As I write this, the fall semester is drawing to a close, and a great quiet is beginning to fill the halls. The last group of students is taking examinations, and faculty are grading those examinations, finishing their articles and preparing for next semester’s classes. Right now is the perfect time for resolution and reflection; it’s also the perfect time to share news regarding some of the things that have been going on at the law school in recent months.

As some of you may already know, in June we were fortunate enough to hold an alumni reception at the United States Supreme Court for our Washington, D.C.-area alumni. Justice Clarence Thomas served as our most gracious host, and was kind enough to take the time to speak with as many of our guests as was possible. He also said more than a few kind words about our law school, and included memories of the time he spent studying for the bar in our very own Omer Poos Law Library.

We have also added fifteen new faculty members over the last six years; some of our most recent recruits are featured in this issue of the magazine. Three of our senior faculty members were recognized by appointment to professorships this fall. Professors Tim Greaney and Nic Terry were each appointed to a Chester A. Myers Professorship, and thanks to a splendid gift from Tom Keefe, ’78, and his wife Rita, another professorship was established in the name of Vince Immel and given to Professor Joel Goldstein (now the Vincent C. Immel Professor of Law). You will see his remarks about Professor Immel in this issue on page 18. You will also see articles by three of our faculty, and a profile on Professor Alan Howard.

The Fall 2005 entering class is a terrific group of students, with an average undergraduate grade point of over a 3.6 on a 4.0 scale. What a pleasure it is to be in the classroom with them. The quality of our entering class is due in no small part to the generosity of Lance Callis, ’59, who provided full-tuition scholarships to ten of our students for their three years of law school. As new students arrive we are always heartened by the fine placement success of our law school — 91% of the May 2004 graduates had jobs within nine months of graduation. This betters the national placement rate of 89%. We anticipate that the May 2005 class has had similar success.

On another note, there has been a lot of activity in our Office of Development and Alumni Relations and the Student Services Office. Danielle Caruso has recently moved from her role as Assistant Director of Development and Alumni Relations to become the Assistant Dean of Development and Alumni Relations, and Dina Gale has taken over her old position. And our own Becky Chase, who was once on the floor with the Development group, has now moved to the Student Services suite to become the Director of Minority Affairs. I have no doubt these three will do fine jobs in their new roles and continue to make the School of Law proud.

I want to express my special thanks to you for your support of the law school. Your generous gifts make a real difference in the quality of legal education at Saint Louis University, and provide a crucial margin of excellence.

In this holiday season I wish for you and your family a time of reunion, joy and comfort. May peace be with us all.

Sincerely yours,
Jeffrey E. Lewis
Dean and Professor of Law
A Supreme Evening:
U.S. Supreme Court Reception
Washington, D.C.-area alumni spent an evening with prospective and current students, law school administration and guest of honor, Justice Clarence Thomas.
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Davor Sopf, ’98, Protection Officer, UNHCR Representation in Bulgaria and Adam Kazin, ’01, Judge Advocate, United States Army
Focus on Privatization

This year’s Childress Lecture was held on September 30 and examined privatization, or governmentally sponsored efforts to move assets and economic decision-making away from the political arena and into the hands of individuals or private corporations. Professor Carol Rose of Yale Law School was the keynote speaker and her talk was titled, “Privatization — The Road to Democracy.” Two panels of experts from across the country gathered to discuss Rose’s lecture, as well as offer more targeted thoughts on the topic of Intellectual Property. The lecture was made possible by alumni and friends of former Dean Richard J. Childress, a respected member of the law faculty who was well known for his commitment to human rights.

Hon. Rodney W. Sippel Served as 2005 Jurist-in-Residence

The School of Law was pleased to have the Honorable Rodney W. Sippel as the Jurist-in-Residence for the Fall 2005 semester. Judge Sippel was at the School on Tuesday, November 8, and visited classes, met with faculty members and was the guest of honor at a Q & A lunch session for students. Judge Sippel has been a member of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri since 1998. At the time of his nomination by President Clinton, he was vice chair of the litigation department at the law firm now known as Husch & Eppenberger. He had previously served as a staff member for United States Senator Thomas F. Eagleton and Representative Richard A. Gephardt.

Watson Leads Research: Medical Debt Linked to Homeownership Difficulties

The Missouri Foundation for Health has funded a three-year policy project on Access to Health Care and Medical Debt in Missouri, and the Center for Health Law Studies has partnered with The Access Project, a Boston-based group that has spearheaded the empirical work on medical debt, and three local advocacy groups in St. Louis, Jefferson City/Columbia and the Bootheel region of Missouri. According to a recent report by the Access Project, “medical debt is becoming a threat to housing stability for many American working families, including those with health insurance.”

Professor Sidney Watson, who is helping to lead the St. Louis portion of the national study, spoke to this claim on November 9 at a press conference designed to promote awareness about this growing problem, and discussed the research that’s being done in this area, as well as the work that needs to be done to alleviate what has become a genuine concern for at least 46% of the 1700 individuals and families who participated in the national survey. The study found that having health insurance often did little to protect people from acquiring housing difficulties, as medical debt frequently develops from the shift in higher deductibles and copays, thus leading to problems paying rent and mortgage bills, which ultimately determine the suitability for homeownership. This is the first time this aspect of the medical debt problem has been documented.

A second report from the Access Project further chronicling the research will be released Jan. 2006.
Incoming first-year students were treated to a grand pre-orientation celebration, which allowed them to mingle with their future peers, as well as faculty, staff and mentors. On Wednesday, August 17 from 7 to 9 p.m., the law school hosted its first annual Orientation Kick-Off Party, held outside the Vincent C. Immel Atrium. Food and drink were served, and the live band, Serapis, provided the evening’s entertainment.

Orientation, held on August 18 and 19, was the first of many programs set up to help prepare students for their first-year law school experience. There were library tours, hands-on technology support and introductions by the Dean, Assistant Dean of Students, President of the Student Bar Association, Assistant Dean and Director of Career Services, Director of Academic Support and Director of the Law Library. The Honorable E. Richard Webber of the United States District Court, Eastern District of Missouri, gave a speech on professional responsibility, and students had opportunities to meet professors and attend lectures on Case Briefing and Legal Research and Writing.

As a complement to the School’s orientation program, incoming students were grouped with several of the School’s 120 Mentors. The Mentor Program was established so that first-year law students could find guidance and support throughout the beginning phase of their law school experience. President of the Mentor Program, Brandon Porter, says that during Orientation, a Mentor Group “does virtually everything together, often forming friendships that last throughout law school and beyond.” Mentors also usher students into what Porter says is often a “daunting, uncertain first-year experience. It provides students with a way to make friends and get ‘real’ questions answered by those who have been first-year law students and survived.”

Orientation was followed by the very well-attended Street Fair, where incoming students had opportunities to learn about School of Law organizations and area businesses, by way of the booths set up just outside the School’s Vincent C. Immel Atrium entrance.
Reflections on Serving as Guardian Ad Litem for Terri Schiavo

Distinguished Speaker Jay Wolfson visited the Center for Health Law Studies on September 13, and gave the presentation, “When Good Law is All You Have: Reflections on the Schiavo Case.” In his talk, Dr. Wolfson discussed his experiences serving as appointed guardian ad litem for Terri Schiavo.

Dr. Wolfson is the Director of the Florida Health Information Center at the University of South Florida College of Public Health. His research interests include various aspects of health and the workplace, including the costs, quality and outcomes associated with workers’ compensation and employee health benefits programs. He studies utilization and cost trends experienced by various employee/beneficiary populations in the public and private sectors in order to establish databases that allow for the design and implementation of cost management and health status improvement systems. As Director of the Florida Health Information Center, Dr. Wolfson is responsible for reporting to the Florida Legislature on a broad range of health policy issues. He has evaluated aspects of Florida’s distinctive mandatory managed care workers’ compensation statutes for the state of Florida. He has also conducted numerous financial and legal evaluations and assessments of major health systems, including the Florida Medicaid system, Adult Congregate Living Systems in Florida, the financial health and regulatory policies affecting Florida’s Health Maintenance Organizations (HMO), full-service school programs, school-based drug intervention programs, and the readiness of health care organizations to respond to disasters, such as hurricanes.

Fear, Fiction and Risk Assessment in HIV Law and Policy

On November 2, Catherine Hanssens, Director of the Center for HIV Law and Policy, gave the talk, “Risky Business: Fear, Fiction and Risk Assessment in HIV Law and Policy,” as part of the Center for Health Law Studies’ Distinguished Speaker Series. Hanssens is the founding director of the Center for HIV Law and Policy, an incubator project of the National Center for Civic Innovation. She has been active in HIV legal and policy issues since 1984 and served as AIDS Project Director at Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund until 2005. At Lambda, Hanssens led the development of HIV litigation and policy work, and was lead attorney on all of Lambda’s briefing on U.S. Supreme Court cases affecting the Americans with Disabilities Act and people with HIV. Hanssens also worked with the AIDS Law Project of Pennsylvania, where she created and managed a model on-site legal assistance program for single parents with AIDS in Philadelphia-area hospitals and clinics that brought together legal, medical and social services. While working for the New Jersey Department of the Public Advocate in the 1980s, she successfully litigated the state’s first case addressing involuntary HIV testing, a system-wide challenge to segregation and treatment of prisoners with HIV, and the only federal appeals court decision recognizing the right of incarcerated women to funded elective abortions.

Annual Health Law Symposium
Focus on Shifting Costs of Health Care

The Center for Health Law Studies’ Annual Health Law Symposium, “From Risk to Ruin: The Shifting Costs of Health Care,” will be held in March 2006. The event will highlight a series of community-based research projects on medical debt that Professor Sidney Watson is conducting in collaboration with The Access Project (TAP) in Boston and community groups in Missouri. This research is funded through a generous grant from the Missouri Foundation for Health. Preliminary results of the project will be unveiled at the symposium. The project includes research on medical debt in Missouri, as well as surveys investigating the relationship between medical debt and housing, bankruptcy, and state court garnishments and liens.

Confirmed speakers include Melissa Jacoby (University of North Carolina), Mark Rukavina and Robert Siefert (The Access Project, Boston), Sidney Watson (Saint Louis University), John Columbo (University of Illinois), Nancy Kane (Harvard University) and Jill Horowitz (University of Michigan).
Developments In Anti-Discrimination Law: The EC, Germany and United States

The Center for International and Comparative Law was proud to welcome Professor Dr. Rolf Wank from the Ruhr University in Bochum, Germany, who presented the talk, “Latest Developments In Anti-Discrimination Law: The EC, Germany and United States,” on October 6. Professor Wank has been teaching Employment Law and Labor Law, Civil Law and Legal Theory at Ruhr University since 1985. He taught at the University of Münster from 1983 to 1985. He has published many books and articles, mainly in Employment Law and in Labor Law, and is co-author of a textbook on EC-Employment Law and Social Security Law. He teaches Comparative Employment Law in the European Union and the United States.

Added Option to Study Law in Paris, France

Saint Louis University School of Law has just forged a cooperative agreement with the Université de Paris-Dauphine, which makes it possible for School of Law students and recent graduates to study for one semester in France. Candidates who successfully complete courses at the Université de Paris-Dauphine receive credit toward their J.D. degrees from the School of Law. The Université de Paris-Dauphine specializes exclusively in the areas of business and commercial law. Students must fluently speak, read and write French, since classes are taught entirely in French. Recent graduates of the School of Law also have the opportunity to study at Paris-Dauphine. After receiving the J.D. degree, graduates will be entitled to apply again during the following year to complete the Master’s degree, which makes one eligible to sit for the French bar examination upon completion of an apprenticeship in France.

