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COMMENTS  
Class of 1972

1) I will be interested to see the type of conclusions which you can draw from such a sparse questionnaire.

2) Question VIIA, which seems quite important in light of the current controversy, seems too vague for any meaningful analysis.

My University of Michigan law school education stressed procedure, preparation, and methodology. The most significant lack which I observe in young attorneys is their failure to understand or research proper procedure, and their lack of preparation. I would opt, in school and on the bar examination, for increased emphasis on "how to" rather than "what."

Any attorney can find the law. How to use it, practice it, and better it, is much more difficult, yet is the least stressed area in legal education.

Re: VIIA. I assume that you are asking for areas in which I would have taken more courses as opposed to areas in which more courses should have been offered. Nevertheless, my indication of a legal writing deficiency is based on a perception that there was insufficient opportunity for legal writing for students who were not members of a journal.

As an assistant prosecutor for Wayne County, I do not find very many U of M graduates engaged in the practice of criminal law here.

During law school, I held a position as a law clerk with a private firm in Ypsilanti. That was the most valuable training I received during law school.

Now, as then, I understand there is great pressure from students to teach them the more mechanical functions of law practice (actual form completion, service of process, etc.). Forget it. These things can be learned by an idiot in a few weeks of actual practice. Teach them to reason, to analyze, to solve problems,--and how to write a paragraph.

Going back to VII B...Law school qualified me to be a lawyer. What I have learned since then, particularly while a law clerk, contributes most "meaningfully" to whatever ability I presently have.

University of Michigan gave me a good over-all legal background, but could improve by adding more third year practical seminars (probably ungraded) which could be taught by practicing attorneys. Such seminars would better prepare students for the "real world" of law practice. Keep up the good work. I am always well received by fellow lawyers when they learn that I went to U of M., which is a great benefit in the practice.

I agree with Prof. Allen's comments in recent issues of The Quadrangle on the need for a broader, humanitarian approach to legal education.

More emphasis on legal writing in the law school curriculum.

An increase in the hiring of law professors who have practiced in the field in which they will teach, especially in business and litigation oriented courses.
I began with class of 1973, but was forced by military to attend summer sessions, thus graduated end of Dec. 1972, barely with class of 1972. I consider myself a part of class of 1973.

Based upon my experience, I feel that the law school curriculum I confronted was divorced from reality, was somewhat useful in teaching "the law," but was next to useless in teaching "lawyering." For example, much is made today about the need to teach "professional responsibility." The need to teach professional responsibility is something that must be met in the context of each class, not as a separate subject. The concepts of professional responsibility, of "justice," and of similar subjects were not so addressed. Moreover, the principles of bargaining, negotiating, compromising, cajoling, and the theories of psychology, personality make-up, etc., all so important in conducting day-to-day business in a law office or government department, were not at all presented in law school.

I feel the substantive aspects of my Michigan coursework to be of no use whatsoever in my present practice. (Indeed, I took few courses related to my present practice. Those I took related to my practice [with one exception] were those in which I received my poorest grades.) However, the analytical techniques I learned in those courses have been valuable.

I would like to see the results of this survey. The Law School curriculum should be expanded to include a more practical preview of the practice of law, i.e. the economics of the profession. I have found that young attorneys are almost totally ignorant of the "business of law"--a situation which I believe should and could be remedied.

Negative criticism re Law School: the Socratic (cases, Q & A, little or no lecturing) method confuses, pretends to pseudo-complexity, and resembles the nutshell game; also, makes Gilbert Outlines almost a necessity--to find the "forest."

While I am presently an investigator for the Senate Subcommittee on
Investigation, I have spent most of my time as a trial attorney at the Federal Trade Commission and will be moving on again within the next month. My choices are in three directions:

1) Assist. Chief Counsel for NHTSA in charge of litigation
2) Deputy Administrator for Blacklung compensation program, Dept. of Labor
3) Director of Evaluation, OSHA

Due to my dual background in law and social science, there are many varied and interesting opportunities available to me and which I expect to try during my professional career. THANKS!

