Model of the Law School viewed from Fayette Street. The building in white represents the structure and location of the new law library adjacent to the Westminster Church.
REPORT OF THE DEAN

University of Maryland
School of Law 1978
In October of this year I presented to Dr. John Toll, the new President of the University, a memorandum outlining the strengths and needs of the Law School. This rather personal assessment of the School was an attempt to acquaint Dr. Toll with our status, concerns and ambitions. It occurred to me that the memorandum for Dr. Toll was a document that might be of more general interest to our students, alumni, and the profession in Maryland. It departs somewhat from the usual format of a Dean's report, but I hope it will prove to be informative and interesting to all those who have an interest in the University of Maryland School of Law.
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To: Dr. John S. Toll, President
University of Maryland

From: Michael J. Kelly, Dean

Subject: A Prospect of the University of Maryland Law School

After three years of serving as Dean, I think it is appropriate for me to undertake a systematic assessment of our situation, my ambitions for the school, and our needs. It is my hope that this "Prospect" will not be accepted and filed away, but rather that the habits of criticism that are fundamental to legal education will generate some lively comment on this document, and a number of concurrences or dissents.

THE STRENGTHS OF OUR LAW SCHOOL

Our school has long enjoyed a reputation as a solid and effective institution for the education of lawyers in the State of Maryland. We have enjoyed a respected, but not distinguished, place in the perceived hierarchy of American legal education. Whatever may have been the merits of this reputation in years past, I think it is a profound misrepresentation of the nature of the Law School today. We are, in my not altogether unbiased opinion, perhaps the most underrated law school in the country today, despite the fact that our reputation is rising rapidly in legal education circles and amongst the bar of Maryland. There is at Maryland a sense of growth and development and openness to new ideas (as opposed, I believe, to fashion) that gives Maryland something of the character of a new institution, although our time of founding makes us one of the oldest law schools in the country.

The Law School has improved markedly with the strong support of the University over the past few years, but there are some weaknesses that need attention and some unusual opportunities that could significantly affect the quality of the Law School. We believe the School is on the verge of a breakthrough to the very top ranks of legal education in America. Our reputation has soared and we now have the
recruiting ability and evolving educational program which should enable us to command a leadership position in legal education. The Law School, by comparison with other programs, is an extraordinarily low cost operation. For a relatively small additional investment, the University could realize through the Law School an extraordinary gain in its community strength and national reputation.

Here is how I assess our strengths:

**Curriculum**

The Law School offers one course of study leading to one degree—the Juris Doctor (née LL.B.). All 780 students at the School are enrolled in the J.D. program. About one half of the 84 credits required for graduation are mandatory, a requirement much out of step with the recent trends in American legal education, but which we have no intention of changing. This difference between the extent of the required curriculum at Maryland and the requirements of most other good law schools is more symbolic than real, since most students at law schools who are seeking to pass a state bar examination will take the kinds of courses we require: Evidence, two semesters of Procedure, Constitutional Law, Criminal Procedure, Commercial Transactions, Taxation, etc. Our program is largely directed toward the education of practicing lawyers. It is not designed primarily as a liberal education in law, or a public policy or business program, although no doubt some students seek the J.D. degree for these purposes.

Even a cursory review of the leadership of the Maryland bar, judiciary, business and public life reveals that the Law School functions as probably the single most important institutional training ground for the community leadership of the State of Maryland. Whether lawyers and law training should play the central role they do in the creation of our State’s leadership is open to question, but the fact is that lawyers play a crucial role in Maryland; and the University of Maryland Law School has a dominant position in this form of leadership training.

Several important developments have taken place in the
curriculum over the past several years. These additions to the basic curriculum have added considerable (and I might add desirable) complexity to the pedagogy and management of legal education at Maryland. Our array of upper-class electives and seminars is probably as extensive as that of any school our size in the nation. Part of this is simply a function of the diverse interests of our faculty. Part of this development has been the rapid growth of interdisciplinary courses and joint degree programs. And part is due to the use of part-time faculty for some specialized subjects, with the view of enriching the experience, and we hope, exciting the imaginations of our students.

Another change has been the stronger focus on writing and research skills through extensive allocation of our resources to the first-year Legal Method program, the creation of a new course in Legal Writing which is a tutorial for students who seek writing improvement, and the institution of a new writing requirement for graduation. The faculty is acutely aware of student deficiencies in these areas, the critical importance of lucid writing and effective research for the successful practice of law, and the need to bolster and improve the quality of the various writing programs now in place.