European Union and Reviving a Constitution

On Tuesday, September 20, visiting Professor Joël Monéger gave the talk, “The EU Constitution: Can It Be Revived?” Monéger, Professor of Law at the Université de Paris-Dauphine in France, returned to teach at the School August 19 through September 23. He also taught the mini-course, “European Union Law: Mergers and Acquisitions.” In addition to being on the faculty at the Université de Paris-Dauphine, Professor Monéger is a Doyen honoraire (Honorary Dean) at the Université de Orléans School of Law. He is the Vice-President of the “Société française de législation comparée” (French Association for Comparative Law). He was a Full Professor at the Université d’Orléans School of Law until Fall, 2002 and was Dean until 2001. Previously, he was Director of the “Institut de droit économique et des affaires” at the Université d’Orléans. Professor Monéger holds a Jean Monnet Chair from the European Commission for his involvement in technopôle new courses in European community Law in France and in the United States, particularly at the School of Law.

National Human Genome Research Institute Advisor Served as Practitioner-in-Residence

Vence Bonham, the Center for Health Law Studies’ Practitioner-in-Residence for the fall semester, was at the School of Law on Wednesday, November 9 through Tuesday, November 15. He served as a guest lecturer in several health law classes, hosted multiple student discussions on various issues of health law and met with Center and law school faculty to discuss issues in health law practice and research. He gave a formal presentation to the law school community at noon on Wednesday, November 9.

Mr. Bonham is Senior Advisor to the Director on Societal Implications of Genomics at the National Institutes of Health were he works in the National Human Genome Research Institute. He is also Chief of the Education and Community Involvement Branch in the Office of Policy. In addition, he serves as Associate Investigator of the Social and Behavioral Branch of the National Human Genome Research Institute in Bethesda, Maryland. He has authored chapters and sections in several books and has written numerous articles on health law and medicolegal liability for a variety of academic and professional journals.
Health Law Scholars’ Workshop Offers Peer Review and Mentoring During Early Scholarship

Since 2002, the Center for Health Law Studies, in conjunction with the American Society for Law, Medicine and Ethics, has sponsored the annual Health Law Scholars’ Workshop, held at the School of Law each fall. The Workshop is a collegial forum in which faculty new to health law and bioethics scholarship present works-in-progress and receive in-depth advice and critique from experienced scholars and teachers. The Workshop encourages health and bioethics scholarship, fosters the professional development of emerging scholars and furthers a sense of community among health law academics.

Because not all junior scholars have faculty colleagues willing and able to comment generally on their work, and few have access to a cadre of health law scholars to assist them with their early scholarship, the Health Law Scholars’ Workshop has found a valuable place in the academic community. Modeled on the ASLME’s highly successful Mayday Scholars Workshops hosted by Saint Louis University, the Health Law Scholars’ Workshop seeks to bridge these gaps by providing peer review, mentoring and advice on article placement. Each author’s work-in-progress accepted for the Workshop is read in advance by three or four senior health law or bioethics faculty. During the Workshop weekend, each author presents his or her paper to the full group. After extensive oral feedback from the readers, the floor is open for a sustained exchange between the presenter and the full group. The Workshop draws on health law and bioethics scholars from across the country, inviting senior faculty from a variety of law schools and disciplines to review the works-in-progress and participate in the weekend. The Workshop also draws on the expertise of Saint Louis University faculty from the Center for Health Law Studies, the University’s Medical School, School of Public Health, Nursing School and Center for Health Care Ethics.

“The Scholars’ Workshop provides a unique opportunity for young scholars to get in-depth, thoughtful advice on their scholarship, but more importantly, builds a sense of community in which young scholars are welcomed into the field of law,” says program coordinator, Professor Sidney Watson.

Watson credits much of this to the fact that so many individuals from different departments within the University and different law schools across the country are generous in giving of their time and expertise on behalf of the Scholars. “Health law is interdisciplinary,” she says, “and we are pleased to be able to connect Scholars with individuals who specialize in the topic they have chosen to write about. During one particular year of the program, for example, we had two people writing about health care economics and were able to bring in three economists to discuss their papers. And when we had a Scholar whose paper dealt with issues of philosophy in bioethics, we brought in a philosopher from the Center of Bioethics. It is remarkable to see so many individuals willing to give of their time to further research in integral areas of health law.”

Watson is equally pleased to see senior faculty from the School of Law make such a commitment to be a part of the Workshop, and applauds their efforts in making themselves available after the Workshop, and throughout the weekend so that they may get to know the Scholars. Many members of the ASLME, which co-sponsors the Workshop, are also “very generous, and give up a weekend each year to participate, because mentoring is that important to them,” she says.

For more information about the Health Law Scholars’ Workshop, held annually at Saint Louis University School of Law in the fall, please contact Mary Ann Jauer, Program Coordinator, Center for Health Law Studies, at (314) 977-3067 or jauerma@slu.edu.
Griesbach Elected President of the Faculty Senate

In April 2005, School of Law Professor John Griesbach was elected president of the University Faculty Senate, and will serve a two-year term in the position. The Faculty Senate is the primary means by which faculty participate in the governance of the University as a whole, and consists of faculty elected from all colleges, schools and libraries. Griesbach has been a member of the Senate for eight years, and is pleased with his new role. “Being the president of the Faculty Senate is an honor, a challenge and a responsibility,” he says.

Almost all University policies are passed through the Senate for input, and some of the more recent topics dealt with have included the Revised Appropriate Use Policy, a comprehensive revision of the Faculty Manual (which was last revised in 1994), a possible reorganization of Parks College, the consolidation of the School of Nursing and the School of Allied Health and the integration of the School of Social Service into the College of Professional Studies. The Senate also deals with personnel issues, University committee appointments and compensation and benefits.

“One of the expressions you hear throughout higher education is a model of ‘shared governance,’” says Griesbach. “I’m not altogether comfortable with that language. I don’t think governance is something you share, like a prize or a pie — it raises the question of whether your share is big enough and carries with it an atmosphere of competition in some sort of zero-sum context. What we try to do at the University on many matters is to engage in what we might call cooperative or concerted or even joint governance, and that language suggests the complexity of the decision-making process, with input and perspective from different directions, and suggests that what we do is for the sake of the well being of the overall institution. So we in the Senate don’t see ourselves simply as an interest group for the faculty. We have the faculty perspective and interest in mind, but our focus is much broader.”

Office of Admissions Initiates First Student Ambassador Program

In 2005, the Office of Admissions, in conjunction with administration from the School of Law, has created the Saint Louis University School of Law Ambassador Program. The purpose of the Ambassador Program is to provide prospective applicants with a first-hand account of the Saint Louis University School of Law student experience, and to provide current School of Law students the opportunity to offer input/information to the Admissions Committee regarding applicants.

The Ambassador Program is open to 1L and 2L students at the end of the spring semester. Each of the 15 chosen Ambassadors will have completed an application and an interview before being selected by the Office of Admissions to represent the student body to prospective students.

Luncheon Recognizes First Class of Callis Scholars

On October 19, ten School of Law students gathered with Dean Jeffrey Lewis to be recognized as the first group of Callis Scholars. Thanks to the generous support of Lance Callis, ’59, 10, full-tuition scholarships were awarded for three years in an effort to recognize a group of exemplary students for their outstanding academic achievements.

“I was anticipating meeting a group of bright, enthusiastic young people, and my hopes were richly rewarded,” said Callis. “I’m sure they will bring honor to the profession and to the School for years to come.”
Supreme evening at the Court
Approximately 200 alumni and friends from the D.C. area gathered in the main hallway of the United States Supreme Court on Thursday, June 16, 2005, reminiscing about law school, talking about current events in the legal world and enjoying the evening along with Justice Clarence Thomas, who hosted the event on behalf of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Dean Jeffrey E. Lewis welcomed alumni, as well as entering, current and prospective students in attendance. After the dean’s speech, Thomas approached the podium to bestow many kind words of praise upon the School of Law, the level of education received by its students and the fine work performed by its administration. He also recalled a time, many years ago, when he studied for the Missouri bar exam in the School’s Omer Poos Law Library.
New Members of the Faculty

Over the last six years, the School of Law has hired 15 full-time faculty members, whose specialty areas span everything from tax law to critical race theory, and have come from as close as Chicago, to as far away as Scotland. The divide in geography and specialization has never served to separate them, though, as all the School’s faculty are united by the common desire to educate tomorrow’s lawyers. Dean Jeffrey E. Lewis is proud of his faculty, and notes that “we look for faculty members who have good experience, sharp intellects and demonstrated commitment to teaching law. We have hired fine classroom teachers, productive scholars and excellent members of the law school community.”

The School’s most recent faculty recruits were selected among thousands of applicants, and have experience in the classroom, the courtroom and even the Supreme Court of the United States. Most importantly, they have a dedication that’s hard to ignore, and a commitment to share their knowledge of the law with their students. Just one of the many things that makes the School of Law what it is today — a place where knowledge touches lives.

Professor Ann Scarlett wants her students to be excited about the law. The heart of an attorney’s work, she says, is developing a successful strategy for the client. “That’s what makes the practice of law exciting regardless of whether you are a litigator, a transactional attorney, or in-house counsel,” she explains. She hopes to facilitate her students’ understanding of what those strategies are, by teaching them not only the doctrinal and theoretical concepts but also the practical applications of the law in her Civil Procedure and Business Associations classes. “I try to make my classes rich with real-life examples, and use stories from my practice to explain to students the kinds of things they will likely deal with as attorneys,” Scarlett says.

Before coming to the School of Law, Scarlett worked in a transactional practice at Stinson, Mag & Fizzell in Kansas City, dealing with mergers, acquisitions, formation of business entities, securities offerings, and regulatory and securities filings. She subsequently switched to a litigation and appellate practice with the same firm, now known as Stinson Morrison Hecker LLP. As a litigator, she handled cases in state and federal courts on a wide variety of legal issues including business torts, contracts, antitrust, fiduciary duties, shareholder rights, insurance, consumer protection, condemnation and products liability.

In addition, Professor Scarlett was a law clerk for Justice Clarence Thomas of the Supreme Court of the United States and a law clerk for Judge Pasco M. Bowman of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. Concurrently with her law practice, she was a lecturer at the University of Kansas School of Law.
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Professor Ann Scarlett wants her students to be excited about the law. The heart of an attorney’s work, she says, is developing a successful strategy for the client. “That’s what makes the practice of law exciting regardless of whether you are a litigator, a transactional attorney, or in-house counsel,” she explains. She hopes to facilitate her students’ understanding of what those strategies are, by teaching them not only the doctrinal and theoretical concepts but also the practical applications of the law in her Civil Procedure and Business Associations classes. “I try to make my classes rich with real-life examples, and use stories from my practice to explain to students the kinds of things they will likely deal with as attorneys,” Scarlett says.
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In addition, Professor Scarlett was a law clerk for Justice Clarence Thomas of the Supreme Court of the United States and a law clerk for Judge Pasco M. Bowman of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. Concurrently with her law practice, she was a lecturer at the University of Kansas School of Law.
As a result of her own positive experiences, Scarlett encourages students to consider judicial clerkships. “Clerking is the best job a student could have ever had when it comes to viewing this legal system they’ve learned so much about,” she emphasizes. “They see things from the decision side. As a law clerk, you help the judge make decisions and draft opinions. At the same time, you see various styles and methods of advocacy by the lawyers involved in the cases before the court. Clerking gives young attorneys a unique and valuable kind of training that they take with them into private legal practice.”

It is the classroom that Professor Scarlett now calls home, and she is able to draw on the experience she’s had practicing law to help her students understand the options that a legal education can provide in terms of career choices. “When I entered law school, I had no idea where my legal education would take me,” she says. “Now that my career has led me to home, and she is able to draw on the experience she’s had practicing law to help her students understand the options that a legal education can provide in terms of career choices. When I entered law school, I had no idea where my legal education would take me,” she says. “Now that my career has led me to teaching, I am eager to see where a legal education will take my students.”

Thank goodness for her students that Ryan was always sure she wanted to one day be in the classroom — on the other end of the podium. “Teaching was always in the back of my mind,” says Ryan. “I knew I would get there, but I wanted to first build a knowledge base in my specialty area.”

And that is what she did. After receiving a Master’s degree in Accounting from Tulane University, Ryan continued on to law school at the same institution. After law school, she received her LL.M. in Taxation from the University of Florida. From there, she became an Associate in the Estate and Business Succession Planning Department at Bose McKinney & Evans in Indianapolis, where her client base consisted of closely held business owners. “My practice was so much more than document drafting,” Ryan says. “The modern estate planner needs to be a jack of all trades with the ability to provide business, tax and personal planning advice.”