It is possible that the combination of my practicing in Ann Arbor as a sole practitioner and the fact that my first employer was indicted and convicted of embezzlement of a client's funds (and subsequently disbarred) have made my situation so atypical (I hope) that my responses herein are essentially useless for real statistical purposes.
I have found it somewhat difficult to fit my career experience into the parameters of this questionnaire. I have worked as an associate in a law firm, a law librarian (academic, then for a large law firm) and currently as "Supervisory Attorney - Research Services" -- a kind of de facto resource person for complicated legal research and for non-legal research, employed by a private law firm. I did not take my first year at Michigan, and am, thus, unqualified by direct experience to comment on the legal research training involved in the case club program. I can imagine, however, on the basis of requests for research support from fellow Michigan grads (and grads from Wayne, Harvard, Yale, Chicago, Columbia, Texas and Virginia) that sophistication in legal research technique is normally the result of on the job training or self-instruction.

My frustration with law practice was based largely on the perception which I hope is ill founded that in many instances the limitations of time or the cost of time prevent thorough research. This appears especially to be the case in instances where an assignment takes a lawyer outside the research tools with which he is familiar.

I found that the kind of objective presentation of how the literature of the law is organized and how it is to be approached that was a byproduct of my library education a terrific and embarrassing improvement of my ability to 'practice law,' compared with the often time wasting or information missing techniques that I happened to develop in law school and practice.

I am not sure how many law students elect the course that Ms. Leary offers, now, in the library school. I would think that a substantial course, outside the confines of the reading and writing program of the first year, may be a useful contribution both as a model for legal educators generally, and as an offering to current law students.

When I was working in the library at the law school at Penn, we attempted to organize a series of small, no-credit lectures concerning research in tax and labor materials for both law and business school students. I would imagine that there might be room for such presentations, mayhap by the library staff, as a part of tax and labor courses.

I appreciate this opportunity to report on the harrowing step from the stimulation and pleasure of legal education (at least for the student) to the practical limitations of the world outside.

I do not believe that the law schools (including Michigan) are doing enough to train law students to work effectively. It is not enough to teach research skills, though they are important; somewhere a student needs to learn the art of persuasive writing. I believe Michigan should offer such a course and employ journalism or English professors to teach it, not law professors who do little, if any, writing other than treatises and review pieces and not third-year law students who are no better writers than the first year class.
COMMENTS

With respect to the answer to Part I above, you should know that the law firm by which I am employed maintains a large office in the City of Detroit and serves the entire metropolitan Detroit area.

This form should be revised to include the category Military lawyer.

My comments relate to item VII of this questionnaire:

I do not feel that course offerings should be reduced in any area. It is a great strength of our law school that it can and does graduate lawyers capable of dealing with a wide diversity of problems in many types of practices. I strongly feel that the breadth of the curriculum must be retained.

Several areas could receive more emphasis. I believe that advocacy, not limited to the narrow area of trial or appellate advocacy, should be stressed. Every lawyer should be able to publically argue a position -- effectively and honestly. A seminar giving training and experience in arguing before municipal, administrative, zoning, etc. bodies would be helpful.

I also feel that we have an obligation to give more thorough instruction in professional responsibility. I have no doubts about the ethics of Michigan graduates, but find that the Bar as a whole is deficient in this area. As graduates of one of the nation's finest law schools, we should be in the forefront in setting and following the highest of ethical standards.

The profile of my class, when sent to me, will not be relevant unless I have something to compare it with (e.g., that of the '71 class). I suggest that comparative data also be sent along to those who cooperate in filling this out.

My income for 1977 is a bit exaggerated because of factors contributing to an excellent year for my firm. This resulted in an extra bonus of approx. $3500.

I felt that my legal education was excellent.

As to revisions in course offerings, it has occurred to me that some courses which are necessary in teaching a few basic principles, but not of enough significance to justify a 3-hour course, could be reduced to 1-hour courses, or combined with similar subjects. For example, "Conflicts" is an area which is generally necessary to a practitioner. However, it seems to me that the basic principles could be taught in at least 1/3 the time. This may necessitate scrapping the Socratic method, but let the chips fall where they may. As in other areas, the practicing attorney uses a knowledge of "Conflicts" primarily to identify issues and to know when to research; few specialize in the area.

