

1-19-1973

## The Caveat, January 19, 1973

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/caveat>



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

"The Caveat, January 19, 1973" (1973). *Caveat*. Paper 26.  
<http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/caveat/26>

This Newsletter or Magazine is brought to you for free and open access by the Other Law School Publications at GGU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Caveat by an authorized administrator of GGU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [jfischer@ggu.edu](mailto:jfischer@ggu.edu).

---

# Golden Gate University

# CAVEAT

Vol. VIII - Extra

School of Law

January 19, 1973

## INDEX TO THIS EDITION:

<u>CONTINUING LAW STUDENTS ESCAPE TENTATIVE TUITION INCREASE</u>	.....page 2
<u>FLEXIBILITY THEME OF OPEN MEETING</u>	.....page 4
<u>FACULTY MEETING DEALS WITH STUDENT ISSUES</u>	.....page 5
<u>BORROMEO HIRED IN PLACEMENT OFFICE</u>	.....page 6
<u>REGISTRATION SCHEDULE</u>	.....page 7
<u>LAW LIBRARY ACHIEVES NEW STATUS</u>	.....page 7
<u>WANT AD</u>	.....page 8

## Golden Gate University Caveat

The GGU Caveat is the monthly student newspaper of the School of Law. Letters to the editor may be addressed to the editor, GGU Caveat, 536 Mission Street, San Francisco, 94105.

The opinions expressed herein are not necessarily those of the University or any component thereof of or the publishing organization, or of the student body as a whole.

Staff credits may be obtained by consulting Vol. VIII, no. 4.

## CONTINUING LAW STUDENTS ESCAPE TENTATIVE TUITION INCREASE

by John Jones

(Ed. note: The Executive Council consists of University President Otto Butz, the University's academic deans and cost center managers, and student representatives. The law school student representatives are the SBA president, Tim Stearns, and the editor of the Caveat, John Jones. The Executive Council usually meets every other Thursday at 2 p.m. in room 502. The meetings are open to interested individuals from the law school, who, subject to space limitations, are welcome to sit in.)

Perhaps it could be said that the Executive Council meeting of January 11, 1973 was strikingly different from most such meetings. The cause for this difference was the last of the seven items on the agenda, "7. Proposal for modest raise in tuition to help cover unavoidable increases in fixed costs. Butz, Marley".

The discussion of this agenda item began as University Controller George Marley, reading from various accounting forms, projected that the University would need some \$350,000 additional revenue during fiscal 1973-1974 to meet increased costs for providing substantially the same services the University is now providing during fiscal year 1972-1973.

The additional monies will be required as a result of many factors, among which Marley listed increases in salaries and fringe benefits, expenses for additional space for the law school, and a general increase in outlays experience dictates the University will be likely to incur during fiscal 1973-1974.

Marley's estimate assumed no increase in student enrollment over fiscal 1972-1973.

The initial suggestion made to raise the \$350,000 was to increase the undergraduate tuition by \$4, from \$35 per unit to \$39, and to raise the graduate (not including law) tuition also by \$4, from \$48 per unit to \$52.

(By decision of the University's Board of Trustees on October 27, 1972, next year's incoming law students will be charged \$60 per unit, while the per unit charge for continuing students will remain \$48.)

CONTINUING LAW STUDENTS..... (cont'd.)

The observation was then made that, by not raising next year's tuition for continuing law students, the law school's percentage share of contribution to the general overhead of the University would drop, resulting in a relative shift of financial burden onto the graduate and undergraduate schools. From this, it was suggested that, in order to maintain the present percentage of the law school's contribution in relation to the total general overhead of the University, a tuition increase should be applied to continuing law students.

Dean J. Lani Bader answered that he felt that the present percentage contribution of the law school to the general overhead was too high, and flatly asserted that he would live, during the next fiscal year, within his present budget plus the additional revenue generated from the incoming student rate of \$60 per unit. Bader opposed any tuition increase at this time for continuing law students, and argued that such an increase would tempt the University to rely, in future fiscal years, on an even greater law school dollar contribution to the University's general overhead.

