors Office.
Carol Roush was recently appointed Assistant Director of the Division of Management Review for the Arizona Department of Economic Security. Her responsibilities include direction of internal audits, legal services, special investigations, management analysis, and appeals.

Susan Oliver Friedlander, formerly Susan Worth, is a member of the Scottsdale firm of Friedlander, Friedlander, P.C.

CLASS OF 1976
Timothy W. Ewens has become a member of the Phoenix firm of Mcneilly, Vermeere & Tulley.
Joel A. Gildar has become a partner in Hinck, Gildar & Hilpert. The firm has its offices in Scottsdale.
Franklyn D. Jeans is practicing with the Oakland, California firm of Hardin, Cook, Loper, Engle & Berger.
Martha B. Kaplan is now associated with the Phoenix firm of Lazarus & Rogers, P.C.

Ralph Kostant spent six months last year in the Washington, D.C. office of O’Melveny & Myers preparing a claim by an American corporation against the Iranian government. Unfortunately, the time the claim was ready to submit, there was no Iranian government to receive it.

The trip was not a total loss, however, as Ralph and his wife Laura returned to Los Angeles with a daughter, Sara. Ralph recently joined the Real Estate and Natural Resources Department of O’Melveny & Myers.

Jose Rivera, formerly with the Department of Justice in Washington, D.C., now works with the Civil Division of the United States Attorney’s Office in Phoenix. He is married to Nina Parsons Rivera ‘79, who is employed by the Small Business Administration in Phoenix.

CLASS OF 1977
Pat Norris is an at-large director of the ASU Alumni Association.
Daniel R. Ortega, Jr. was appointed by Governor Bruce Babbitt to the Arizona Industrial Commission. Ortega previously was a staff attorney for Maricopa County Legal Services and had entered private practice prior to his appointment.

Richard S. Plattner is associated with Monkebe, Vermeere & Tulley of Phoenix.

Barry Silverman was named Criminal Court Commissioner for the Maricopa County Superior Court in December. He had previously been a Deputy County Attorney for Maricopa County and a Phoenix City Prosecutor. He has served the law school for several years as a teaching assistant in the Criminal Prosecution Internship Program.

Richard S. Vihe, studying law at the University of Western Australia in Perth. He is married to former Law School Assistant Dean Rhoda Kappel.

Elliot G. Wolfe is now an associate of the Phoenix firm of Longerman, Begam, Lewis, Leonard & Maris.

1979 Entering Class Data
From a total of 1246 applications received, 392 applicants were admitted and 399 enrolled. Of the 129, 118 or 81% were Arizona residents and 26 or 19% were nonresidents. 52 women composed 71% of the class, and 25 of 25 students represent 15%. The mean undergraduate grade point average (GPA) of the entering class was 3.83 and the mean Law School Admission Test (LSAT) score was 617.

Karen C. Kennedy has joined the Phoenix firm of Matlack, Weeks, McIntrye & Friedlander.
Edward P. McNeff has opened an office for the general practice of law in downtown Phoenix.
Catherine Stark Shiel recently became associated with the firm of Rhodes, Kendall & Harrington in New York, New York. She previously clerked for United States Chief Judge James B. Meredith of the Eastern District of Missouri. At her new firm, she joins Timothy S. Wagner, ’79.

Karen C. Kennedy has joined the Phoenix firm of Matlack, Weeks, McInrey & Friedlander.
Faculty Activities
1978-79 School Year

Professor Michael L. Altman was on leave of absence during 1978-79. He worked as a staff attorney in offices of a District Attorney and Public Defender in Massachusetts.

Professor Harold H. Bruff is Chairman of the Separations of Powers Committee and a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on Legislative Reform for the ABA Section of Administrative Law. He prepared an opinion on the constitutionality of legislation requiring approval of federal funds applications by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee. His article on "Presidential Power and Administrative Rule Making" appeared in the Yale Law Journal. Professor Bruff is spending the 1979-80 academic year on leave in the Office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice, in Washington, D.C. In July, he was appointed to a special task force of the president's commission investigating the Three Mile Island nuclear accident.

Professor William C. Canny was a co-investigator on the National Science Foundation Project on Legal Service Pricing and Advertising. During the year, he was a faculty member for an ABA commercial speech course in Washington, D.C.; a board member of Community Legal Services; and a board member and secretary for the Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest. In March, he testified before the Arizona Senate Committee on Health regarding medical malpractice insurance. In addition, he was a consultant to the U.S. General Accounting Office for the performance audit of the FCC. He was the keynote speaker for the National Convention of Private Practitioners of Pathology, a speaker for the Arizona Press Club workshop on the First Amendment, a panelist for KDKB Radio, an instructor in Indian Law for the Cook Christian Training School, and a speaker on "Art and the First Amendment" for the State Bar of Arizona. At the University, he was a board member and secretary of the Faculty Association and a member of the AAUP Censure Removal Committee.