Students should be required to study professional responsibility in more than token capacity.

Answers to IVD & X are somewhat misleading since I have only had my present job since May 1977. In June 1976, we moved to Florida, where I (cont)
took the Bar, not being admitted until May 1977. In Florida, I clerked for a firm for 3 mos, and we moved back to Colorado in January 1977, where I clerked for another firm until getting this present job.

I continue to be proud of my Michigan Law School experience. Michigan should always emphasize having and using professors who teach analyzing and thinking (particularly for first year students). I practice with a firm of 130+ lawyers. The problems are often complex. The "law" comes from the library—but the confidence and ability to deal with the issues intelligently comes from the Law School.

In general, the survey is good. I feel that the following information would be interesting and informative.

1. All occupations engaged in. For example, I do a substantial amount of teaching which does not provide at least 25% of income but is a substantial endeavor.

2. For all participants — how long (if at all) law has been or is being practiced. For example, one may have practiced for a significant time and just recently entered another field.

3. A response regarding our retrospective views on the overall law school program and our years at the school (I, for one, found it so distasteful that I considered it to be a monumental waste of time)

4. A response on specifics why we liked or disliked law school. (In my humble opinion, it was considerably too esoteric and ignored the practicalities of being a lawyer; i.e. how to find the courthouse).

Thank you for the opportunity to make comments.

1. Do C and D in IX apply to non-marrieds? Not clear.

2. VII - Difficult to single out which areas should be decreased - They are all important and should be kept as options so that different types of lawyers will be produced by law schools.

Much of the information you seek is not only none of your business (family and personal financial info), but also information which in my opinion cannot be meaningfully used by the school, e.g., IV-D, V.

In retrospect I have great fondness for my law school experience. I do believe that at least while I was a student the school was neglectful of training in legal research. In fact as a practicing lawyer I find that we lawyers as a group—from the various schools—lack the ability to quickly and correctly find the most pertinent legal authorities when faced with an unfamiliar problem. The result is great wastes of time and all too frequently sloppy legal practice "justified" by the pressures of time. The judiciary simply reflects (very often) the deficiencies of the advocates.

Regards, item VII my practice would lead me to take more courses in the areas I now work significantly in. However, I feel the broad background offered by the varied course offerings at U/M goes far to broadening a lawyer's education and thus explaining why my limited response regarding course deletions.

The only course I took which I feel has benefitted me to an insignificant amount in my practice was legal history.
I believe law school courses, particularly the basic ones, should be taught with a combination of the case method and an outline—such as Gilbert's outlines. The outline is a fantastic tool for giving a student the overall perspective of how the details of a subject fit together. The case method is important—students must learn to read opinions and to cull from them principles of law. But a good working knowledge of the subject's total identity is equally important.

I learned a great deal in bar review courses. I am confident that I understood contracts, torts, evidence, etc., more completely after the bar course than I did in school.

QuestionX's answer may be somewhat misleading in that my present employment pays substantially less than I was earning in private practice.

I feel that a clinical law program is an excellent idea, since there are many aspects of legal practice which can only be learned by doing. Medical schools provide for internships as part of a medical student's education, and I do not know why law schools cannot do the same. Also, I feel that the Criminal Law and Criminal Procedure courses I had in law school would have been much more helpful if the professors had actually taught the subject matter, rather than used the time to moan and cry about police misconduct.

My failure to respond to Part VII simply reflects my personal view at this time that, particularly in retrospect, the curriculum was well balanced and I, fortunately, appear to have made wise choices given the legal areas in which I work most frequently.

I would like to add that I happen to share Dean Allen's view (as recently expressed in portions of his article in "Law Quadrangle Notes") that those who feel that the primary or sole function of an outstanding law school is to train its students in the "nuts and Bolts" are mistaken. I hope the conceptual rigor of law school instruction in general and at the U-M in particular remains.

