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Last summer, shortly after I assumed the job of Acting Dean, I reported to you briefly in the pages of the Gargoyle in quite optimistic tones. I noted that the legislature, through the biennial budget bill adopted late in the session, had finally added a substantial sum of money to the Law School's budget. I said that this money will enable us to continue and strengthen a number of programs which at times within the past year we thought we would have to abandon. I said we will be able to continue our clinical programs at least at the same level as in the past, continue our small section program and intensive legal writing program for first year students, continue to offer two sections of General Practice each year, and continue our extensive offerings of lecturer-taught courses in the Trial Court and Trial Advocacy areas. I tempered my optimism by saying that we still have too many large classes and too few seminars and that we clearly need to continue to strive for improvements.

Once again, I can report to you in optimistic tones, because we have made very substantial strides in funding improvements and in other ways during the past year. The road in between the beginning and the ending of the 1975-76 academic year, however, has not always been smooth.

In summer in 1975, we received a report from our accrediting agency, the Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar of the American Bar Association, notifying us that we had not made sufficient progress toward correcting the deficiencies noted by the 1971 accreditation inspection team. The report stated that we must improve our student-faculty ratio, that we must improve our faculty pay scale so as to enhance our competitive position in the market for teachers,
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In summer in 1975, we received a report from our accrediting agency, the Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar of the American Bar Association, notifying us that we had not made sufficient progress toward correcting the deficiencies noted by the 1971 accreditation inspection team. The report stated that we must improve our student-faculty ratio, that we must improve our faculty pay scale so as to enhance our competitive position in the market for teachers,
and that we must provide more office and classroom space. We were required to submit a report by November 1, 1975, showing how we would make these improvements and be in full compliance with ABA standards by July 1, 1976, with the threat of further proceedings against us if we did not comply. My first reaction to the report was a sense of outrage that a law school of this stature should be subjected to these demands. Upon further reflection, however, I realized that the Council was merely performing its function of prodding law schools throughout the country to maintain high standards in the face of difficult problems such as the tremendous demand for legal education and the seeming inability of resources to keep pace with this demand. Moreover, I have since learned that many law schools throughout the country, both eminent and not so eminent, have been subjected to criticism and demands by the accrediting agency.

I will not review again here the reasons for the many problems which we, along with many other law schools throughout the country, have faced in recent years. Previous Deans have discussed them with you, and I made an attempt at my own explanation in a recent issue of the Gargoyle. I am simply pleased to report at this time that, in my opinion, we have made great strides during the past year toward solving our problems.

I do not of course claim personal credit for this; many persons and groups have helped. In fact, one of the first groups I turned to was the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin Law Alumni Association at its meeting on October 4 last fall. The Board at that meeting voted to provide salary support for a person on the Law School staff to serve as Executive Director of the Wisconsin Law Alumni Association. We were fortunate to be able to obtain the services of Ed Reisner, who on February 1 of this year was appointed Assistant Dean for Placement and Alumni Activities. As many of you know, Ed is a former employee of the State Bar and a 1972 graduate of our Law School. His appointment was made possible by the action of the WLAA Board of Directors at the meeting on October 4 but was made timely by two other events. The first was the retirement of Mary Staley as Placement Director whom many of you will remember fondly for her services in that capacity in recent years. The second was the decision by Bill Lewis who has served as your part-time Executive Director for the past couple of years that his law practice had grown to a point where he could no longer do justice to both his law practice and the Wisconsin Law Alumni Association.

The second aspect of the resolution adopted on October 4 was the approval of a program improvement fund in the amount of $50,000. This resolution was adopted at least in part as a response to the criticism of the accrediting agency that our faculty salary structure was not sufficiently competitive. Although the fulfillment of this aspect of the resolution must await further improvements in our fund raising efforts, I nevertheless appreciate very much this expression of support by the alumni.

Another person who deserves much credit for the strides we have made during the past year is Chancellor Edwin Young. Chancellor Young initially supported a request of $186,000 to be added to our budget on an annual basis. Because the Regents have not acted on the 1976-77 budget as of the time of this writing, it is premature to discuss the matter further. Nevertheless, I can say that I anticipate a substantial gain in resources, at least sufficient to satisfy the goals set for us by the ABA accrediting agency with regard to our student-faculty ratio. I must also pay tribute to our many friends in the Legislature without whose understanding support these improvements may not have been possible.