With more field experience under her belt, she then took a position as Visiting Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Florida, where she taught Income Taxation, Corporate Taxation and Federal Tax Research. Now, she’s joined the School of Law faculty at Saint Louis University, and is ready to share her knowledge — and love of tax — with her students.

In addition to her teaching, she plans to focus her scholarship on the ways in which tax policy intersects with and influences social policy. Her current work-in-progress analyzes the relationship between the tax incentives for higher education and traditional forms of student aid, such as grants, loans and work study.

Ryan argues that the increasing tendency of Congress to provide federal dollars through the tax system rather than through traditional aid channels represents a disturbing shift in governmental higher education policy — a shift away from increasing access for lower income families towards increasing choice for middle and upper income families.

From the time she was a law student, Professor Nicole Porter exhibited a keen interest in finding the inadequacies of our laws, and thinking about ways to change the laws for the better.

As a practitioner specializing in labor and employment law, Porter enjoyed the challenges of law practice, but was often frustrated by how little she was able to influence the employers she represented to change troubling policies and practices. So when an opportunity to serve as corporate counsel for a Michigan-based manufacturing company presented itself, Porter was hoping her luck would change. As corporate counsel, she was able to teach her employer how to comply with the law while still considering their business needs. Nevertheless, she saw many instances where the employer’s interests were in conflict with the interests of the employees and saw these circumstances as fertile ground for more exploration.

Luckily, that exploration came in the form of a new role as professor at the School of Law. Here, Porter is able to focus her scholarship and teaching on areas of law about which she is most passionate — disability issues, and issues surrounding women with children. Her approach is very reform-oriented. “I tried to get away from focusing so heavily on reforming the law,” says Porter, “but I couldn’t escape it. My brain is wired to find a way to solve problems, and my research is very goal oriented. I realized that’s definitely not something I should be trying to stifle.”

Another thing Porter isn’t stifling is her displeasure regarding the lack of rights she feels working mothers have in the legal workplace. “There is a lack
of protection for them,” she says, “and employers are often unwilling to recognize that women with children have very different obstacles than women who don’t have them.” She discusses this inequity in her upcoming *Duke Journal of Gender Law and Policy* essay, “Redefining Superwoman: Overcoming the Maternal Wall in the Legal Workplace” (of which a condensed version appears on page 22). In it, Porter says that as long as our society keeps perpetuating the myth of “the perfect mom” (i.e. the one who bakes cookies, attends PTA meetings, picks up the kids from school, works full time and still finds time to fix dinner for her family), then women will keep themselves from what could otherwise be fulfilling legal careers, simply because they feel pressured to do everything all at once, and beat themselves up for not being able to do so. As a working mother of three, this is something Porter fully understands.

“I am all in favor of stay-at-home moms, but I hate to see women quit their legal jobs only because they think they can’t have a career and be the mother they want to be,” says Porter. “What most women with children want is to have a career and still have balance in their life — and the more you work, the less that’s going to happen.”

What Porter suggests is that legal workplaces implement a reduced-hour policy that’s available to everyone, not just working mothers. If a firm is going to make a committed effort to decrease attrition — which is a major problem due to women with children leaving — they need to adopt a non-stigmatized reduced-hour proposal. And more importantly, she says, firms need to offer training to explain to employees why they’re implementing such a policy.

“The number of firms that allow this kind of flexibility has increased, but only a small percentage does it right,” Porter says. “And if a woman’s only choice is to work the same hours as her male counterpart and ignore her children or quit her job, that’s not a real choice, and it shouldn’t be her only choice.”

In the office of Eric Miller, a casual observer will witness one of two things — a syncopated strumming of the keyboard as he works on scholarly research, or a slightly reclined position with the phone cord tangled around his finger, as he speaks with a reporter about said research. And should a casual observer need to speak with Miller during any of these moments, they will always be met with a kind glance and an acknowledgment, and usually a few minutes of waiting time so that Miller can finish a thought. In no time, however, he’ll be ready to answer most any question — particularly if it involves his latest research.

Recently, he has been studying the ways in which criminal law affects urban communities through the War on Drugs and its distinctive manner of policing, as well as unique proposals for reform, such as the development of drug courts that operate to divert addicts from prison and supervise their recovery.

“Understanding the real-world application of criminal law,” he says, “raises important and difficult questions about the values that underlie our system of criminal justice and the roles we expect the police, prosecutor and defense attorney to undertake.”

And as both scholar and professor, Miller finds great need to question and understand the basic components of this area of law. He urges his students to take active roles in this process, so that they will be able to interpret, on a broader scale, the social and ethical issues presented by criminal law and criminal procedure.

“Among those issues,” says Miller, “are the law’s engagement with inequality — particularly race and class-based inequalities. Criminal law provides one ready set of examples in which different communities receive disparate treatment.”

It is for reasons like these that Miller has involved himself in writing about and litigating seeking redress for historically significant race-based acts of violence — acts that he says “show the grim underbelly of American law — when justice was denied to American citizens, and the law and state organizations were used to oppress groups on the basis of race alone.”

“If law is, in some sense, about justice,” he says, “then we [as students of the law] need to understand and account for the whole picture, and determine our responsibility for accepting or changing the society in which we work.”

As someone who practices what he preaches, Miller suggests change through his research and scholarly writing. His article, “Role Based Policing: Restraining Police Conduct Outside the Legitimate Investigative Sphere,” has been accepted for publication by the *California Law Review*, and his article, “Representing the Race: Standing to Sue in Reparations Lawsuits,” was published in a 2004 edition of the *Harvard Black Letter Law Journal*. He has also presented at law schools across the country on such topics as “Reparations and Institutional Discrimination,” “Behavior Modification In Drug Courts: A Normative Alternative to Therapeutic Understandings” and “African American Reparations: Politics and Justice.”

“...and employers are often unwilling to recognize that women with children have very different obstacles than women who don’t have them.”

“...and employers are often unwilling to recognize that women with children have very different obstacles than women who don’t have them.”
ment cases — about half of which were related to the Internet and other computer technology — at a Chicago law firm, McKenna is more than a little familiar with the subject area. It was the intrigue of being able to explore more fully an area of law people think about or experience frequently that made him want to become a professor. And it’s his ability to put the world of IP into perspective that has made his elective course, Intellectual Property Survey, so popular.

“In the information economy, intangible assets are becoming a company’s most important asset,” he says. And because those assets are so important, McKenna believes it is critically important that the legal rules that define them be properly grounded. Such is the task he takes up with respect to the right of publicity in his most recent article, “The Right of Publicity and Autonomous Self-Definition.” In it, McKenna explores the prevailing justification for legal protection against commercial use of an individual’s identity and argues that the normative case for awarding individuals the economic value of their identity is weak, since celebrities do not need additional incentive to invest in either their native skill or in developing a persona. But he does not side with those who would abolish the right of publicity altogether, and instead focuses on a different, and underappreciated interest every individual has in preventing uses of her identity that strip her of control over the meaning of her identity. “It is that interest, and only that interest,” McKenna argues, “that the law should protect.”

Professor McKenna’s current project undertakes a similar exploration of the normative foundations of trademark law. He says the prevailing narrative of trademark law is that it is justified because of a concern about consumer confusion. Many modern doctrinal innovations, however, are difficult to fit into the consumer protection paradigm, leading most commentators to conclude that modern law is unjustified. McKenna says he finds the criticism too simplistic, however, because the historical record reveals a different motivation for traditional trademark protection. “My belief is that it’s never been about consumer confusion for its own sake,” he says. “It’s been about companies protecting an interest in existing consumers, and confusion is only one way in which that interest can be affected.” For this reason, McKenna seeks to fit the modern conception of trademark law into the broader intellectual tradition relating to property theory and wants to better understand the ways modern trademark law really has changed.

Both his explorations and discoveries translate seamlessly into the classroom. The students in his Intellectual Property Survey course are often shocked to realize that so much of what they know and see every day is IP. They see it even more in the visual aids he uses, which are often no more than a Boston Red Sox hat, a bag of Pepperidge Farm Goldfish Crackers, or a Tiffany’s jewelry box. And he does this, not only because it makes class more fun, but also because he feels it’s easier to help students better grasp the subject matter if they can see how it ties into the real world.

“That’s what you do in law,” he says. “You try and take rules and apply them to situations. In class, I take concrete examples of law and apply them to everyday life.”

Professor Teri Dobbins
Assistant Professor of Law
July 2002-Present

Professor Dobbins gained significant litigation experience in state and federal court. She also honed her writing skills through appellate experience that included drafting petitions for writ of mandamus, petitions for review and briefs on the merits in the state courts of appeal, the Texas Supreme Court and the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

All of this experience took Dobbins to where she ultimately wanted to be — in academia. “I was attracted to academia as a law student,” she says. “I liked being able to explore issues from the policy perspective. It’s one thing to know the rule, it’s another to know why we have it or question whether we should change it. But I wanted to gain some practical experience before I began teaching.”

She has found it useful to draw on her experience to help students understand the practical effects of what they’re learning. “In the classroom, students learn the rules and read the cases but it’s not always clear how the rules are applied in the real world or why they matter,” she says.

In the teaching of a Contracts course, for example, Dobbins quickly learned that her students often came to class expecting to dig into big, thick legal documents and often viewed contracts strictly as a business course. “But what they don’t realize,” she says, “is that contracts are an integral part of their everyday lives. The lease on their apartment, for example, employment contracts, agreements between spouses, partners, or family members are all governed, at least in part, by the law of contracts. There is also a great deal of public policy involved both formally and informally. When they realize these things, they are able to connect with the material in a different way.”

In addition to actively engaging her students in class, Dobbins keeps herself actively engaged in scholarship, professional speaking engagements and administrative appointments. She has written an article in the Oregon Law Review that deals with the Implied Covenant of Good Faith, and another in the Journal of Law in Society that deals with barriers to justice in the law of contracts. She has presented to the Asian American Bar Association and Mound
City Bar Association on the topic of “Decreasing Minority Enrollment in Law Schools,” and to the Society of American Law Teachers—Class in the Classroom—Contracts Panel on the topic of “Rights Without Access: Acknowledging (and Teaching About) Barriers to Justice in the Law of Contracts.” She serves on the law school Admissions Committee, the Student Life Committee, Retention Committee, Clinical Assistant Professor Search Committee and the Ad Hoc Diversity Committee.


Frederic Bloom has a way with words. When he’s standing at the front of the classroom giving a lecture, or seated around a conference table in his “Today’s Supreme Court” seminar, it’s difficult not to be drawn in by the words he uses. The quiet passion he has for the law is just as apparent as his ability for teaching and helping his students make more targeted connections to the material. Though, if you asked him, he’d modestly say it was the richness of the subject, not the professor, that helps them make such connections.

In his most recently published article, “Unconstitutional Courses,” he argues that from time to time, the Supreme Court requires inferior federal courts and ultimately itself to make decisions in unconstitutional ways. “We spend a lot of time as observers of the Court,” he says, “concentrating on whether or not particular outcomes seem correct or incorrect, wise or unwise. It’s an absolutely sensible focus, but it’s also an incomplete one. In ‘Unconstitutional Courses,’ I argue that the Court can reshape and abuse the ‘judicial power’ through things other than bold pronouncements or obvious doctrinal revisions. It can do so through something more inconspicuous: the prescription of unconstitutional decision-making procedures. These procedures have attracted little sustained attention. But by charting ‘unconstitutional courses,’ the Court has refashioned the ‘judicial power’ in an untenable way.”

As a professor, Bloom’s hope is to convince his students to be precise, careful, and thoughtful about the positions they take and the arguments they craft.

“One of my favorite professors — Pam Karlan — once told us to read poetry,” he remembers. “She didn’t say what kind of poetry we should read, but her message struck me as profound. Law, like poetry, needs to be studied deeply and places great emphasis on words. And law, like poetry, has its own measure of art.”
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For Mark Bernstein, Director of the Omer Poos Law Library, every day is its own adventure.