1. Generally I believe I received an excellent education from U-M Law School.
2. However, a clinical law program for the business area would be helpful.
3. A greater emphasis on the tax aspects of business transactions would be helpful for a practitioner in my position, who, although I specialize in securities law and commercial law (UCC, UCCC, bankruptcy), is also general counsel to small and medium size businesses.

One area where improvement could be made in 3rd year courses is to provide simulated experience, problem solving, in handling and identifying problems involving divergent and interrelated law. For example, the horror stories we often encounter where estate planning objectives are complicated by corporate tax, income tax, securities law, private foundation law and other restrictions.

In my view, and it's widely shared, some areas should be found to incorporate into the law school education, training in the drafting of basic legal documents, together with a greater emphasis upon the basic legal problems faced by an attorney and how to approach these problems.
I felt too much emphasis was placed on career guidance in large private firms—not enough was made available about corporate opportunities, and smaller firms in smaller communities were almost discouraged. Also, 2 years of law school classroom training and 2 years of clerkship in "real life" situations I feel would better prepare the young lawyer to practice and serve the public than the present 3 years and a bar exam format. I dare say the only functions of the bar exam are 1) to insure familiarity with local law in basic areas 2) to keep out competition.

This questionnaire fails to delve into areas in need of examination. Law school was, in the main, very boring and utterly irrelevant to the practice of law.

I think the most important mission of a law school is to teach the dialectic and the basic tools of problem solving and advocacy, negotiation, ethical consideration, etc., at least for the practicing lawyer. For the governmentally inclined an overlay of legislative process might be helpful. I think courses which present finite problems for research, planning and argumentation can be best, especially if they are designed to stimulate thought and policy balancing, deal with issues at the fringes of decided principles, and are likely to ensure ultimate familiarity with the entire range of research possibilities. No one can hope to absorb all the law or to anticipate his areas of emphasis.

I have found a knowledge of accounting to be absolutely essential in almost every area of my practice. The law school should greatly expand its curriculum in this area or require undergraduate courses for admission.

I spend 100% of my time in the management labor law area. This is the area of specialization I intended to practice before I entered law school and the area I trained in while in school—in that sense my reaction to my education in law school may be atypical. Although law school was a very difficult experience for me—overall I am very satisfied with the education I received.

It was probably a mistake for me to go to law school. Either that or I'm in the wrong field. I never feel sure that I've researched a legal problem correctly or thoroughly enough.

I think my legal education at Michigan is largely irrelevant to my present job as counsel to the Senate Judiciary Committee and was largely irrelevant to my previous job as a trial lawyer at the F.T.C. The school's overwhelming orientation towards commercial practice with a firm is archaic and pompous. I would never recommend that anyone interested in public affairs or public interest law go to Michigan. I found the faculty to be excessively preoccupied with their outside activities and very hard to involve in clinical programs. The student body was stuffy and dull. All in all it was a lousy three years.
I am grateful to the University of Michigan Law School for training me to think as a lawyer. My main recollection of the Law School, however, will always be the intellectual snobbery and inaccessibility of the faculty.

1. While I am a definite believer in the grading process as applied to education generally, I question the system whereby the (academic) rewards are most heavily extended to first year performance (e.g., law review).
2. I look back with tremendous satisfaction upon the education I received at the Law School.
3. I was glad when I was in school, and am glad now, that a variety of courses was required. I do not at all encourage the Law School to allow its students unlimited freedom of choice, for many do not know until later where their needs or interests lie.
4. I would encourage greater counselling of freshmen through the Case Clubs: 1) legal ed. generally 2) career choices 3) exam-taking.

I thoroughly enjoyed my years at Michigan, and I believe I received an excellent education. I will always be grateful for that.

Following law school, I served several months in the army. I then took a position with the New York County District Attorney's office. I remained with that position until June of this year when I took a position with a private law firm.

I think lectures by successful trial lawyers on the subjects of:

- a) getting & keeping clients
- b) fee schedules
- c) discovery
- d) negotiation
- 3) trial skills
- f) & appellate procedure

would be very helpful.