Another major change has been the addition, largely in the third-year curriculum, of so-called clinical and skills courses. Skills courses are structured around simulated exercises designed to develop student abilities in critical lawyering activities such as planning, drafting, counseling, and trial advocacy. Clinical courses involve, under appropriate court rules, real clients and students performing as lawyers under supervision. Clinical education generates special management problems: It is about five times as expensive per student as classroom education because it is faculty intensive and requires the creation of small law offices. It also raises all the classic issues relating to the integration of clinicians and "pure" academics that other forms of professional training, particularly medicine, have struggled with for decades.
Students

Contrary to all our predictions, the number of students seeking to enter the University of Maryland Law School has increased sharply this year—up about 10% from 1977. We now have 1750 applicants for the 250 places in the entering class, despite the fact that the number of applicants is no doubt depressed by our policy of publishing the academic and aptitude criteria needed to gain entry to the Law School.

As a result of this increased demand, the average academic measures of our accepted applicants are an undergraduate grade point average of 3.4 and a Law School Admissions Test score of 650. The faculty are, on the whole, pleased with the quality of our students. The range and vigor of extracurricular student activities is a healthy one. We have an extremely able and intellectually gifted group of students at the school.

Faculty

Our faculty prides itself on being a strong group of teachers with a fundamental dedication to a quality of classroom performance and personal interchange with the students that will motivate learning and provide an education of excellence. This is the soul of our faculty and heart of our mission, although in the last few years there has been a substantial increase in faculty publication activity. There is also a tradition of service to the Maryland Bar in the form of involvement in services to the state and local bar associations. One characteristic of our faculty that is critical to our growth and intellectual health is a self-critical habit of mind and openness to change and experimentation in curriculum development. Part of this openness may be a function of the fact that the faculty is afflicted with almost none of the divisiveness and inter-personal animosity that characterizes some educational institutions. While we harbor an enormous range of views about legal education, politics, and life, we are an institution blessedly free from much of the distracting and degrading lure of academic politics.

One other important feature of our faculty deserves mention, the change in our orientation toward recruitment of
new faculty. Whereas some years ago, it was a typical pattern to choose new faculty from the ranks of recent law graduates or those completing a graduate degree or a clerkship, the faculty places much stronger emphasis on experience as a prerequisite to law teaching. This change of emphasis may be a function of the rapid development of our clinical curricula, our stronger attraction to new faculty, and the recognition that experience and practice within the academic setting contributes effectively to the educational life of the school. We continue to place high priority on the importance of recruiting women and Blacks to the ranks of the faculty.

The Atmosphere of the School

When one undertakes to discuss certain intangibles, generalization is risky. Nevertheless, I would like to venture some descriptions of our Law School knowing full well that there will be a number of faculty and students who may take issue with my characterizations. The administration of the School is rather informal, and students expect and generally receive a sympathetic hearing and action in response to issues they raise. Access to the administration and faculty is open, that is, people are approachable and generally quite willing to help. Part of this accessibility is a function of the extremely favorable faculty-student ratio of our Law School compared with most other law schools in the country. We invest this in small classes, curtailment in the size of the large sections, and extensive opportunities for independent writing under faculty guidance. By and large, the student who wants individual attention can get it. I do not mean to suggest that we have obliterated distinctions between faculty and students, or that Maryland is a less competitive or business-like school than most. But there is, because of the relatively small size of our student body compared to the number of faculty, an opportunity to deal with students as individuals that I hope will remain a prime goal and hallmark of our Law School.

Alumni

One of the most dramatic changes at the Law School in the past few years has been the re-awakening of interest in the
School by its alumni. The Law School Alumni Association has become a more active organization. Its membership has increased significantly; it has made a generous contribution to our new Law School Fund; and it has raised substantially the scope and importance of the annual mid-winter luncheon meeting. The Association sponsors two successful reunion programs in the spring and the fall of each year, which give returning alumni a chance to visit classrooms in the afternoon, to visit with the Dean before the main program and, following refreshments after the program, to have dinner in downtown Baltimore.