Important steps also have been taken toward solving our space problems. The refurbishing and modernization of an old building on University Avenue will provide suitable space for the students and supervisors in our clinical programs. The operations of the Extension Law Department will be housed temporarily in rented quarters in the First National Bank Building, also on University Avenue. By this time next year we expect that ground will have been broken for a 10,000 square foot addition to the Law Library. Although this will be designed mainly as a library facility, it will provide temporary seminar rooms and offices until such time as another addition to the Law Building, which now is in the early planning stages, can be completed. Tentative plans for the latter call for a 22,000 square foot addition which would house both faculty offices, small and medium sized classrooms, and perhaps a second court room, plus other facilities. Prospects for the funding of this addition look reasonably good, but the most optimistic completion date still would be the summer of 1979.

I turn from the matter of money and space to other subjects although I seem incapable of completely escaping the former. With regard to curriculum, I report no major changes although there are a couple of potentially significant developments. We have been experimenting with a new format in the administrative law area. This involves a Basic Administrative Law course which the students
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complete within the first five weeks of the semester. They then have the opportunity to take a number of so-called modules which are offered during the second five weeks or third five weeks of the semester. Each module generally is offered for one credit and deals with the law of a particular administrative agency. For example, during the second semester of 1975-76, modules were offered in communications law, unfair trade practices, regulated industries, state natural resources law and welfare law and administration. Professor Joel Handler has been largely responsible for developing this experiment which seems to have been well received both by professors and students.

I am pleased to report that once again a Wisconsin team, as has been true many times in the past, won the Regional Moot Court Tournament in Chicago. A relatively new venture is our Client Counseling course. It has been taught ever since its inception three or four years ago by two Madison attorneys, Gerald Conklin and Michael Wilcox. A regional and national competition also has been developed in this area, and this year the Wisconsin team coached by Mike Wilcox placed first in the regional competition and second in the national competition.

Once again, as has been true for many years, practicing attorneys played a very significant role in that part of our curriculum which is particularly practice oriented. Six sections of Trial Advocacy, ten sections of Trial Court, four sections of Advanced Criminal Procedure were taught by practicing attorneys. We also had to call upon practicing attorneys to help out in a couple of the more traditional courses. Because of funding uncertainties last spring and because of the tremendous amount of advance preparation which is necessary to run a section of General Practice, we were unable to offer more than one section of General Practice during the 1975-76 academic year. However, we are laying plans now for running two sections during the next academic year.

Potentially one of the most significant actions taken by the law faculty during the past year is approval of the concept of continuing legal education as a proper function of the Law School. The action included authorization to appoint an Associate or Assistant Dean for Continuing Legal Education. We expect to work closely with the Extension Law Department in this matter. You may ask how we expect to be able to take on an activity like this when we are not able to take all the students who want to be admitted to Law School. I suppose the answer again relates to money. We anticipate that substantial revenue will be generated by the continuing legal education programs and that part of this revenue can be used to hire visiting teachers or lecturers during a given year to replace those of our own faculty who are devoting substantial time to the continuing legal education programs. There also may be those interested in engaging in this kind of work during the summers.

Another approach we are taking is to attempt to determine to what extent our regular law courses could be made available to practicing lawyers who will need to fulfill mandatory continuing legal education requirements under the new rules adopted by the Supreme Court. Next fall Walter Raushenbush, on an experimental basis, will be opening his advanced Real Estate Transactions course to a limited number of attorneys to test the feasibility of this concept. To facilitate the enrollment of attorneys, the course will be offered late in the afternoon for a two-hour period. We of course will need the approval of the State Continuing Legal Education Board but we do not anticipate any difficulty. The details have not been worked out, but we anticipate that attorneys would be able to register on an audit basis.

Admissions pressures are continuing at about the same level as in the past several years. Again, we are processing between 1,800 and 1,900 applications, and again most of the applicants seem to be quite well qualified. The processing of these applications and the making of admissions decisions is one of the most difficult, thankless and time consuming administrative tasks we face. The Admissions Committee again is chaired by Walter Raushenbush who is ably assisted this year by Professors Richard Bilder and William Clune.

Somewhat to our surprise and pleasure, placement opportunities for our graduates also seem to be continuing at about the same level as in the past two or three years. Over half of the May graduates already have jobs and a number of the firms which interviewed at our school last fall are again interviewing because of the need for additional help.

With regard to faculty personnel, I can report that we will have two or three new faculty members next fall in addition to some visitors and lecturers. Unfortunately, I also must report that we are losing two of the mainstays of our faculty to retirement. Abner Brodie reaches mandatory retirement age this year and Robert Skilton also has decided to retire. It is sad to see the changing of the guard, so to speak, but on the whole I believe it has been a very good year for the University of Wisconsin Law School. I look forward to the future with optimism although I am sure we will occasionally suffer the temporary setbacks which seem to plague all human endeavor.

Orrin L. Helstad
Acting Dean