“I feel very fortunate to have a job that provides me with the kind of challenges that stretch my mind,” says Bernstein. “More than that, I get the opportunity to help others learn, help them sift through the clues and try to find resolution.”

Bernstein has many plans to make the process of resolution — of obtaining the most pertinent information in the most efficient way — easier for those who conduct research in the law library. In the future he hopes to be able to further develop the library’s collection to reflect the strength of the law school and ensure that the research needs of current and future students are amply met. He has already begun doing this by creating, along with his team of reference librarians, a new collection development policy that will be used as a guideline for determining the immediate and long-term collection priorities of the School of Law. And he has helped bolster research possibilities by collaborating with the University’s Pius Library and the Health Sciences Library to purchase a digitalized version of the U.S. Serial Set of Reports and Documents. Together with the University librarian and the associate University librarian for the Health Sciences Library, Bernstein is also working to create a plan to address issues of importance at all three libraries, as well as exchange ideas that may benefit the entire University community.

Another area in which Bernstein and his colleagues hope to make strides is in technology. As chair of the Technology Committee, he is working closely with faculty, administration and the dean to initiate a pilot program that will allow students to take final exams on their laptops. The preliminary software has been tested in several classes already, and will be further tested this spring.

“The learning style of law students today is different than it was five, ten and 20 years ago,” says Bernstein. “Today’s students have grown up with technology being prevalent in their education, and we as legal educators need to ensure that the learning environment we provide successfully addresses this fact. I believe that a good library reflects the goals and mission of the school to which it is connected. Beyond that, a good library spends as much time anticipating the future needs of its researchers just as much as the present needs.”

Anticipating the future and insuring success for the present are things Mark Bernstein understands and has committed himself to as director of the law library. His vision, his enthusiasm and his experience will serve him well, but it is his ability to help others navigate through the research process with success that brings him the greatest satisfaction.

“When you see that a student has mastered a concept, understood more fully the road they took to arrive at resolution, it makes you proud,” says Bernstein. “There’s nothing more rewarding than knowing that something you did helped to make a difference in someone’s life.”
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As a clinical professor at the Saint Louis University School of Law Legal Clinics, it is my job to teach law students the art of advocacy. The students and I work together as defense counsel on a variety of felony, misdemeanor and ordinance violation cases. By assisting in trial preparation and acting as co-counsel at trial, the students can also explore the justice system in context. They can observe and evaluate the efficacy and reliability of the mechanisms of the criminal justice system while it is occurring around them. Using a variety of techniques that incorporate skill training, reflection and written assignments, we seek to find a style of persuasion that is effective for them.

This past summer I put those techniques to the test when I spent two weeks in China training Legal Aid attorneys in criminal defense advocacy. Preparing for the trip forced me to consider which elements of criminal defense advocacy were so basic that they would translate not only to another language, but to another culture. In the end, I decided that I would model the training for the Chinese lawyers after the lessons that I teach my own students at the Clinics. Although our laws are different, I believe advocacy is a skill that transcends legal artifices.

I became interested in teaching clinical skills in China when I read an interview with the founder of International Bridges to Justice (IBJ), Karen Tse. IBJ was founded in 2000 in an effort to ensure that criminal defendants in Asian nations new to the concepts of due process would have access to competent legal counsel. By providing administrative, legal and technical support to its partner agencies, IBJ seeks to enhance the quality of representation received by criminal defendants. The Chinese government recently warmed to the concept of due process for accused persons with the passage of the revised 1996 Criminal Code and the 1998 signing of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. With the new rights afforded criminal defendants, the desire for trained criminal defense lawyers in China has greatly increased. Although China has opened over 2500 legal clinics for its citizens, the prolonged absence of due process rights for the accused from the Chinese justice system resulted in an absence of persons with the experience necessary to educate lawyers in criminal defense skills.

The training took place in the city of Lanzhou in the Gansu Province of Northwest China. The Legal Aid attorneys at the training came from all over the western region of China. The attorneys were not the fresh-faced young law school graduates that one may expect. Most of the attorneys had been practicing law for several years. They were career legal aid attorneys who, like their American counterparts, make only a fraction of the salary that private lawyers do.

A primary task at the training was instruction on cross-examination techniques. Chinese criminal defense attorneys get very few opportunities to test the government’s evidence through cross-examination. Although the cross-examination of witnesses is permitted, in reality often the only witness subject to cross-examination during the trial is the co-defendant. Victims and witnesses are often not required to testify at trial or be subjected to cross-examination, but instead have their statements...
read into the record by the government. Nor do Chinese criminal defendants enjoy the right to a jury trial — the guilt or innocence determination is made by a three-person panel of judges. There is no presumption of innocence. A criminal defendant cannot refuse to be interrogated and confessions are commonplace. It is a system that severely limits the use of advocacy in the court.

Despite these shortcomings, it was obvious during my experience that many Chinese lawyers and administrators are determined to improve the treatment of criminal defendants. The training began with lectures on procedural criminal law by a Chinese criminal defense attorney from Hong Kong and a law professor from Shanghai. These lectures focused on the client’s due process rights as outlined in the criminal code. However, in practice these rights are difficult, if not impossible, to exercise. In the absence of a powerful central law-interpreting authority, local jurisdictions often are left to determine which of the portions of the criminal code they will enforce. Criminal trials also lack the transparency necessary for accountability. The lecturers urged the Legal Aid lawyers to continue to find ways to take advantage of the opportunities provided by the criminal code.

I had assumed before the training began that the Legal Aid lawyers would be resistant to trying new skills imported by an American law professor who had never faced the level of resistance in the courtroom that they received on a regular basis. During my portion of the training, I sought to engage the students in exercises designed to allow them to experiment with new trial techniques. We also spent a good deal of time on fact development and client counseling. To my delighted surprise, the lawyers were more than willing to experiment with new ways of preparing and defending cases. They literally leapt out of their seats for the opportunity to demonstrate their cross-examination skills. I was deeply impressed by their willingness to experiment with new skills that they may never be allowed to use in the courtroom. It takes a strong measure of hopefulness and conviction to seek better ways to represent clients when effective representation may lead to your own incarceration.

I left China with a deep appreciation for our jury system, for an election system that keeps the government in check and for a free media that informs the public about the condition of the justice system. I worry that we in the United States take for granted the notion that our government will always provide defendants with an opportunity to fully and fairly litigate their cases. Without counsel, effective counsel, those rights are meaningless. What is the essence of advocacy? It is having a passion for your cause and being able to convey that passion to the factfinder. It is the ability to believe not only in your client but in the rightness of a system that promotes adversarial proceedings as a way of getting to the truth. It is the ability to be brave in the face of adversity, to be willing to associate yourself with the unpopular and marginalized. This is the essence of advocacy.

Professor McGraugh is an expert in criminal law, and has written and argued criminal appeals in the Eastern, Western and Southern Districts of Missouri. She joined the School full time in 2003, and has directed the Criminal Clinic’s intern and externships, and has been networking with mental health care providers to offer representation to their clients. “How great is it to have a job that allows me to take any pro bono case I want?” says McGraugh. “I can find people or groups of people that need my help and take their cases. I can network with agencies on issues I feel strongly about. And, I can teach young attorneys how to care about these people, which satisfies the part of me that seeks social justice.”
I was hired by Saint Louis University School of Law in 1994 because Professor Vince Immel was going to visit the following year at Roger Williams, and the law school needed someone to teach his Contracts course. For the last 11 years I have been a law professor. As a law professor, I confess that I enjoy working on my scholarship as much as the next person. Research and writing helps my teaching because it is a way I learn new things. And faculty scholarship helps to enhance the national reputation of the University and law school consistent with the aspirations Father Biondi and Dean Lewis have set for us.

But ultimately I am a teacher. That’s where I must earn my paycheck; that’s how my students do and should measure me. One of the strengths of our law school is the emphasis it places on teaching. Our great dean teaches two heavy courses, on top of everything else that he does — probably more than any other dean in the country. And the fact that the Atrium, a scholarship, and now this professorship, are named for our greatest teacher provides tangible evidence of the weight the institution places on teaching.

Teaching law allows me to affirm some of my most basic faiths — a belief in the legal system, a belief that it can be improved and a belief that law and lawyers can make a difference in perfecting the world in which we live. Teaching law is an exercise in optimism, grounded in the belief that law is worth conveying, premised in the faith that each new generation can improve upon what it has received.

If anyone here doubts the difference a teacher can make, simply scan this room to see all of the students of Vince Immel who have returned today to honor him. For 46 years Vince taught at our School. Many years he taught both sections of Contracts, and he taught a 3L Remedies course. Vince taught virtually all graduates of this law school from 1958 to 2004. He taught a large percentage of those who practice in this town. I recall vividly one of my Contracts students telling me that he was going to take Vince’s Remedies course his last semester, even though doing so meant he’d have to wait by the phone until noon on hooding day to see if he would graduate. He told me he felt cheated that he hadn’t had Vince for Contracts. The impact that Vince has had as a teacher on the way law is practiced in this town is simply extraordinary. I suspect no other law teacher has so influenced legal practice in any major city anywhere in the United States. If Yankee Stadium is the house that Ruth built, the St. Louis legal community is in large part the bar that Immel trained and taught.

I am told that in the late 1980s, early in the first semester of Contracts, Vince called on a student to answer a question in class. The student had spent some years in the military before coming to law school. The question, as Vince’s questions did, called for rigorous analysis, not simply a yes or no answer. But it was early in the first semester and the student

That was not the response Vince wanted or expected, and Vince dissolved in laughter as he has each time I have retold that story in his presence over the past decade.

Yet it was a right answer. The student didn’t know much about Contracts or legal problem solving, but he had already figured out that Vince was special — Vince was “sir,” because he was going to teach that student to be a lawyer.

When I left law practice to begin teaching, my wife, Maxine, bought me a coffee mug with a message she thought would help me adjust to my new line of work. It featured a drawing of a disheveled looking guy, struggling out of bed as the sun rises outside his window. He is reading a large sign nailed to his wall which says: “First the pants. Then your shoes.”

I have found this advice to be helpful, and most mornings I remember to follow it. The pants first, then shoes strategy helps get me to class on time in some semblance of order, but it does little or nothing to ensure success in the classroom. A surer road to success as a teacher is to find a master teacher and try to pick up some of the tricks of the trade from him or her.

My former Constitutional Law professor, John Hart Ely, dedicated his great book, Democracy and Distrust, as follows to the person for whom he clerked: “To Earl Warren — You don’t need many heroes if you choose carefully.” So it is with teaching models — you don’t need many if you choose wisely. For me the choice is easy — Vince Immel.

I don’t mean to suggest that I do, or should, or could imitate Vince’s inimitable style. In fact, Vince would be the first, and was the first, to advise me to teach in the way that was most comfortable for me. He made that point to me shortly after I was hired. After accepting the job here, I thought I should meet this legendary Professor Immel and see what he had to say about teaching Contracts. So I called Vince and he suggested we have lunch at Humphrey’s. That first meeting was typical of dealing with Vince over the past 11 years. He listened more than he spoke, offered help and advice only when it was sought, and then deferentially, and made it clear to me that I should teach the course however I thought best, not how he thought best.

None of us will ever approach the impact Vince has had on graduates of this law school. But we can make ourselves better teachers by following some lessons implicit in his approach, and I want to say a few words today regarding some lessons I have learned from Vince’s example.

First, Vince had a vision of his course. He was most famous for teaching Contracts, but I don’t think Vince ever thought he was teaching primarily the rules and principles of Contracts. Rather, Vince used Contracts to teach students how to solve legal problems, how to think like lawyers. Second, Vince had a vision of the role of the teacher. He was not an answer-giver, a spoonfeeder or a curriculum coverer. Instead, he believed the role of the teacher was to prepare students to function on their own when the teacher was not there, to make students independent, not dependent. Of course, it’s tempting and it’s easier to give the answers or simply cover the syllabus than it is to follow the course Vince set. It’s also counter-productive. Vince often cites to Dean Prosser’s wonderful article, “Light House No Good.” Dean Prosser wrote of the man who watched the fog roll in on the Oregon coast. The man berated the lighthouse because although it blew its whistle and flashed its light and generally raised all hell, the fog came in just the same. Vince understood that the role of the law professor was not to dissipate every fog, but to help students develop the tools that would help them navigate through the fog that is the inherent nature of law.