Marley questioned whether or not Bader's opposition was in the long run beneficial to the law school: if the graduate and undergraduate, particularly the latter, tuition rate increases drive away potential students, not only would there possibly be no net gain in revenue, but the basic premise of the \$350,000 estimate, constant enrollment, would no longer apply. Marley asserted that if such became the case, the law school tuition for continuing students would have to be raised substantially.

University President Otto Butz, although not entirely in agreement with some of Bader's arguments, stated that he tentatively felt that the tuition for continuing law students should presently be maintained at \$48 per unit, but that this policy be periodically reviewed. Butz tentatively set the 1973-1974 tuition rates for the undergraduate school at \$38 per unit, an increase of \$3, and the tuition rate for the graduate school at \$52 per unit, and increase of \$4.

Marley stated he would have accounting statements available for distribution to members of the Executive Council at its next meeting, January 25, while Butz clarified that, at the January 25 meeting, the firm proposal for tuition increases would be announced. This tuition increase proposal will be presented to the University's Board of Trustees at its next meeting, January 26.

## CONTINUING LAW STUDENTS.....(cont'd.)

The discussion gradually changed from one centering on tuition **increases** to one focusing on the financial health and future of the entire University. Butz outlined the alternatives: Golden Gate could run a quarter million dollar deficit for about four years, at which time the University's endowment would be exhausted, and, in effect, the school would go broke; or, Golden Gate could cut costs, trim faculty and cut library expenses, which course Butz predicted would so erode the University as to lead to its demise within eight years; or, as Butz favors, Golden Gate could add the increased operating costs to tuition, and seek to expand the appeal of the University to a greater share of the general public.

This was perhaps one of the most genuine at length discussions at the Executive Council of the possibility of the financial demise of Golden Gate University. What was said served to emphasize the seriousness of the decisions that the administration of the University is now making, both in terms of their short range and long range effects.

## COMMITTEE FOR A VIABLE FSC:

### FLEXIBILITY THEME OF OPEN MEETING

by Dan Nye

At a lightly attended meeting Monday, January 15, Jay Strauss reported the tentative recommendations of the Committee for a Viable ~~FSC~~. These proposals were as follows:

1. Recommendation of the FSC with 50% student representation.
2. Recommend 9 member FSC, 4 faculty, 4 students, and the dean, each to have one vote.
3. Recommend that the FSC have meetings in the conference room open to the number of observers conveniently seated there. Such meetings will be movable upon majority vote of the FSC.
4. Recommend that ~~FSC~~ agenda be **posted** at least three days in advance of the meeting, and that all reports be posted and distributed to all FSC members at least three days before a meeting.
5. Recommend weekly meetings of the FSC.
6. Recommend periodic open meetings of the student members of the FSC.
7. Recommend periodic meetings of the faculty members of the FSC.

## FLEXIBILITY THEME OF OPEN MEETING (cont'd.)

A general discussion ensued as to the appropriateness of each, and, more particularly, the force of each relative to the Committee's bargaining position.

In response to a query from Professor Roger Bernhardt, Strauss stated he felt that the 50% student representation proposal was the least negotiable item. Bernhardt then clarified that he would not pre-empt the Committee's proposals by reurging the Bernhardt-Astle plan.

Several students felt the 50% concept was desirable, and should be advanced to the Faculty first, but emphasized the need for compromise if the Faculty rejected that proposal.

Strauss suggested that, at the January 16 Faculty meeting (see story below), a Faculty negotiating committee be appointed to meet with the Committee for a Viable FSC to work out an acceptable solution.

Professor Leslie Minkus, Faculty chairman, clarified that, unlike the December 6, 1972 Faculty meeting, the FSC issue would not be tabled.

Strauss and the students assembled then agreed to table any discussion of tactical procedures until the next general meeting of the Committee for a Viable FSC to be held Monday, January 22, at 12 noon.

## FACULTY MEETING DEALS WITH STUDENT ISSUES

by John Jones

At its meeting January 16, the Faculty dealt with two separate issues of interest to students, grading anonymity and the tentative proposals of the Committee for a Viable FSC.

Professor Leslie Minkus, Faculty chairman, clarified the Faculty's position on grading anonymity: while reaffirming that all grading will be on an anonymous basis, there is no prohibition against a Faculty member looking at exam numbers after his or her grades are handed in. One apparent benefit to a Faculty member in knowing how some of his or her students performed on a given examination is that it allows that Faculty member some way to evaluate the effectiveness of the exam.