One of the most significant developments of Alumni support for the School is the splendid first year of the Law School Fund. The Fund is an unincorporated, voluntary group of alumni and friends of the Law School, the purpose of which is to conduct an annual giving campaign to raise private funds to be channeled directly to the Law School. In its first year of operation during 1977, the Fund raised $22,000 for the School. It was a strong initial effort, and the funds generated a significant impact on the School during these times of a rather stringent State fiscal climate. This year our goal is $30,000 and at last count we have received over $33,000. We hope that the continued growth of the Fund will enable the Law School to improve substantially through alumni support.

Baltimore

The City of Baltimore has been the location of our Law School since 1816 when lectures first began here. The one firm generalization that can be made about this city is the constant reality of change. There are, in my opinion, a host of important values that follow from our location in downtown Baltimore. Part of this value is intangible: if we are training the future leadership of the State of Maryland, the advantages of exposing students to the cultural, ethnic and economic diversity and the political and policy issues represented by the city are incalculable. Of more immediate practical significance is the proximity of federal and state courts, state agencies, legal aid and other public agencies that offer opportunities for clinical practice for students, as
well as part-time employment opportunities with law firms located a few blocks from the Law School. Our own Baltimore neighborhood, which has been carved out of a declining garment district by Urban Renewal, is undergoing rapid change and upgrading with the addition of the new Social Security complex, substantial changes in the campus, and the use of industrial buildings for residential purposes. Baltimore offers an exciting setting to remind students of the breadth and adaptibility in the law needed to meet the range of interests in our society.

**Evening Program**

Some years ago, there was a relatively widespread consensus in American legal education that evening schools were an inferior form of legal education that reflected poorly on any school unlucky enough to have such a program. Many legal educators today no doubt harbor these same views. Opposition to evening training, however, has subsided considerably, perhaps as a result of a general reduction in the level of dogmatism about the appropriate ways to educate students in the law. Evening education not only provides a significant degree of mobility and opportunity for people who could otherwise not afford legal education; it is a method of attracting to the profession absolutely first-rate talent. No one would minimize the difficulties of evening education, particularly those students who undertake it. Evening school (like the practice of law) is plagued by problems of fatigue and lack of time for adequate preparation.

As demand for evening education has receded compared to the day program, enrollment in the evening has declined slightly, thus increasing costs to the law school of providing, as we have over the past few years, improvements in the number of elective courses and the quality of the first year writing and research program. Nevertheless, the evening program is an important asset to the school, and a service to the profession, to those students to whom it makes legal education available, and to the public whom evening graduates serve.
Physical Plant

We have begun construction this fall of a major addition to the Law School which should solve pressing space problems when the construction is completed in 1980. We will, however, have a variety of extremely severe problems with office space before the completion of the new library and the availability of the remodeled old library space for use by the faculty, students and service programs. We have enjoyed extraordinary support from the University and State Department of General Services to enable us to process the new library in almost record time, and in about three years we should have a physical facility that is first-rate and totally adequate to house a fine new law library, classrooms and offices appropriate for a modern law curriculum.

GOALS

Although speaking about ultimate goals risks vague generalization, it is important to plan with these in mind. I consider the following (not necessarily in order of importance) our basic objectives:

Impact on Students

The mark of a great educational institution is best measured by its impact on the student community it serves. Legal education transforms individual students into professionals. Our graduates must, therefore, be introduced to the fundamentals of law practice. They must acquire a grasp of basic legal doctrine and the analytical and research capacities to enable continual learning in the law, the ability to write, and the rudiments of legal skills in litigation, counseling, negotiation and planning. Perhaps equally important are those intangible forms of learning that are part of becoming a professional. A law school should create an environment where careful and intense work, intellectual curiosity, and a sense of the larger community responsibilities of the profession are nurtured through relationships between faculty and other students who, despite their differences, cherish these values. This is what Justice Holmes meant by saying: “Nearly all the education which men can get from others is moral, not intellectual.” I would hope that our students--regardless of the diversity in their background
and their form of law practice -- would respect these qualities in the professional education offered them at Maryland.

**Service to the Profession and the Public**

A *public* law school has obligations which go well beyond the usual professional activities of faculty serving as members of bar association and law revision committees, or reporters to study groups. Our Law School's *great* asset is the community it serves -- the State and legal profession of Maryland. Our library, faculty and students should be not only a rich intellectual resource for the bar and the public authorities of Maryland; we should provide leadership in supporting improvements in the institutions of law and government. These responsibilities also give us unusual opportunities to affect the quality of Maryland's professional and public life -- from economic development, to state and local government institutions, to the rights of the handicapped and indigent. Although I hope we foster a healthy share of contemplative and purely speculative activity within our walls, our relationship with the system of laws and government in this State cannot be a passive one if we are to introduce our students to the full implications of Maryland citizenship and community leadership.