Third, Vince set high standards. He set the bar high to challenge students to reach their potential. Vince did not praise mediocrity, nor did he let students escape with answers that shouldn’t fly in court. My colleague, Tonie FitzGibbon, wrote of her own experience in Vince’s Contracts class. As she watched Vince puncture the “perfectly reasonable responses” of some of her classmates, she got “that ‘we’re not in Kansas anymore’ feeling.” As some of you may recall, Vince demanded those high standards on exams as well as in class. I was reminded of that fact a decade ago when, after a weekend makeup session for my Contracts students, I encountered a man in the lobby outside the library. Seeing my Contracts book, he told me he had graduated from our law school some years earlier and asked who now taught Contracts. I ran through the list, closing with “Professor Immel.” “Oh, Immel’s still teaching Contracts,” he said. “I never worked so hard in my life for two Ds.”

Fourth, Vince cared about his students. I wish I had a $1 for every time I have had the following conversation upon meeting a member of the bar. “What do you do?” they ask. “I teach at Saint Louis University School of Law.” “Oh, I went there. Is Professor Immel still teaching?” Or “How is Professor Immel?” Or “Dean Immel.” When I would next see Vince I would tell him who I had seen and what he or she had said. Although there was only one of him and thousands of you, Vince always remembered something about the person whose name I mentioned. On one occasion I reported back to Vince that I had met someone in one of his early classes from the late 1950s or early 1960s. “Wasn’t he the pharmacist?” Vince asked. He was.

Or take the testimony of Henry Lay from a tribute he wrote to Vince several years ago. I can’t improve on Mr. Lay’s words, so here they are:

“Sometime around the third semester of my law school days, Dean Immel sought me out and inquired
about my financial prospects for the upcoming semester. (Tuition in those days was about $450 per semester — not credit hour). Not surprisingly, I was short. He explained that he had access to a “fund” (ambiguity by Dean Immel for a purpose) designed to help in cases like this. From then on, through my matriculation, at the beginning of each semester, I would tell him what I needed and the money would be delivered to me in cash — no promissory notes, no loan applications, just the portion of the tuition dollars I wasn’t able to provide.

Dean Immel and I in those student days were not friends. He was a somewhat remote and awesome teacher better viewed from a safe distance. I was so young and callow that it took a few semesters for me to realize that the “fund” was Dean Immel’s personal financial assets. That anonymous and almost bashful generosity of spirit is a wonderful cornerstone to use in building a successful life.”

Fifth, Vince was dedicated to teaching. I have often heard professionals say that they love their work so much they would do it for free. I have only met one person who practiced that sentiment. Vince retired in 1990, but continued to teach, for free, for another 14 years. His dedication was put to the test one day a few years ago. Upon leaving morning mass, Vince found that his car would not start. But he had an 8 a.m. class to teach and time was getting short. Vince charged across the street, stopped a car going the way he needed to go, and persuaded the somewhat surprised woman at the wheel to take him to 3700 Lindell. Vince arrived seconds before class was to start. There was no time to get his book, but Vince had taught the cases before so he went directly to class. Class over, he returned to get his car.

I certainly don’t mean to suggest that by following these five lessons anyone can become a Vince Immel. We tend sometimes to simplify in description the work of the masters. It’s one thing to know how Vince did it, it’s an entirely different thing to be able to do it. It reminds me of a comment Stan Musial made years ago when he, Willie Mays and Hank Aaron were honored as the only then living members of the 3000 hit club. Musial was the last speaker that night and when it came his turn, he said, “You know, people have said lots of things tonight about what it takes to get 3000 hits. They’ve said you have to stay healthy and play a long time. That’s true. They’ve said you have to have some good hitters around you so they can’t pitch around you. That’s true. They’ve said you have to be lucky. That’s true. But there’s one other thing it takes to get 3000 hits. You’ve got to be awfully good.” Like Stan the Man, Vince was awfully good.

Vince elected to make his contribution by teaching students, not writing articles. Having read Vince’s work I hope he will now spend some time writing about the law. His articles were clear and direct and accessible and helpful to lawyers and scholars alike. His essay, “Use of the Contracts Courses as a Vehicle for Teaching Problem Solving,” is a masterful guide to teaching a first year course, one of the best contributions to our law journal’s “Teaching Contracts” issue. And he wrote with some flair. Vince closed his tribute to Dean McDonough as follows:

“On June 27, 1993, the Saint Louis University School of Law lost one of its founding fathers and I lost one of my dearest friends. I look forward to the day when we meet again on some distant cloud. By then I am certain Mac will be comfortably settled in his new home, which is certain to be located in the smoking section of our heavenly abode.”

Finally, I could not ask for a more kind or considerate or helpful colleague than Vince has been to me. My secretary, Mary Dougherty, who does so much and is so important to me, came in after retyping my remarks. She said, “Professor Immel comes in every day to say hello to the secretaries. He’s just a warm, fuzzy teddy bear!”

In conclusion, I have been awfully fortunate in my life. My parents, Milton and Merle Goldstein, gave me the love and example and parental time and opportunities and guidance that few people receive. My sister, Deborah, and brothers, Ken and Alan, have been kind and generous and forgiving and wonderful companions and friends. When I married Maxine
Lipeles 25 years ago, I married way above me — one of the really wonderful people on the planet. Our two children, Rachel and Josh, teach me more than they learn from me. Maxine and I have wonderful family and friends, some of whom are here today. It’s a special pleasure for me that two of our close friends, Tim Greaney and Alan Weinberger, work a few doors down the hall. I have had wonderful models in the law — my father who loved and understood the law in all of its dimensions and conveyed that sense to us; my wife, who has created a pioneering Interdisciplinary Environmental Clinic which teaches students while addressing problems that threaten all of us; Judge W. Arthur Garrity, Jr., for whom I clerked, a man who became the most controversial man in Boston because he understood the Constitution to require that African-American students have a right to equal schools; my former law partners Elmer Price and Gary T. Sacks, who showed me how to practice law and who practiced law with the greatest skill, professionalism and ethics; friends like John Feerick and Harold Hongju Koh, who set the highest standards in their leadership, their scholarship and professional contributions; Senator Thomas Eagleton, my partner in our seminar on the Presidency and the Constitution, a profile in courage who put fidelity to the Constitution over partisan loyalty in opposing the War Powers Resolution; and, of course, Vince. The great law professor, Paul A. Freund, once said: 

“[If you are at all like me, when you have difficult decisions to make you see the head of one of your professors over your shoulder, and you listen to his advice and his counsel. I think that no greater tribute can be paid to a former teacher than to see him as a head everlastingly over your shoulder.”

I suspect many of you have occasions when you see Vince there “everlastingly over your shoulder.” I was never in Vince’s class, but I trust it is implicit in what I have said that he has been and is my teacher, too. No one deserves to be the Vincent C. Immel Professor of Law, certainly not me, but I will hasten to accept this great privilege before you reconsider. I will wear the medallion with great pride and I will draw inspiration from the great honor of having my name associated with his.

“I suspect many of you have occasions when you see Vince there ‘everlastingly over your shoulder.’

I was never in Vince’s class, but I trust it is implicit in what I have said that he has been and is my teacher, too.”

— Joel Goldstein

Right: (l to r): The Chester A. Myers Professor of Law, Nicolas P. Terry, The Vincent C. Immel Professor of Law, Joel K. Goldstein, and The Chester A. Myers Professor of Law, Thomas L. Greaney

Left: Tom Keefe, ’78, with School of Law Dean Jeffrey E. Lewis

Above: University President Laurence Biondi, University Provost Joe Wechsman and Professor Emeritus Vincent C. Immel
Saying Goodbye to Superwoman: Finding Balance in the Law Firm Environment

By Professor Nicole B. Porter

Picture your average large law firm in almost any city. Take a snapshot of the incoming class in any given year. You are likely to see that approximately half of the associates are women. Now take a snapshot of the same incoming class five years later. The number of women still at the firm is likely to be significantly smaller. Finally, take a snapshot of the percentage of female partners at these large law firms. The percentage has, most probably, dropped further, to somewhere around 15% and sometimes even less. So what is causing this decline of female faces in the firm? Most likely, it is caused by the unique issues faced by women who must combine a legal career with having a family.

Professor Joan Williams of the University of California-Hastings College of the Law, has described the unique discrimination faced by women who are also mothers as the “maternal wall.” As Williams states, most women never even approach the glass ceiling; they are “stopped dead, long beforehand, by the maternal wall.” The maternal wall affects women with children in many aspects of their jobs, including hiring, promotions, pay and, sometimes, even terminations. It is difficult for mothers to perform as ideal workers due to pregnancy, maternity leave and, most importantly, the continual demands of child-rearing, which inevitably cause absences for illness, childcare issues and routine doctor appointments. Because they are not similarly situated to men or women without children, courts permit employers to treat mothers differently, which often means they are treated more poorly.

The maternal wall affects many women in a variety of occupations. In the legal workplace, the unique nature of the maternal wall is readily apparent. It is the change in assignments when a woman becomes pregnant: her superiors do not think she either can or will be willing to work as hard as she used to. It is the constant questions, rumors and innuendos about whether she will return after her maternity leave. It is the receipt of a nominal or non-existent bonus during the year she has her baby, while a partner tells her “this will definitely set you back.” It is the agonizing decision she has to make to return to work: even though she loves her work, she cannot conceive of seeing her baby only one or two hours each day, but she cannot conceive of the firm tolerating her leaving the office every day at 5 p.m.

When she does come back, the maternal wall is the non-challenging assignments she gets because everyone assumes her heart and head will be with her baby and not at work. It is the bonuses or promotions she does not get because she does not bill the same hours as her male colleagues, who also may be new dads but who have wives who stay at home. It is the opportunities she does not get because they involve travel, and it is assumed she will not travel. It is being called “part-time,” and being treated like half of an attorney if she tries to work a reduced-hour schedule.

Some of this is illegal. Most of it is not — at least not yet. So what is the solution to this problem? Further legislation may be in order, but, ideally, the solution will come from the legal profession itself. Law firms need to recognize that discrimination against mothers and the firms’ inability or unwillingness to provide true flexibility and balance to their attorneys will lead to the continued costs of high attrition. Almost all large firms that I am aware of at least give lip service to diversity, and it is my impression that most care about having a diverse workforce. But many firms have struggled with the constant problem of retaining female attorneys and often have no idea how to correct the problem.

The solution is two-fold. First, firms need to recognize and then avoid the discrimination that occurs from stereotypical assumptions, such as women who are pregnant will not work as hard, or women with families cannot travel. Such stereotypical assumptions not only hurt women, but are also illegal. Second, the firm needs to offer a non-stigmatized, balanced-hours program that truly gives the attorneys who use it the balance they need to remain employed. Many women who choose to leave the legal workplace completely when they have children would stay if they thought they could work a balanced schedule that would allow them to remain a valuable member of the firm.

In order to accomplish these solutions, firms need to recognize the debilitating effects and costs of attrition, and the harm caused by having a non-diverse workforce. In other words, they need to have a real desire to make a difference, and the entire firm has to be willing to change the definition of success so that success can mean something other than simply billing the most hours. Once the firm has the desire to make a difference, it needs to implement a plan to change the culture and the structure of the legal workplace. It is not possible in just a few pages to go into detail regarding what that plan would look like, but there is an excellent article on this topic written by Joan Williams and Cynthia Calvert, co-directors of the Project for Attorney Retention, titled “Balanced Hours: Effective Part-Time Policies for Washington Law Firms,” (PAR Final Report, 3d ed., April 2002). In a nutshell, the article, which was based off of a year-long study of Washington law firms, provides law firms with a variety of reasons for providing balance to their attorneys, and offers detailed instructions on how to implement such a plan, including a model balanced-hours policy that firms could adopt as their own.