I would have been interested in the number of individuals with income levels over $40,000 in greater detail -- i.e. 40,000-45,000, etc.

In view of the almost belligerent assertion by members of my class upon our entrance that we were really interested in alternatives to traditional law practice, and in fact, the remark made in an orientation speech that summer (1961) that many of us "did not believe in private property," I think this questionnaire should have focused (even in very briefly) on whether we did anything at all to find employment in alternative settings, alternative institutions, etc. In my particular case, practice with what amounts to a civil rights organization might fit IV(A)(3), depending on the definition of "law firm," and does not fit any of the enumerations in IV(B). May I assume that my failure to fit this form reflects that the remarks about 'alternatives' that we made upon entrance were abandoned?

I am a "small town" attorney best classified as a general practitioner.

I find the practice quite satisfying and generally stimulating. When I attended law school, I wish that I had been better informed of the appeal to some of the small town, small firm practice.
In the past several years, I have run across considerable antagonism toward lawyers in the society. Indeed, I possess some myself. I wish law school could teach the need for humility and sensitivity in the "practice" of law. Secondly, I think too much emphasis in our society has been placed on "legal" solutions, but I believe the emphasis should be reduced. Finally, I think I was helped to acquire a sense of duty toward the profession and a certain reverence for the law from the older, more experienced faculty members who had been out in the real world. In my opinion, it would be a mistake to acquire too many professors from the law school-clerkship-academia pipeline.

Clinical law may have great value to students who wish to be sole practitioners but its benefits are learned quickly when working for a firm with experienced attorneys.

I can think of no specific course or courses which have been invaluable to my career. Rather I believe I benefited from taking a range of courses some of which have no substantive relation to my area of practice. Virtually all the courses demanded hard work and discipline which has been important to what is for me a successful and enjoyable career.

With respect to Part VII, I would suggest increased law school emphasis on drafting legal documents.

The area of real property law should be expanded. Prof. Cunningham's Real Property course for 90 hours was a complete waste because the material and real property concepts were not adequately covered. Foregoing professor should not be allowed to WASTE the time and money of students.

I still consider my legal education I received at the University of Michigan Law School to have been a very rewarding experience, and I am quite proud to be a Michigan graduate. In general, I would strongly urge the faculty to continue to maintain as many traditional programs as possible, particularly in light of some of the rather avant-garde courses offered at some of the other national schools. In my opinion, Michigan is without a doubt the best national school to attend if one desires a solid, traditional legal education.

I think that courses that simply play around with easily understood case law are useless. I am quite satisfied with the training I received at Michigan. To an entering law student, I would recommend a curriculum with emphasis on the subjects that can only be learned well in law school, such as Taxation I and II, Trusts and Estates, etc., coupled with meaningful experience in trial practice and clinical law; 6-12 hours of the latter work would be sufficient.
I firmly believe that the law curriculum should not become overly specialized and that students should be encouraged to take as broad a spectrum of basic level courses as possible.

Moreover, clinical experience is important, primarily to assist the student in gaining perspective, but it nevertheless should not substantially infringe upon the student's ability to take a wide variety of substantive courses.

-------

Sometimes the practice of law sucks! (but I haven't found anything better)

-------

A point which I feel is worth some comment relates to the field from which the new faculty members are selected. My reading of the Law Quad Notee indicates that very few if any faculty are obtained with anything but token experience in the private practice of law. Almost without exception the patterns seems to be: top 10% or higher of some appropriately prestigious law school and an appellate clerkship for a few years. It seems to be that substantial benefit could be obtained in breadth of exposure by obtaining some persons with four or five years experience in private practice. Perhaps it is difficult to attract top flight private practitioners with that degree of experience because of financial considerations or whatever, but I believe it would be worth the effort.

I read with some interest, but little agreement Prof. Allen's concerns of anti-intellectualism in law schools. My experience was certainly directly opposite and as indicated above the law school's attempts to isolate itself from the practicing profession of law seem a far greater danger to law schools than "anti-intellectualism" whatever that means.