**Intellectual Community**

We are part of a great University. Our membership in this enterprise means that a fundamental mission of our School is encouragement of the life of the mind, and its natural products: reflection, exploration and communication through scholarship. A law school must be a place where there is extensive and thoughtful interchange of ideas within the faculty community; where the intellectual environment stimulates discovery; and where the reputation of the University is enhanced by the scholarly productivity of its law faculty. And we have an obligation to avoid both intellectual and institutional insularity in our dealings with the rest of the University.

**The Teaching Function**

A stimulating academic environment all too often is translated into only one activity: scholarship. But teaching and its
structuring through the curriculum must be vital elements of the intellectual atmosphere of the School. Legal education is undergoing major changes. In addition to responding to the exponential growth of the law and legal institutions, faculties have developed ambitions for legal education that go well beyond the traditional classroom methods and teaching mission created by Langdell and Ames in the Nineteenth Century. Integrating analytical and performance skills in the law -- without the luxuries of extraordinary financing -- will require an environment that stimulates curiosity, experimentation, tolerance, challenge, and interchange of ideas. Students will no doubt play an important role in the great adventure of legal education in the 1980's: adapting the traditional curriculum to contemporary needs.

In translating these goals in programmatic terms, here is how I assess our opportunities:

**Advances in the Curriculum**

**Ethics in Legal Education** - We have been working with the Center for Philosophy and Public Policy at the College Park campus of the University to create a joint faculty position that would involve a major contribution to the teaching of ethics in American legal education. The research focus of this faculty member would be the development of philosophical materials to respond to the paucity of serious analytical literature in legal ethics taught in the required Legal Profession courses in law schools. But from the point of view of the Law School, an important by-product of having a faculty member freed to undertake these research interests would be the capability to work with teachers of various subjects to develop appropriate materials that highlight the special ethical problems associated with various subject areas in the law. Without such staff support, it is unlikely that the so-called "pervasive" method of teaching ethics can begin to find its way into the classroom.

The special curriculum committee of the faculty is considering moving the traditional required course in legal ethics to the first year and creating small classes in which simulations and extensive discussions can occur. This significant upgrading in the importance of the course, and lowering of faculty-student ratios in teaching the course, will
require additions to the faculty. I would hope we could also create an advanced seminar dealing with ethical issues in law.

If we were able to combine an extensive clinical program that is genuinely reflective about ethics in law practice, together with the proposed shift of the required Legal Profession course to the first year, and the development of staff support for the faculty as a whole to encourage discussions of ethical issues in substantive law courses, we will have begun a project that few law schools in the country have taken seriously, namely a rigorous and systematic introduction for students to the ethical dilemmas in the practice of law.

Clinical Education - One of the great strengths of American legal education is the quality of classroom instruction. It is also one of the great weaknesses of American legal education, because over-reliance on the classroom as a method of communicating the variety of learning in the Law excludes important aspects of a lawyer's professional life and some of the most difficult intellectual challenges facing an attorney. Learning how to perform as a lawyer is not just a process of acquiring some practical skills relating to the management of clients, other attorneys, courts, and administrative agencies. It involves understanding the variety of conflicts that arise between the lawyer's own interests and those of his client, as well as judges and other parties. The capability to undertake reflective analysis of these issues is important to the student's maturation as a professional.

American legal education has left the teaching of critical so-called practical skills to the practicing bar, with predictably mixed results. It seems clear that even those institutions with strong reputations for training young attorneys -- the large firms -- are becoming less capable of performing that function in view of the economic realities and rampant specialization under which they operate.

The clinical experience in the law school is essential for two reasons: First, the law schools owe a responsibility to the public to train law students more fully in the range of skills needed to practice law. Schools cannot graduate fully competent practitioners, but they can establish standards of preparation and performance which are fundamental to the
attainment of competence in practice. Second, the intellectual dimensions of clinical experience are important to the education of an attorney. Understanding of a "case" is enormously enriched by experience with clients who can inform inquiries into the art of fact-finding, and the role of strategic factors in framing issues and formulating the law. The absence of a clinical experience in law schools deprives law students of a powerful analytical tool and reflective experience by which the students can assess his or her own abilities and interests and drives in the context of the demands of professional life.