Most importantly, firms need to work to eliminate the stigma attached to being a working mother by convincing attorneys in their firm that billable hours are not the only measure of success. In fact, as far as most clients are concerned, the hours an attorney puts in on their case is not nearly as important as the quality of the work they do, the relationships they form and the knowledge they bring. In an era where keeping clients is becoming increasingly
more difficult (and evidence shows that clients prefer stability in the attorneys who work on their projects), the cost of attrition is simply unaffordable. The problem is that many employers confuse the issue of who has talent with the issue of who puts in more face-time. While I do not deny that firms need attorneys who are willing to put in the long hours, they also need good attorneys — particularly ones who are exceptional at maintaining the all-important client relationship. Many women who are not willing to work 2,000+ hours per year because of family obligations are willing and able to bring unique skills to their job: both commitment and an exceptional ability to keep clients happy.

When reduced hours are mentioned, many assume that such a plan is simply unworkable, both financially and practically. In response to the financial argument, Williams and Calvert point out that the accounting used to support such an argument is flawed, in part because it focuses only on revenue, rather than also looking at expenses. One of the flawed economic assumptions is that overhead is the same for all attorneys. In fact, partners usually have bigger offices, and have much higher expenses related to business development. As a practical matter, balanced hours attorneys impose only marginal costs. While office space is the biggest expense, the offices would still be there (yet empty) if the reduced-hours attorney was not working there. As stated earlier, firms also do not consider the significant cost of attrition.

When partners complain that they cannot have part-time attorneys working on their projects, they need to ask themselves, do their full-time associates work only for them? Most likely, the answer is no. One partner at a large Washington law firm came to this “startling realization,” stating:

[An outstanding woman associate who had been working with me on a piece of major litigation [became] involved in another matter that required her to work two days a week outside the office for a different partner. [Rather than lose her work entirely], I decided to take three days a week. And then I realized: virtually every associate who works with me works on other cases for other partners, and is therefore a part-time lawyer as far as my cases are concerned.]

What difference does it make to a client if the attorney is spreading her time between three clients, or two clients and a family? As long as the reduced-hours attorney does not try to continue with the same workload (i.e., the same number of cases or matters), she will still be able to give the same amount of attention to each case on which she works.

Finally, some firms are concerned that if they allow and encourage workable reduced-hours programs, everyone will want to adopt such an arrangement. Williams and Calvert state that this fear is just that: a fear that has not come to fruition. Firms that have worked hard on work/life issues may have higher program usage rates than other firms, but no floodgates can be said to have opened. Consultants agree that usage will top off at between five and ten percent. Even though the common fear is that firms cannot afford to offer part-time options, the reality is that they cannot afford not to offer usable and effective reduced-hour policies. “To keep keepers in an era when half or more of law students are women, and in a society where the younger generation has become more insistent on work/life balance, law firms need to offer balance without career penalties.”

Until and unless all law firms adopt policies like the one proposed in the Williams and Calvert article, my recommendation to women is more personal in nature. I recommend that women with children who are working as lawyers or in any high-pressure professional environment need to learn some mental balancing tricks. Mother-attorneys have to recognize that it is virtually impossible for them to be everything to everyone all at once. When a mother-attorney is giving 100% on the job, she is not going to be giving 100% to her family, and vice versa. Feeling guilty about not giving 100% to everyone all of the time only exacerbates the problem. Learning to constructively manage that guilt with some positive self-talk is one of the most important balancing-tricks a mother-attorney can do.

I don’t have all of the answers for what it takes to be a success at both raising a family and having a rewarding, successful legal career. Certainly, there is still a great deal that needs to happen structurally within law firms in order for women to be able to successfully fill roles as both mother and lawyer. Nevertheless, I do believe some of the problem can be solved with an attitudinal adjustment. As such, my advice to women-attorneys is this: recognize that you are only human. It is virtually impossible for you to be everything to everyone all at once. If you try to be both the most hard-working attorney and the world’s most perfect mother, you will burn out eventually. The only thing for which you should strive is finding balance.

---

1This article is derived in part from an essay I have written, titled “Redefining Superwoman: Its Essay on Overcoming the Maternal Wall in the Legal Workplace,” forthcoming in 13 Duke Journal of Gender Law and Policy (Spring 2006).

2Although statistics will vary depending on the study, in one article, “Where’s the Class of ’88?” it was noted that in 1986, 41% of law school graduates were women and in 2005, 16 years after those women graduated, only 16% of the partners in the law firms were women. Joanne Cronan Bamberger, “Where’s the Class of ’88?” (9/22/04) <http://www.law.com/jsp/article.jsp?id=1095434436715>. Considering that partnership track works on other cases for other partners, and is therefore a part-time lawyer as far as my cases are concerned. 

3See id. at 413-14.

4Id. at 415-16 (quoting Andrew Marks, Partner at Crowell & Moring).

5See id. at 421-25.

6See id. at 421-22.

7See id. at 421-22.

8See id. at 421-22.

9See id. at 421-22.

10See id. at 421-22.

---

Professor Nicole Porter’s research interests lie between the areas of disability issues, and issues surrounding women in the workplace. She enjoys employment law because it “deals with real life, real people, and real relationships, and is not simply about money or business, but about the ways in which people interact with one another in the workplace.” As one closely connected with her scholarly work, she readily admits that her “brain is wired to find a way to solve problems,” and her research is “very goal oriented.”
Alan Howard believes that although the First Amendment is a relative latecomer to the legal scene, it has more than made up for lost time. "The amendment was ratified in 1791," he says, "but it wasn’t until 1919 that the U.S. Supreme Court began to interpret it. And since then, the Court has rendered at least one free speech decision each term."

The Court’s absorption with the First Amendment mirrors Howard’s. After graduating from the University of Chicago School of Law in 1972, he joined Sidley & Austin in Chicago where he worked with Newton Minnow, a partner and former Federal Communications Commission chairman under President John F. Kennedy. A Washington, D.C., native, Howard transferred a year later to the firm’s office in the nation’s capital. The firm defended the First Amendment rights of a stable of media clients, including CBS and the nation’s first cable television operators.

The University of Georgia-Athens recruited Howard from private practice by hiring him to become the first director of the newly created Legislative Research Division in its Institute of Government. The research division was established to provide unbiased research to Georgia legislators. He had a joint appointment in the political science department, teaching several courses, including criminal justice and a seminar on free speech, and he was a frequent guest speaker in the law school.

"I sort of fell into teaching, but it was a graceful fall," Howard says. "I enjoy every aspect of the learning-teaching process."

In 1977, Howard joined Saint Louis University School of Law as an assistant professor and began establishing himself as an expert on the First Amendment. He wrote the School’s first course description and syllabus for the First Amendment and has been teaching the class ever since. The bulk of his scholarship focuses on the First Amendment — free speech in particular. "Between 1986 and 2002, the Rehnquist Court rendered 106 decisions in free speech cases," Professor Howard says. "That’s more than six percent of the Court’s caseload. It’s a prolific area of constitutional adjudication, which is one of the reasons I never tire of teaching it."

"The School of Law has been blessed with bright and hard-working students who are respectful to the faculty, and toward each other."
Marlin Gray was executed on October 26, 2005. He was convicted for murder in 1992. The evidence at trial proved that he did not kill anyone and was not present when the killings occurred. There was no evidence that he encouraged, requested or instructed the actual killers to murder the victims. So why was he convicted for murder? And why did the State of Missouri execute him? Witnesses testified that Gray participated, along with three co-defendants, in the rape of two women and the robbery of a man. The crime occurred on the Chain of Rocks Bridge. After Gray departed the bridge, his co-defendants killed the women by pushing them off the bridge. The male victim jumped into the river and survived the fall.

In theory, capital punishment is reserved for those who commit the most heinous crimes. Death penalty proponents contend that there are some individuals who are so morally debased that they are beyond redemption, and that such individuals deserve to die. As a theoretical matter, it is difficult to contest this argument. There may well be some individuals who are beyond redemption.

In practice, though, the legal system is poorly equipped to decide which murderers deserve to live, and which ones deserve to die. In the State of Missouri, about 150 people are convicted of murder each year. Only about five of those 150 convicted murderers are sentenced to death. The process of selecting among the 150 murderers, to determine which five will be sentenced to death, is as random as spinning a roulette wheel. The five who are selected to die are not the “worst of the worst.” They are just the unlucky few who have been victimized by the system.

Consider Marlin Gray. He was 23 years old at the time of the murder. Prior to his murder conviction, Gray had never been convicted of a felony. In fact, he had never previously been charged with a crime of violence. A bishop in a local church testified that he had known Gray since he was three years old. He characterized Gray as “a nice young man” whom he “admired.” Approximately one month before the murders, Gray saved a man’s life by resuscitating him after a car ran over him. Gray continued to care for the man on a daily basis until he (Gray) was arrested for murder. In short, Gray was not a hardened criminal; he had significant potential for rehabilitation.

Gray was sentenced to death because of flaws in the judicial process. The prosecutor concealed evidence supporting Gray’s claim that the police had beaten him severely to secure a false confession. The trial judge gave the jury confusing instructions, leading them to believe that Gray could be convicted for crimes committed by his co-defendants, without any showing that Gray himself intended to kill the victims. The prosecutor made an emotional appeal to the jury, impermissibly comparing Gray to Charles Manson, and the judge let him get away with it. On appeal, the Missouri Supreme Court made critical factual errors, wrongly attributing to Gray statements manifesting an intent to kill, even though the trial testimony shows clearly that Gray never made those statements. Finally, thanks to legislation enacted by Congress in 1996, which was designed to streamline the process in capital cases, the federal courts were powerless to correct these errors.

Marlin Gray was not beyond redemption. Like many other death row prisoners, he was the victim of a flawed judicial process, which consistently sentences to death individuals who have significant potential for rehabilitation, while allowing the “worst of the worst” to live out their natural lives. If we, as a society, could devise a reliable system for distinguishing between those criminals who are truly beyond redemption, and those who deserve to live, I might be persuaded to support capital punishment. Unfortunately, our current system is more like a game of roulette, where we spin the wheel of fortune to decide who lives and who dies. We are all morally debased by this process. Like Marlin Gray, we are all accomplices to murder.

**Professor Sloss** is a member of the School’s Center for International and Comparative Law. His research focuses on the interface between domestic constitutional and public international law, including the constitutional law governing the conduct of U.S. foreign relations. “One of the main areas where the U.S. comes under international criticism is for failing to live up to international human rights norms in relation to the death penalty,” says Sloss, who, with his colleagues, is currently undertaking a major empirical study of capital punishment in Missouri.
The Partners in Excellence Program offers law firms, corporations and individuals an opportunity to contribute to the development of future leaders and play a role in the advancement of American legal education. Participants become partners by sponsoring an individual course of study. Participation in the program is precipitated by a yearly gift of $2,500 to the School of Law Annual Fund. In the spring, partners have an occasion to witness their investment first-hand when they are invited to attend the annual Excellence Awards Ceremony, which recognizes outstanding scholars who receive the top grades in their law courses. Partners are also given a plaque that notes their generosity and commitment to legal education. Overall, the Partners in Excellence Program provides an extra level of community support to our students, the most significant components of a truly great academic institution.

For more information, call the School of Law’s Office of Development and Alumni Relations at (314) 977-3300 or at (800) 758-3678.

Leave Your Legacy at Saint Louis University School of Law

Saint Louis University School of Law has benefited from the generosity of many alumni and friends who have supported the School through a planned gift. The most common planned gift is a charitable bequest provision included in a will or trust.

The following sample wording for a general bequest to the School of Law may be incorporated into a will or trust:

I hereby give and bequeath to Saint Louis University, a Missouri corporation, located in St. Louis, Missouri, [____% of the residue of my estate][the sum of _______ dollars][the following described property: _______] to be used for the general purposes of the School of Law.

Individuals who support the School of Law through a planned gift become members of a recognition program called the 1818 Society. The Society’s name commemorates the year that Saint Louis University was founded and became the first institution of higher learning west of the Mississippi River.