-------

1) City of Columbus is rapidly expanding in legal opportunity. All major law firms have doubled in the last 5 to 7 years. The city itself is young and an excellent place to raise a family. When I was in law school, I had no desire to practice in Columbus, but an accidental interview changed my mind. Please encourage U of M students to consider practice in this community.

2) I wonder if my skills in writing and research could have been more sharply developed in law school. I had the feeling when I joined this firm that my skills were superior to my contemporaries in all areas except putting together a brief or memorandum.

-------

1. The Law School should allow no one to cause it to depart from its policies (unique, in my experience, for a state supported institution) with respect to the selection of students and faculty.

2. The classes in corporations, taxation, securities, etc., are what the Law School does best. The budgetary and faculty selection processes should reflect this fact.

-------

I will be becoming a member of the firm of Barth and Richheimer, P.C., 195 Church Street, New Haven, Connecticut 06511 as of December 5, 1977. This firm was formerly Leslie R. Barth and Associates, P.C. and was formed together with firm I am presently employed at upon the split up of Bernstein & Barth, P.C. in 1976. Barth & Richheimer, P.C. will employ 4 attorneys and my guaranteed income will be in the category 11 above.
Well pleased with Michigan training - directly contributes to success on present job.

Suggest greater recognition be given to tax and corporate areas at Michigan.

Also consider non credit seminars, lectures, luncheon talks on what a student should expect in early years of practice with corporation, in private practice, etc.

Q. X. is not reflective of our firm's actual position - we have judgments amounting to more than $660,000 - with contingent participation which will raise average earnings substantially.

An important point which constantly comes up is that I graduated from U of M as opposed to Wayne, etc. This helped secure a position as an adjunct professor at U. of D. Law School

The dedicated responsible practice of law has got to be one of the most difficult, frustrating and psychologically draining occupations there is. At a time when the legal system has already entered an advanced stage of malfunction and its efficiency is rapidly diminishing due to its inability to adapt to sweeping social changes, law school applicants, law schools and law graduates have got to be prepared to confront and live with the emergency situation facing the legal profession. Incompetency is rampant and the inefficiency of the system forces many if not most lawyers to exaggerate the seriousness of client problems as a means of charging exorbitant fees, (I could go on and on--")

The income figure is for 1977; for 1976 it would be somewhat less, $20,000-$22,499.

With reference to question #VII,B, I cannot overemphasize how important I believe the basic legal education with respect to truly understanding legal theories to be as opposed to the type of education some of my contemporaries have received at local law schools where what amounts to a three year bar review program is conducted.

I have delayed responding because this questionnaire perplexed and disturbed me. For over four years I have been with a public interest law firm. Hence, we are not truly a private firm; nor government-funded; nor a non-law firm that has a legal department. I seem to have fallen between the cracks on Question IV.

Concededly, public interest law is relatively new, and employs a small percentage of attorneys. But it is a growing Field and merits separate mention in surveys such as this one. Perhaps future questionnaires will exhibit greater sensitivity to public interest law firms. If I can assist in this regard, please feel free to contact me.

I found question VII ambiguous. Are you asking for my suggestions as to changes in the curriculum or for my admissions of mistakes in selecting courses?
I have changed within the past year from being a sole practitioner—general practice (1 1/2 years), after being with a small firm—general practice (3 years), to a medium-large law firm, presently. Areas of experience, but not specialities as you define them, are general litigation, bankruptcy, negligence, workmen's compensation.

Extremely pleased with my education and experiences at Michigan. Keep up the school's reputation. Be careful in faculty hiring. My only "peeve" in law school was a few young professors who had no teaching ability whatsoever.

I would suggest that a similar questionnaire be circulated at 5 year intervals.

Item VII B - I was fortunate to have worked closely with a highly competent teacher during the summer between my first and second years of law school, doing research in a variety of areas of the law which I had not previously studied. The techniques I learned during that summer have been more valuable to me than anything else I learned in law school. I firmly believe that the substantive law one learns in law school is far less important than the teaching of methods and procedures for solving legal problems. My own law school education centered mainly on areas of the law which differ from the areas of my practice but I have found that it is not too difficult to learn a new area of substantive law if one has the methods for learning a new area as a background.