In recognition of his professional stature, he was one of three persons recommended to the White House by the nominating commission for appointment to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. He wrote on government funding of abortions for the Arizona State Law Journal, on physician advertising for the Duke Law Journal (with former Dean Ernest Welsh), and reported on his NSF project in the Arizona Law Review.

Professor Emeritus Edward W. Cleary, with Professor Robert L. Moxier, prepared Proposed Model Local Rules for United States District Courts of the Ninth Circuit. He published a third edition of his Handbook of Illinois Evidence (with Michael Graham) and a supplement to his McCormick on Evidence, along with an article on the federal rules of evidence in the Nebraska Law Review.

Professor Richard C. Dahl taught a legal research course for the Legal Assistant Program of the Center for Executive Development at Arizona State University.

Chairman of the Committee on Significant Current Trends in Probate and Trust Law of the ABA Section; a member of the Maritime Property Committee; and a member of the Continuing Legal Education Committee for the State Bar of Arizona. He is a consultant to the Arizona Law Association on probate law and estate taxation, and he was a member of both the Multi-disciplinary Coordinating Committee on Aging and the Advisory Committee on Promotion and Stability of Employment at the University. He serves as Lay Leader of the Christ Church Methodist Church and as Director and Secretary of the Tempe Life Care Village, Inc. He published a second edition of the Arizona Probate Code Practice Manual.

Associate Professor Ira M. Ellman is a member of the University Committee on Experiments with Human Subjects and of the Board of Directors of Community Legal Services. For the summer of 1979, he received a grant from the University to support research on the governance of nonprofit corporations. In January, he presented a paper on nonprofit corporations at the Business Associations Section of the Association of American Law Schools. He wrote on nonprofit corporation laws for the Arizona State Law Journal.

Relations Section of the Association of American Law Schools and served as a member of the Association's Accreditation Committee. In addition, he was on the Board of Editors of the American Journal of Comparative Law and on the Board of Directors of the American Association for the Study of Comparative Law. At the University, he is a Director of the Center for Latin American Studies. He spoke at a commercial law seminar in Iowa City at a bankruptcy seminar for the Nevada and Arizona Bars; to the Bar of the City of New York; and for the U.S. State Department and International Communications Agency in Bolivia, Argentina, Uruguay, Peru, Mexico, Ecuador, and Central America. He also taught a course on the Andean Region at the American Graduate School of International Management during the summer of 1979. He published on commercial arbitration in the California Law Review and the New York Law Journal; on inter-American trade in the International Trade Law Journal; and on codification of commercial law in the Boston College Journal of International and Comparative Law, as well as on comparable law for an Argentine law journal.

Associate Professor David Kader joined the faculty in August. Prior to coming to ASU, he was Associate Professor of Law at the University of Iowa, and he previously served as a lecturer at the University of Warwick in England and as clerk to
Justice Robert Utter of the Washington Supreme Court. During the fall semester, he taught the large section of Torts and the Civil Internship. He is also interested in problems of the elderly and is a member of Amnest International.

Associate Professor Dennis S. Karpala was a writing instructor at the 1978 summer Southwest CEO Institute at Albuquerque, New Mexico, and conducted a seminar for students in the ASU School of Social Work on the legal rights of the handicapped. For the summer of 1979, he received a University grant for research on the corporation of a leadership. He has received a Fulbright Fellowship to teach American law at the University of Hokkaido in Japan during 1980.

Professor David H. Kaye was a fellow in the National Endowment for the Humanities Seminar on the Problems of Legal and Political Philosophy at Harvard University during the summer of 1979. A member of the Test, Development and Research Committee of the Law School Admissions Council, he was a panelist for the AALS/L.S.A. Regional Workshop, and for the Fourth Annual Affirmative Action Conference. He has been a member of the University Academic Affairs Committee. He was elected to the Community Legal Services Board of Directors, and in 1979, he received a University research grant for an empirical study of lawyers' pre-trial preparation in criminal cases. He was on leave during fall, 1979 to teach at the University of Virginia Law School. He published an important study of joint representation in criminal cases in the Virginia Law Review.

Professor Stephen E. Lee co-edited the Arizona State Law Journal and administers the Voluntary Income Tax Assistance Program (VITA) for approximately 80 second-year students. At the University, he was a member of the Continuing Education-Summer Sessions Advisory Council and the Social Science Grant-in-Aid Review Committee. He serves as legal adviser for the Supreme Judicial Council of the Navajo Nation and is Treasurer of the Arizona Civil Liberties Union.