In light of these observations, it is clear to me that we should act to make these issues a basic part of the curriculum. And we should continue our efforts to integrate the clinical program and clinical teachers into the more traditional classroom curriculum. Our Law School should ultimately require some form of clinical experience as a precondition for graduation. The faculty has not yet reached (nor rejected) this conclusion. The financial barriers to achieving it are formidable in view of the fact that we can offer at present only one third of our students the opportunity to participate in clinical programs. We ought, however, to be exploring a variety of clinical models to assess whether lower cost methods of clinical training are feasible.

The Demands of the Curriculum - There is a feeling among some faculty which I share that the demands of our curriculum upon students after the first year are rather anemic. As a recent article by Lester Brickman for the Council on Legal Education for Professional Responsibility makes clear, this is a widespread phenomenon in legal education. The pressure (some would say the collective terror) of the first year leads generally to a high degree of effort and responsiveness on the part of the students. Once students have "gotten the hang of it", been discouraged by the Law School grading process which (unlike undergraduate and other forms of graduate education) awards very few A's and a substantial number of C's, and developed an appetite for working as a paid clerk in a law firm, the performance in upper class courses often deteriorates.

It is important that the faculty addresses this problem and
explores some remedies. Poor writing skills continue to be a major problem: we should consider making the second year Legal Writing tutorial mandatory for students with writing difficulties perceived in the first year program. There may be a variety of techniques for dealing with classroom problems, such as instituting exams during the course of the semester (which might also generate more effective methods of evaluating student performance) or adjustments in classroom requirements. In any case, the faculty should face the fact that a large number of second and third year day students are part-time, and apparently the structure of our curriculum permits this to happen. I do not have objections to students working to supplement their funds and to gain valuable experience. But I am concerned over increasing evidence that the quality and effectiveness of the training we are able to offer is suffering because outside activities take precedence over the course of instruction at the Law School.

**Interdisciplinary Studies** - We have embarked on or are about to proceed with a number of formal interdisciplinary programs: joint degrees in law and policy studies (UMBC), business (M.B.A. at College Park), psychology (Ph.D at Hopkins and UMBC), urban studies (College Park and Hopkins), and social work (UMAB). In addition to these, we have joint courses in Philosophy, English, Economics and Geography (Hopkins) as well as the potential for significant collaboration with other schools in the health care field. While I think the growth of these efforts enriches our curriculum, we should begin to pay more attention to the administrative detail and ultimate financial implications of these developments.

**Evaluation** - This past academic year, the clinical teachers at the School undertook the beginning of an evaluation process for their programs. While the methods of this evaluation are still in a rudimentary stage, the commitment of law teachers to a program of self-evaluation is an extremely important beginning. I would hope that we could extend the example of the clinical staff and make use of the subject area groupings of our present faculty to begin development of evaluation of our programs by our faculty. If such a program is to be suc-
cessful, it must be supported by some resources, such as funding (for example) of an internal conference or retreat on teaching, or the purchase of time of an individual who could provide support and encouragement to evaluation efforts.

Audio-Visual Support - As our academic program has placed more emphasis on certain performance skills, videotaping technology has become an important teaching aide. Unlike the other professional schools on the Baltimore campus, the Law School has an extremely rudimentary videotaping program involving no professional personnel and rather primitive equipment and storage facilities. Our equipment has such intensive use that constant breakdown now seems to be the rule rather than the exception. It seems clear that additional equipment and staff support will be required in the future.

Evening Program - One of the great disadvantages of the evening school is the inaccessibility of daytime clinical programs. It is unlikely that we can devise a clinical curriculum outside of normal hours for the functioning of law offices and courts, but we can seek to provide more simulation courses (counseling, trial practice, estate planning) for evening students which would go some way toward making up for this weakness in the evening program.

Tuition - Tuition at the University of Maryland Law School by 1979 will have risen 100% since I first became Dean in 1975. This dramatic increase in cost to the student has seriously affected the budgets of many students who may not ordinarily have qualified for scholarship assistance. More important, it places a burden on law students that is not shared by other students in the University professional schools. Law students pay a far higher percentage of their education costs than other professional students on the Baltimore campus. There has been general recognition of the fact that the Law School has been underfunded at the University of Maryland, but the technique used over the past three years to improve the funding of the Law School largely has been passing the improvement costs to students rather than any significant reliance on University general funds.
Counseling - Although we have no quantitative measures of student needs, there is increasing evidence that students at the Law School need access to extensive counseling resources. We are disturbed at the high incidence of marital discord and acute distress and anxiety that many of our students suffer, and believe we need to explore methods of providing better assistance to students in difficulty.