The law school does a fine job of preparing one for practice. Keep up the good work.

I found that by involving myself in the legal process (clerking for a local judge during my senior year) while in school, the subject matter of what I was being taught before and at the time I was working became more understandable, more reasonable, and easier to grasp. Thus, I feel that the greater the law student's exposure to "the outside world," the better he/she will perform in the academic area. Programs which encourage outside involvement should be pushed more heavily.

Large case paid off last year. Anticipate about $20,000 this year.

1. More practical experience needed in drafting contracts and other legal documents.
2. Direct exposure to local courts (even as observer only) should be mandatory.
3. Civil procedure course should teach drafting of pleadings in addition to esoteric principles of civil rules.

Because I opened my own private office on 7/1/77, my answers are considerably different than they would have been 6 months ago.
No one can be more appreciative of their law school training than I am. My JD degree enabled me to clerk for a judge on the Supreme Court of Minnesota and enter private practice. Still, the practice of law, being so different from law school, was quite disenchanting. I currently work in the entertainment field (television) in an area which is highly specialized. Still, I am confident that without my legal education exposure at Michigan I would not have had an opportunity to work in a legal department for a major motion picture company which ultimately gave me the experience and contacts enabling me to secure my present position. I feel strongly that Michigan Law School is the best around. I feel sorry when teachers depart (who I had) for other endeavors because I know that the up-coming students will lose out on being educated by such brilliant men and women--(I am still very close with several classmates.)

I believe that many courses did not have a practical benefit for me. I would think some discussion of the method of billing-the economics of running a law office, etc. would have helped. The one thing I have noticed about small-town law firms is that the general practitioner does practice in all areas of the law and it is difficult to explain to clients that you are limited as to expertise & specialty. They want you to be an expert in everything.

It seems to me that the substantive law learned in individual courses is soon forgotten after the bar exam (at least when your practice is limited to litigation). As a result, each case requires individual legal analysis of substantive issues (as opposed to procedural problems). Thus, the real utility of law school was learning how to analyze legal issues—not the substantive law of any given area.

My partner and I left a large law firm with which I had practiced since graduation. We have just completed our first eighteen months since our departure with no income and no clients. Our income has increased dramatically in the past few months, and hopefully this trend will continue.

For those of us in a corporate environment, planning and analysis and litigation management are important at an early point. I feel weak in the "mundane" litigation detail; case clubs helped some in appellate matters, but not in the significant area of claim resolution, insurance company relationship and philosophies, and trial court approaches and tactics. Also useful would be a course that analyzes the legal needs of selected clients—the indigent, the average citizen, the business entity—and surveys and treats means and approaches to fulfilling these needs.

Have just begun new career in private practice after 4 years legal services. Expecting to move into labor law.

In my opinion question VII is ambiguous. The introductory phrase refers
In my opinion question VII is ambiguous. The introductory phase refers to my individual election of courses, while the operative phase of the question asks where I believe the course offering should be increased, my response reflects my opinion with respect to an increase in course offerings. I would not, on the other hand, decrease the number of courses offered.

In light of Chief Justice Burger's recent comments at the ABA Convention, I think the U of M law school should totally reevaluate its program for preparing students to be trial lawyers. It can be done! Trial practice courses should be greatly expanded; perhaps some should be made mandatory. As I mentioned in VII-B, I feel law school prepared me extremely well for handling appellate matters. Within two years of my becoming a member of the Illinois Bar, I successfully argued a case before the U.S. Supreme Court. My training as a trial attorney has come more slowly and with greater difficulty. Just as medical schools are expected to train surgeons, law schools should be expected to train trial lawyers. The ineffective assistance by a trial attorney can be just as damaging to his/her client as the ineffective treatment of a poorly trained surgeon. Less emphasis on the substantive areas of law and more emphasis on trial practice will benefit the future lawyer and our society.