If you would like to include the School of Law in your estate plans or for more information, please call the School of Law’s Office of Development and Alumni Relations at (314) 977-3300 or at (800) 758-3678.

“Going to law school at Saint Louis University impacted my life in so many ways, and giving back so that future generations might have the same opportunities I did just makes sense to me.”

— Anonymous Donor
1948
The Honorable Carl R. Gaertner was included in The Best Lawyers in America. Gaertner specializes in alternative dispute resolution.

1957
Donald H. Clooney, senior partner of the Clooney & Anderson law firm in St. Louis, has been elected to the Board of Directors of ShowMe Aquatics & Fitness.

1965
The Honorable Jack Buechner was elected President of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress.

1968
Charles J. Kolker Jr. has recently returned to Shenzhen University, Shenzhen, China, for his third year where he teaches undergraduate and graduate level English courses. The Honorable Robert F. Ritter was listed in The Best Lawyers in America and has also been named one of the 2005 “Super Lawyers.”

1969
James J. Virtel works in commercial litigation, energy law, and personal injury law and was recently named to The Best Lawyers in America.

1970
John J. Inkley specializes in financial institutions law and was listed in The Best Lawyers in America. Jon Theobald was elected to his fifth year as chair of the F.R. Bigelow Foundation Board of Trustees. He is the executive vice president and chief compliance officer for the Mairs and Power Mutual Funds and for Mairs and Power, Inc. located in Saint Paul, Minnesota.

1971
Jim Wollrab has published three novels with a fourth coming soon, which include The Malediction, Murder at the Palais-Royal, Consanguinity and Russian Winter.

1973
James A. Fein is senior partner in the law firm of Fein, Flynn and Associates, in Tuscon, Arizona. He is an AV rated attorney and is a certified specialist in personal injury and wrongful death by the Arizona Board of Legal Specialization. He is also listed in The Best Lawyers in America — personal injury and wrongful death section — and is a past president of the Arizona Trial Lawyers Association. He recently became a certified personal trainer and plans to do education lectures on the legal aspects of personal training for the American Council of Exercise, a national organization devoted to educating personal trainers and health club operators. Vance D. Miller was named to The Best Lawyers in America. He works in labor and employment law. Peter von Gontard was listed in The Best Lawyers in America. He concentrates his practice in the areas of high exposure products liability and medical malpractice suits, and is a member of the Management Committee and Strategic Planning Committee at Sandberg, Phoenix & von Gontard, P.C. in St. Louis.

1974
Jack C. Carey has been elected vice president of the Illinois State Bar Association. James A. Coles, a partner at Bose McKinney & Evans LLP in Indianapolis, has been appointed to the advisory board of the Entrepreneurship Law Clinic, Johnson Center for Entrepreneurship & Innovation, at Indiana University’s Kelley School of Business. Doreen Dodson is currently serving a three-year term as chair of the ABA’s Standing Committee on Judicial Independence and was also appointed vice-chair of the current ABA president’s Commission on the Renaissance of Idealism in the legal profession. She represents the Missouri Bar in the ABA’s House of Delegates and is state chair of the Fellows of the American Bar Foundation. She was recently reappointed to the Advisory Committee of the Missouri Supreme Court for a three-year term. She has also chaired the Dean’s Council for the last eighteen months. Michael W. Forster has joined Spencer Fane Britt & Brown LLP as a partner. His practice focuses on counseling financial institutions on regulatory compliance, loan documentation, development of new services and loan workouts. He also practices general corporate and commercial law, including contract and real estate law. Edwin L. Noel specializes in environmental law and was named to The Best Lawyers in America. G. Keith Phoenix was listed in The Best Lawyers in America and has also been named to the Board of Trustees of Saint Louis University. He is a trial lawyer and principal at Sandberg, Phoenix & von Gontard, P.C. in St. Louis.

1976
Michael J. Hanagan recently authored a law journal article on Illinois insurance law which was published by the Journal of Dispute Resolution at the University of Missouri-Columbia School of Law. Kathleen O’Brien has joined the firm of Polsinelli Shalton Welte Suelthaus PC as an Of Counsel attorney representing the Wealth Planning Group of the Business Law Department. She concentrates her practice in the areas of estate and trust planning, trust administration and probate administration. Cary Sandman was recently elected to serve as president of the Morris Udall Inn of Court in Tucson, Arizona.

1979
Sandra A. Mears is the Judicial Executive Assistant to the Honorable Mary R. Russell, Judge of the Supreme Court of Missouri. She is the author of “Commercial Driver’s License Law,” that was published by the Missouri Bar this past summer in the Missouri Bar CLE Deskbook DWI Law and Practice. Renee C. Winter has moved to Santa Cruz, California, where she is still practicing law with Bryan Cave.

1980
M. Paula Ashen has her own firm, the Law Office of M. Paula Ashen, LLC, in Denver, which specializes in plaintiff personal injury and domestic relations. Matt Morrissey has his own civil trial practice in Chicago, and works in the insurance defense/tort area.

1981
Janette M. Lohman, a partner at Thompson Coburn, LLP, was elected to The Best Lawyers in America and was selected by Super Lawyers Magazine as one of the top 50 female attorneys in Missouri and Kansas. She has also recently been designated a “Certified Member of the Institute” by the Institute of Professionals in Taxation. David Sauерburger is a partner in the CPA firm, Stelmac, Cochran & Sauerburger, P.C. in St. Louis. Suzanne Schmitz has recently accepted a new position at Southern Illinois University School of Law where she initiated an academic success program for law students. She currently works with first-year law students to refine their skills in legal analysis and with third years to prepare for the bar exam. Mark M. Stewart is a shareholder at Lafollette, Johnson, Dehaas, Fesler & Ames in Los Angeles where he primarily litigates medical...
Timothy J. Tryniecki was included in The Best Lawyers in America. He works in real estate law.

1982
Kevin Stuart Cavanaugh is a solo practitioner based in Overland Park, Kansas, and serves clients in the metropolitan Kansas City area in both Kansas and Missouri. George M. von Stamwitz made the list of The Best Lawyers in America. He specializes in environmental law.

1983
Tim Cisar was appointed Eldon municipal judge in 2005 and won the Atticus Finch award from the Missouri Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers in April 2005. Richard Provaznik is a partner in the CPA firm, Stelmacik, Cochran & Sauerburger, P.C. in St. Louis. Thomas Staymaker practices in a small firm in Citrus County, Florida, and is devoted to the affairs of the elderly.

1984
Brian J. Cadwallader was recently promoted to Associate General Counsel of International Paper and is responsible for the company’s litigation, antitrust compliance, global sourcing, intellectual property and environment, health and safety matters. Brian Konzen has accepted the position of City Attorney for his hometown of Granite City, Illinois, and continues to practice as a partner with his dad at Lueders, Robertson, and Konzen.

1985
Joseph Fred Benson is the Judicial Archivist at the Supreme Court of Missouri. He is known for the Book Publication Subcommittee of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of the Missouri Historical society. Patrick J. Hagerty was listed in The Best Lawyers in America. Robert L. Jackstadt was elected Mayor of the Village of Glen Carbon, Illinois, on April 5, 2005. He is a founding shareholder with the law firm of Tueth, Keeney, Cooper, Mohan & Jackstadt, P.C. with offices in St. Louis and in Edwardsville.

1986
Stephen R. Woodley was listed in The Best Lawyers of America and has also been named one of the 2005 “Super Lawyers.”

1987
Kathy H. Butler is the Manager of the Health Law Practice Group at Greensfelder, Henkes & Gale, P.C. in St. Louis. Dana Wiele has recently become Senior Vice President & Associate General Counsel of RGA Reinsurance Company in St. Louis.

Protection Officer, UNHCR Representation in Bulgaria

When asked what she remembers most about former LL.M. student, Davor Sopf, ’98, Professor Nan Kaufman simply says: “his heart.” And while she readily admits that he is both bright and analytical, she cannot help but focus on what truly drives his life, as both a student and as an attorney. “He’s got such heart,” she says. “He was extremely sensitive to the concerns of refugees and was dedicated to improving the treatment they received. He worked very hard and wrote a wonderful thesis. But what I remember most fondly is the way he cared about his work, because of the people he hoped it would serve. He’s an excellent lawyer, but, boy, has he got heart.”

And as one who works in the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), heart is a very good thing to have. And it probably came in handy when, after completing his LL.M., he returned to his post at the UNHCR in Croatia, and worked with asylum-seekers and refugees. He also worked on supporting the government in preparing asylum legislation and relevant refugee law training for governmental and non-governmental institutions. In January 2003, he was appointed as Protection Officer (legal adviser) to the UNHCR Representation in Sofia, Bulgaria. And in addition to serving as deputy representative for Bulgaria, he joined the team of trainers in international refugee law delivering lectures, seminars and training at different universities in Bulgaria within the Academic Refugee Studies Initiative (ARSIB), teaching refugee law at the MA program at New Bulgarian University, and organizing a number of other training programs with governmental institutions and non-governmental organizations. Currently, he is in charge of the office’s support to the Ministry of Justice in preparing for Bulgaria’s accession to the 1954 and 1967 UN Conventions on Statelessness.

He had been working for the office of the UNHCR for four years prior to his time at the School, and his LL.M. studies were made possible by the Ron Brown Fellowship Program, funded through the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the United States Department of State.

His experience as a student at the School of Law was, as Sopf says, “an extraordinary experience, both from academic and professional angles. The courses I took gave me excellent opportunities to develop my skills, and, later on, to use my newfound knowledge in the demanding context of international refugee law where instruments of both the common and civil legal systems melded together.”

Sopf remembers fondly the benefit he received from the courses he took in Comparative Law and Client Counseling, and is grateful for the support he received from Professor Kaufman when working on his thesis, which focused on the “rather novel concept (at the time) of Temporary Protection in refugee law.” He also remembers well the academic advice and practical support he received from Professor Stanislaw Frankowski. Understanding and support from the law school library staff also made a huge difference,” as Sopf recalls. And he vividly recalls the many hours spent, after his studies, with Associate University Librarian for Health Sciences, Patrick McCarthy, assisting him in his dedicated work to help refugees from Bosnia and Herzegovina arriving in St. Louis. “This was a tremendous comparative and rewarding experience for me,” Sopf says. “One year at the School of Law was a unique experience, the memories of which I still cherish.”
1988
John Beulick, who specializes in Intellectual Property Law, was listed in The Best Lawyers in America.

1989
Donald Jay Cohen has been out of the regular practice of law since 2000 and has been involved in commercial real estate where he works on a nationwide basis for retailers such as PetSmart, Pier 1 Imports and Circuit City.

1990
Gregory A. Hunziker established his own law firm, Hunziker & Walton LLC, in Peoria, Illinois, and focuses on corporate transactional law, bank representation, municipal representation, commercial/residential real estate development, estate planning, commercial litigation and international law… Craig G. Kallen III became a principal in the firm, Hais, Hais & Kallen, P.C. Mimi M. Lee was just named Hiring Partner of the Los Angeles office of Thelen, Reid & Priest, LLP… James E. Mello made the list of The Best Lawyers in America. He specializes in public finance law.

1991
Jay L. Kanzler Jr. practices law with his brother Chris Kanzler, ’94, in the firm of Witzel and Kanzler LLC in St. Louis. On September 11, 2005, he was ordained as an Episcopal Priest in the Diocese of Missouri, and is a member of the clergy staff at St. Peter’s Episcopal Church in Ladue, Missouri… Chris Kopecky was recently selected as “Best of the Bar” by the Kansas City Business Journal. His firm, Kopecky Law, P.A. is a three lawyer firm focusing on criminal law across Missouri, Kansas and Iowa… Timothy J. Prosser is a senior consultant for Planned Giving & Endowment Services at TIAA-CREF Trust Company, and is president-elect of the Saint Louis Planned Giving Council.

1992
Kevin Kakac is currently serving his third elected four-year term at the State’s Attorney for Wayne County, Illinois.