Professor Gary T. Lowenthal served as Faculty Senator, on the Search Committee for the Director of the Center of Criminal Justice, and as a member of the University Academic Affairs Committee. He was elected to the Community Legal Services Board of Directors, and conducted a seminar for Superior Court judges on the new Criminal Code. For the summer of 1979, he received a University research grant for an empirical study of lawyers' pre-trial preparation in criminal cases. He was on leave during fall, 1979 to teach at the University of Virginia Law School. He published an important study of joint representation in criminal cases in the Virginia Law Review.

Dean Alan A. Matheson continued to serve as a member of the Board of Governors of the Arizona State Bar of Arizona. He participated in the Arizona Trial Hall, and he addressed an Arizona Community College Personnel Workshop, the ASU Law Alumni Association, and various local service organizations. He was a panelist at the Conference of Western Law Schools on the subject of the "Future of Legal Education." He was a member of the ABA Accreditation Inspection Team for Yeshiva University's Benjamin Cardozo School of Law and served as a member of the Salary Study Committee for the Tempe Elementary School District.

Professor Robert L. Misner spoke at the Arizona Town Hall on the new Arizona Criminal Code and at the National Association of Federal Court Administrators on Uniform District Court Rules. He served as consultant for the Uniform Rules of Civil Procedure of the United States District Courts of the Ninth Circuit; as Reporter for the Speedy Trial Planning Group of Federal District Courts of Arizona, and of the Southern District of California; and as Director of a seminar in the Criminal Code for state judges. He spoke before a California State Bar Committee on the Uniform District Court Rules, and was counsel for the statewide prison suit and adviser for the National Para-Legal Training Program of the Bureau of Land Management. He published on capital punishment in the Arizona State Law Journal and on the Speedy Trial Act in the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology.

Professor John F. Morris is a Director of the Great Western Bank. He addressed the National Association of Wholesale Grocers and lectured for the Bureau of Land Management. He served as a director to the University Athletic Department and as a member of a special AALS Committee on University Censure. He wrote about the law school's curriculum for the Arizona State Law Journal.

Professor Beatrice A. Moulton in February went on leave of absence to become Director of the Office of Program Support for the Legal Services Corporation in Washington, D.C. She was a member of the Dean Search Committee and a member of the Board of Community Legal Services and the Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest. She is also a member of the Board of the Society of American Law Teachers.

Professor Wilard H. Pedrick lectured on estate planning before seminar groups in Las Vegas, Sarasota, San Diego, and Cincinnati. He spoke at Indiana University on the proposed restraints on admission to federal courts and at the ABA Conference on Legal Education at Notre Dame. He was a member of the inspection team for Order of the Coif at Florida State, a consultant to Pepperdine Law School on appointments and for AALS membership, and a trustee for California Western School of Law. At the University, he is a member of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and the Grievance Committee. Continuing his impressive role, he directed musical productions at the Law School, for the Arizona Civil Liberties Union, and for the AALS Annual Meeting. He was on the Board of Directors for the law reviews of Washington University, Ohio State, and Arizona State; prepared an estate planning paper for the University of Miami Institute on Estate Planning and a paper on the Lee Marvin case for the Fourth Annual Community Property Seminar. Commerce Clearing House published the new edition of his estate and gift tax book and his 1978 Rosenthal Lectures, Death, Taxes and the Living.

Professor Jonathan Rose testified before the National Commission for the Review of Antitrust Law and Policies and before the Transportation Committee of the Arizona State Senate. He spoke on municipal anti-trust liability to the American Public Power Association, the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, the Los Angeles City Attorney seminar, and the Arizona League of Cities and Towns. In addition, he presented anti-trust papers at the Annual Convention of the Arizona State Bar and an Arizona Bar CLE Antitrust Seminar. He is a member of the National Association of Attorneys. He General Committee on Antitrust Evaluations and of the Arizona Board of Legal Specialization, and Vice Chairman of the Arizona State Bar Association Section on Antitrust Law. He wrote on municipal anti-trust liability for the Municipal Law Review and Urban Geoergia and on occupational licensing for the Arizona State Law Journal.

Associate Dean Milton R. Schroeder was Chairman of the Dean Search Committee for the College of Law. He is Chairman of both the ASU Ad Hoc Committee and the Board of Regents Committee on Services for Faculty, and is a Trustee of the Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation. He lectured for the Bureau of Land Management and for the Conference for Planning and Zoning Commissioners and Attorneys.

Professor Donald N. Zillman was a Visiting Fellow at the University of Southampton Law School during the Spring Semester, then left the law school to join the faculty at the University of Utah. Matthew Bender published his handbook, The Military in American Society.

ARIZONA STATE LAW FORUM