Scholarships - Our recruiting of top students is, I believe, significantly hampered by a scholarship budget which has not increased over the past several years. We should develop more opportunities for students to work as research assistants at the Law School as one means of combating the second and third year “letdown” problems mentioned earlier. Another program that interests me would permit evening students to receive scholarships to enable them to take leave from their employment and enroll in clinical and seminar writing programs in the day division.

Bakke and the Admissions Policy of the Law School - Shortly after the Supreme Court’s decision in Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, the faculty committee which is reviewing the admissions policy of the Law School considered whether that decision mandates changes in our policies.

In Bakke, the Supreme Court reversed the decision of the state court which had enjoined the University from considering the race of an applicant in its admission program. The court decided that admissions programs at State schools may lawfully consider race as a positive factor in the admissions process.

The Court also held that Alan Bakke should be admitted to Davis Medical School because that school’s admissions program violated a federal statute. Davis admitted a fixed number of minority students selected by a separate special admissions committee. Mr. Justice Powell’s opinion stated that there were no judicial, legislative or administrative findings that the rights of the group of which those students were members had been violated nor any evidence that the separate admissions program was necessary to achieve any other legitimate purpose.

After careful study of Mr. Powell’s opinion and other opinions in the case, we believe there are a number of
reasons to distinguish sharply the Court’s decision on the Davis program and the University of Maryland situation. We have never had a quota for minority students: the number of Blacks enrolled at Maryland has varied widely during the last several years. We have never maintained a separate admissions committee for minorities. Perhaps most important in terms of Mr. Justice Powell’s reasoning, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare notified Maryland in March of 1969 that it found the state was operating a segregated system of higher education and requested the State to prepare a plan to desegregate its institutions of higher education. The Law School’s admissions policy is part of a plan responsive to that administrative finding of unlawful action and is therefore consistent with the decision in Bakke.

Although the HEW finding provides a legal basis for the affirmative action efforts of the Law School, the faculty has independent reasons for strenuously pursuing the recruitment of minority students. Individual faculty members give different weights to different reasons and may disagree over the validity of particular reasons. They agree, however, that special admissions for Black students are justified. Among the reasons asserted by faculty members for special consideration of race in admissions are the following:

1. It is necessary to consider race to prevent admissions criteria from perpetuating discrimination. Although the use of the national Law School Admission Test scores and college records are essential to eliminate unqualified applicants to school, their automatic or uncritical use to rank qualified applicants tends to perpetuate the effects of past racial discrimination.

2. Racial considerations are necessary to assure a diverse law school class reflecting different experiences and backgrounds. This is particularly true in light of the fact that race relations is one of the most significant problems which the law must address.

3. Because of past discrimination, there is a significant need for more Black attorneys in the state. This need has several dimensions:
a. Black children need role models who will show them that opportunities are open for them and will encourage efforts to become attorneys;
b. The Black community needs political leaders trained in the law to promote more effectively the concerns which particularly affect that race;
c. The Black community needs counselors as well as courtroom advocates willing to work in the community who are understanding of and sympathetic to their particular needs and experiences.

Although the faculty has reasserted its commitment to the continuation of the special admissions for minority students, the *Bakke* decision has revived our interest in reviewing the entire admissions process. This review and analysis of our admissions criteria and procedures, begun three years ago, has been lagging and now appears to be heading for a full report by the end of the school year.

**Faculty Improvement**

*Intellectual Environment* - One of the most important aspects of a faculty is the intellectual exchange essential for stimulating ideas both in teaching and in research. The lack of this kind of atmosphere has, I believe, been a weakness of the Law School in the past, and some efforts have been undertaken to provide the kind of environment that fosters new thinking and writing by the faculty. We have sponsored a “brown bag lunch club” which is a setting in which faculty can read first drafts, listen to visiting scholars, or discuss important new topics in legal literature. It is essential that the faculty make more of an effort to contribute to this atmosphere, and to participate in the collegial and intellectual life of the institution.

*Faculty Salaries* - The faculty salaries at the University of Maryland Law School are low, and place the Law School at a severe competitive disadvantage with its peer institutions. Substantial progress must be made in this area if we are going to retain our best faculty and recruit additional faculty of high quality.