Minkus also clarified that no Faculty member will tell one student another's grade, either intentionally, or inadvertently, as, for example, by discussing a student's grade with that student within ear-

## FACULTY MEETING DEALS WITH STUDENT ISSUES (cont'd.)

shot of other students.

In dealing with the tentative proposals of the Committee for a Viable FSC, Minkus stated that the Faculty would be willing to select two of its members to sit down with two students to work out from scratch a proposal for the organizational structure most appropriate for Golden Gate school of law. Emphasizing that such work would be in good faith on the part of the committee designates from the Faculty, Minkus considered the function of the committee as somewhat creative, in terms of developing a proposed structure uniquely suited to the needs of Golden Gate, without starting from fixed positions, or preconceived notions of what that structure ought to be.

Minkus stressed the importance of the committee lies in reestablishing a feeling of good faith, while analyzing the problems that face the school of law.

While the Faculty does not believe that a quick job can be done, Minkus continued, the Faculty is concerned that the job be done well. Therefore, the Faculty rejected, either as a permanent or interim solution, a proposal that three students join Faculty meetings. The Faculty apparently felt that, if this were done, it would limit the options of the proposed two Faculty-two Student committee and hamper its essential function of starting from scratch in constructing a proposal.

Although wishing to avoid a they-we adversary notion in Faculty-Student exchanges, Minkus did clarify that bargaining in good faith did not preclude the Faculty from rejecting a proposal of the two Faculty-two Student committee. It is not clear at this time how the student body would ratify or reject the committee's proposals.

At least until such time as the two Faculty-two Student committee presents a proposal, the law school will continue under the present system of Faculty-Student committees, with the Faculty as the governing body.

## BORROMEO HIRED IN PLACEMENT OFFICE

The Placement Office announced recently the hiring of Peter M. Borromeo as assistant for law school placement. Borromeo is

## BORROMEO HIRED IN PLACEMENT OFFICE (cont'd.)

a third year student in the J.D.-M.B.A. (Tax) joint degree program and plans to hold this position until his graduation from Golden Gate in 1974.

Borromeo is available in the Placement Office on the first floor mezzanine from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, and hopes to soon be open 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. one evening a week for night students and graduates unable to come in during the day.

## REGISTRATION SCHEDULE

First Year Students Only - Monday, February 5, 2 p.m. to 7 p.m.

2nd, 3rd, 4th Year - A-I, Tuesday, February 6, 2 p.m. to 7 p.m.

J-Z, Wednesday, February 7, 2 p.m. to 7 p.m.

Please pick up registration packets in the Dean's office on February 1 or 2. Please have the entire form typed before you come to registration.

Remember: The Accounting Office will ~~now~~ be charging \$2 for each program change. For example, if you drop ~~Conflicts~~ and add Admiralty and Federal Jurisdiction all on one form, it will still cost \$6. Hence, at registration, it is best to be as definitive as possible about your schedule.

Also, please check the Final Exam schedule once ~~again~~. It was published with the ~~Mid~~-term Exam schedule before school began in August. Updated schedules will be available when you pick up your registration forms.

Please make sure the line numbers you use for courses are correct. Day and Evening sections of the same course have different line numbers.

## LAW LIBRARY ACHIEVES NEW STATUS

The Law School Library at Golden Gate University has recently been designated a depository for California state publications ~~effective~~ March 1, 1973. The Library will receive free of charge such basic legal documents as legislative bills, legislative committee hearings and reports, legislative journals, statutes, administrative reports,



LAW LIBRARY ACHIEVES NEW STATUS (cont'd.)

the California Administrative Code and Register, and annual reports of state agencies.

The Law Library's new status as a depository will save the school ~~some~~ \$1000 per year and insure automatic receipt of state publications without time consuming separate ordering of items.

The depository designation was achieved through the combined efforts of Dean J. Lani Bader, Gerard Magavero, Law Librarian, and Assemblyman Willie L. Brown, Jr.

WANT AD

Attention: First and Second Year Students

Wanted: Student coordinator to assist Carol Silver with Alumni Association. Will help plan activities to mutually benefit students and alumni. Those interested should contact Tim Stearns or Carol Silver.