*Visiting Positions* - One of the most widely used means of
stimulating the Law School faculty environment is the use of
visiting professors. There has been very little of this kind of
activity at the University of Maryland, and we are the poorer
for it. Visiting faculty can provide fresh perspectives, and
allow us to make better informed judgements about the
quality of those to whom we make offers for permanent
positions. Visitors can become a means of extending our
reputation beyond the confines of the State of Maryland.
Many law schools have five or six such positions a year,
which may be an appropriate scale for full development of
the program. Initially, however, we should plan for about
two visitors annually.

Research Funds - Most first-rate law schools have research
funding available to provide to those faculty who are under-
taking unfunded research for publication. Without funds
of this nature, faculty are likely to orient their research to
government subsidized areas and to ignore important areas
of the law which may not be of immediate practical
significance to the state or federal government. We think it is
important to have a research fund which would be
distributed very much like grant monies upon application by
a faculty member with a specific proposal for a research
project. Grants should amount to $2-$4,000 which is
roughly equivalent to the additional funding used to reim-
burse faculty for teaching in summer school.

Subject Area Groups - At the request of the Curriculum
Committee in the spring of 1977, subject area committees
were formed consisting of faculty who teach multiple sec-
tions in one subject of the curriculum. The purpose of these
groups is to encourage faculty who teach the same subject to
discuss common problems, work out variations in coverage,
discuss appropriate textbooks and other issues of mutual in-
terest. The committees have barely begun to function and it
is an important priority of the administration to encourage
the activity of these committees and support their efforts.

Moving and Recruitment Expenses - At the present time the
Law School has no budget for moving and recruitment ex-
enses for new faculty. Most of our limited travel funds are,
in fact, spent on recruiting travel costs. If we are to under-
take a visiting faculty program of any scale, such a budget is
absolutely necessary.
Improvements in the Atmosphere of the School and Student Life

The Westminster Church - One of the most important contributions that can be made to the atmosphere and quality of student and faculty life at the Law School would be the addition to our plant of the historical building and grounds of the Westminster Church and old western burial grounds. The Church and Graveyard are immediately adjacent to the Law School, and represent a unique opportunity to acquire and restore a distinguished historical site. In addition to acquiring the burial place of Edgar Allen Poe, the Church would enable us to add to the Law School a beautiful library reading room and a handsome ceremonial chamber for the Law School and the entire Baltimore campus. We hope soon to execute a lease agreement with the Presbytery of Baltimore that will enable us to lease the Church and grounds for about three years with the right to purchase the property if we are able to raise enough money to restore the Church buildings during the lease period.

Student Amenities - Student life at the Law School has suffered from our commuter school surroundings. We have submitted our suggestions for the overall campus plan calling for improved parking, athletic, housing, and leisure space on the campus. Within the Law School, lounge space has been limited and there is very little in the way of pleasant space to encourage students to stay at the Law School for study or work as a community. The new law library will dramatically improve the quality of our basic living environment. One small part of the new library contains a cubbyhole that we would like to use to create a coffee house that would be of sufficient quality to encourage students and faculty to use it as a meeting place and discussion room. While this may seem to be a small matter, it is symbolic of an important weakness of the Law School and the campus. We believe it is important that this coffee house be managed in such a way that it does not fall under the general campus contract with a food services operator whose profit margins must be large enough to satisfy both the University and its own profit goals. Since the Law School has never figured
prominently in the overall catering income of the Baltimore campus, we would hope to be allowed to develop a small food service to contribute to the life of our School.

*International Trade Law Journal* - Some years ago faculty and students at the Law School created a new publication, the International Trade Law Journal. The staff of the Journal is an enthusiastic one, and it has now become an important extracurricular student function at the Law School. The Trade Law Journal, however, has never had the sound financial support the Maryland Law Review has enjoyed. Under its present publication schedule, and subscription and other income, a subsidy of about $10,000 a year would be sufficient to put the Trade Law Journal on a firm financial footing.

*Physical Changes* - Our most immediate need is the conversion of the present “old” library space to offices for faculty, clinical programs, student publications and the like. We are budgeted for a conversion cost of $1,250,000 and this is a matter of very high priority for the Law School since we have offices spread a variety of places around the neighborhood: trailers, a surplus public school, an old real estate office, and a converted church.

We have some unusual opportunities to grow as an institution and to be a great credit to this University. We hope to have the chance (and the resources) to prove ourselves.

Michael J. Kelly
Dean