1993
Valerie Howard Burke has joined Baker University School of Professional and Graduate Studies as the director of the new Dispute Resolution Graduate Certificate Program, where she leads this new educational initiative for both attorneys and non-attorneys seeking graduate education in dispute resolution and conflict management. She is also the 2006 chair of the ADR Committee of the Kansas City Metropolitan Bar Association… Anthony L. DeWitt was recently honored with the Ellen Binney award for Pro Bono service by the Missouri Coalition for Quality Care. He also published his book, The Respiratory Therapists’ Legal Answer Book, and has an article coming out in The Journal of Trial Advocacy next year… Dan Kotz opened First Class Title, Inc. and the Law Offices of Kotz & Associates in March 2005 which will serve Maryland, Virginia and Washington, D.C. … Sandra Lawlyes (Hoth) works for the Vermillion County State’s Attorneys Office in Danville, Illinois… Mike Molano works at Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw, LLP in Palo Alto, California.

1994
Chris Kanzler practices law with his brother Jay, ’91, in the firm of Witzel and Kanzler LLC in St. Louis… Meg Tebo just marked her sixth year at theABA Journal where she is a senior writer. Tebo also teaches Media Ethics and Law to undergraduate journalism students at Columbia College in Chicago and is presently the editor of the Chicago Headline Club.

1995
Laurie K. Landgraf is currently an in-house counsel for The Boeing Company in Ridley Park, Pennsylvania… Brenda LeChien and her husband, John, founded Rutledge Builders, L.L.C., a residential construction and remodeling company in the Shreveport/Bossier City, Louisiana, area. John manages Rutledge Builders and Brenda is the controller at the YWCA of Northwest Louisiana, Inc.

1996
Bart Herriman has joined the Indianapolis law firm, Clark, Quinn, Moses, Scott & Grunh, LLP, and focuses in the areas of real estate, zoning, land use and alcoholic beverage matters… Morgan Parker is currently working in Washington, D.C., as the staff assistant to the State Department’s Assistant Secretary for Consular Affairs. Prior to this, Parker served as a Watch Officer in the State Department’s Operations Center, and in early 2004, she worked in Iraq with the Coalition Provisional Authority as Deputy Government Coordinator in Baghdad… Gerald “Jay” Konkel practices insurance recovery litigation in the Litigation Practice Group of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP… Saraann S. Parker was elected partner at Blackwell Sanders in January of 2005. She practices in the areas of Commercial Transactions, Technology, Advertising & Marketing, Media & Creative Arts, and Mergers & Acquisitions.

1997
David Firth has been honored by the Clayton Chamber of Commerce as “Member of the Year.” He practices as a litigator with the law firm of Dana McKiritch, PC, in Clayton, Missouri… James O. Hacking III has become a member of Tonkin & Mondl, L.C., a St. Louis law firm specializing in admiralty law… Sharon P. Hengel has opened her own law practice, serving the South Hampton Community in the City of St. Louis, and practices in criminal law, personal injury, wills, workers’ compensation, contracts, real estate and employment law… Robert Q. Wilson has been named a member of The Bogatin Law Firm, PLC, where he continues to practice in the health care practice group.

1998
Dale W. Hood was recently named Associate Circuit Judge in St. Louis County… Raymond Flojo has joined City of St. Louis Law Department as an Assistant City Counselor. He is working in the Civil Litigation Unit… Gregory Kratoff recently became a shareholder in the law firm of Polsinelli Shalton Wele Suedhaus, PC in Kansas City, Missouri. He works in the firm’s Science and Technology Law Group with a special focus on licensing and high technology issues… Belinda Spaeth has joined the City of St. Louis Law Department as an Assistant city Counselor. She is working in the Problem Properties Unit.

1999
Chris Ott was elevated to Partner with Kilpatrick Stockton, LLP, a 500-attorney law firm based out of Atlanta. He continues to work in the firm’s Washington, D.C., office, in the Government Relations Group, with a practice focused primarily in the area of defense and health care related matters.

2000
Don Daniel has rejoined the health care practice group of Thompson Coburn, LLP in St. Louis. He previously served as vice-president of Legal Affairs & General Counsel for Presbyterian Medical Services in Santa Fe, New Mexico, and will remain outside general counsel for the company… Mark Murphy works with his father and brother at The Murphy Law Firm in Liberty, Missouri. He argued in front of the Missouri Supreme Court for the first time in October 2005… Madalyn Payne works at Crowe & Shanahan in St. Louis, and represents claimants in appeals of their Social Security disability denials… Robert Slenker, attorney at Armstrong Teasdale LLP, was recently elected to serve on the board of directors for the Metro St. Louis Regional Division of the national not-for-profit organization, Easter Seals. He is a member of Armstrong Teasdale’s Intellectual Property Practice Group and concentrates his practice in the areas of patent, trademark and intellectual property… Christopher P. Threlkeld was made a partner at his firm, Lucco, Brown, Threlkeld & Dawson, LLP, in Edwardsville, Illinois.

2001
Jeremy Haldeman moved to Washington, D.C., where he currently works as the Legislative Counsel for Congressman Russ Carnahan… Ellen Harmon was hired in June 2005 by Lutheran Senior Services as their Risk Manager and Corporate Compliance Officer… Laura Hughey currently works at Lowenheim and Chasnoff, LLC in St. Louis where she specializes in tax and estate planning. Hughey became an Accredited Investment Fiduciary Auditor.
Alumni Focus: Adam Kazin, ’01
Judge Advocate, United States Army

Adam Kazin, ’01, followed his curiosity for working in the public interest sector straight to the military — and, ultimately, to some very interesting international assignments. Currently, he’s serving in Korea as trial counsel for the Office of the Staff Judge Advocate, Second Infantry Division, and is the Officer in charge of the Camp Stanley Legal Center. In his position as trial counsel, which Kazin says is a “cross between an assistant district attorney and an in-house counsel for a large corporation,” he advises commanders on a variety of legal issues, but his primary duty is handling military justice cases, to include prosecuting Courts Martial. Saint Louis Brief recently caught up with Kazin, and asked him a few questions about what it is he does as a Staff Judge Advocate, what he’s learned in his four years with the military and how he found his calling as a prosecutor.

What made you decide to practice law in a military setting?

I pretty much fell into the JAG Corps; I had no prior military service before law school. I decided, by the end of my first year in law school, that private practice was not for me. I didn’t think I could tolerate the concept of billable hours. So that left the public interest sector. I found the brochures for each service branch’s JAG program, and gave it some serious thought. I looked closely at the Air Force and Army programs, and decided upon the Army JAG Corps because of its strong reputation for training litigators, which was appealing to me because I wanted to do trial work. I applied, and got accepted in January of 2001, the second semester of my 3rd year. I was slated to begin Officer Basic Training in January of 2002, and was committing to three years of active duty service, with five years of reserve time to follow.

What was the first legal role you had with the Army?

I worked in the Office of the Staff Judge Advocate, XVIII Airborne Corps in Fort Bragg, North Carolina, as a Claims Attorney my first year. I had never considered torts after taking it my first year of law school, but essentially I was the Army’s personal injury lawyer. I handled claims made by civilians for compensation of property damaged by military personnel under the Federal Tort Claims Act and pursued claims against third parties for injuries to soldiers under the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act. I never got into the courtroom, but it was fascinating and fun work. In one year my medical recovery team recouped over $1.2 million in medical claims for the government.

Where did you have your first international assignment?

In April of 2003, I deployed as the Trial Counsel/Group Judge Advocate for the 18th Soldier Support Group in Kuwait. Four days later I spent my 27th birthday sleeping on the floor of our tent in the middle of the Kuwait desert. I was not in a combat unit, and I never fired my weapon (though I was armed). I spent a few weeks in Kuwait and then moved north into Iraq with my unit. I mainly handled Military Justice and administrative law issues, such as advising law enforcement on criminal investigations and answering questions on military regulations and money questions. I was only there for four months, which is a pretty short deployment, but it was an amazing experience, the occasional mortar attack aside. It was hot, dusty, dirty and generally unpleasant, but the work was interesting. I was caught in sand storms and eaten by fleas, but our unit helped to rebuild a school, so there were definitely some positive outcomes to be had during that deployment.

When I came back in August of 2003, I was assigned to the Federal Litigation Division, once again, in Fort Bragg, as a Special Assistant U.S. Attorney (SAUSA) for the Eastern District of North Carolina. This was another great job. Fort Bragg is the second largest military installation in the country, with thousands of civilians living and working on the post. When they commit crimes on post they are prosecuted in federal court. I handled everything from traffic tickets to drug dealing and fraud. I was finally spending significant time in the courtroom and getting invaluable experience. In 22 months I had over 50 felony and thousands of misdemeanor convictions. I truly found my calling as a prosecutor.

In October of 2004 I made the decision to sign up for another three years of active duty. I just didn’t feel like I had gotten everything I wanted out of the JAG Corps. Still, I did not know what my next assignment was going to be. I was sent to Korea on June 5, 2005, and that’s where I am now. I am a Trial Counsel for the Office of the Staff Judge Advocate, Second Infantry Division, and the Officer in charge of the Camp Stanley Legal Center. I am the only attorney on our particular base, with five paralegals. I am here for one year.

What has your overall experience been like?

Since becoming an Army Judge Advocate in January 2002, I’ve worked as a personal injury lawyer, a federal prosecutor and a military prosecutor. I’ve also drafted wills, powers of attorney and provided all manner of legal services. I even worked as a research attorney for the prosecution in a death penalty case. I’ve practiced law in four different countries, including a designated combat zone. I’ve wanted to be a lawyer since I was 15 years old, and to be able to live my dream while serving my country is a great personal coup for me. I’ve worked with some of the brightest and most dedicated attorneys and paralegals in existence and have learned more about being an attorney in these first four years than I think I would have in ten years on the outside. I’ve also learned a lot about our military and how it works and about the soldiers who are actually out there risking their lives on behalf of our nation. Being in the military requires accepting certain lifestyle choices, and it’s not for everyone. But so far, it’s been a real learning experience for me, and, I have to say, it’s been quite an adventure.
Jeremy K. Johnson has joined the St. Louis law firm, Sandberg, Phoenix & von Gontard, P.C. Jason Kelly has joined the law firm of Bryan Cave LLP, and is practicing in the area of Intellectual Property. Rosemary R. Rifkin recently joined Sandberg, Phoenix & von Gontard, P.C. as an associate. She concentrates her practice in the health law-malpractice area.

Kathryn Forster, an associate with Lashly & Baer, P.C., received the St. Louis Bar Association Award of Merit. Maurice Foxworth was named Associate Director and Head/Intellectual Property Licensing in Saint Louis University’s office of Innovation and Intellectual Property. Brian Massiminio recently joined the firm of Witzel and Kanzler LLC in St. Louis. John Mueller accepted a position as Director of Corporate and Legal Affairs at Intrav, Inc., a St. Louis-based travel provider and cruise line. Ashli R. Smith is currently working as an Attorney/Guardian ad litem for Voices for Children in St. Louis City. She represents a caseload of about 140 children in foster care in St. Louis City. Nicholas Swertlow is currently employed at the California Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General as a deputy attorney general in the employment regulation and administrative division.

Eric W. Jacobsen has joined The Barry Law Firm in Clayton, Missouri, and focuses his practice on commercial banking transactions and litigation.

Erica L. Airsman has joined the plaintiff law firm at Gray, Ritter & Graham in St. Louis. Her primary areas of practice are commercial litigation and products liability. Gustavo Eduardo Arango Arredondo has joined the Law Offices of Kenneth K. Schmitt, and practices in the area of Immigration Law. Joi N. Cunningham has joined the St. Louis law firm, Sandberg, Phoenix & von Gontard, P.C. James M. Heffner was promoted to Associate Attorney from his position as law clerk at Danna McKitrick in Clayton, Missouri. He practices in both litigation and transactional law. Todd Parker is a staff attorney for the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, and has had a seminar paper he wrote while at the School of Law accepted for publication in the UC Davis Journal of International Law and Policy. He also passed the New York bar exam. Howard Podolsky is the new chief medical officer and senior vice president for Centra Health in Lynchburg, Virginia. Morris Turek recently joined Annette P. Heller in St. Louis as an associate practicing in the areas of trademark, copyright, and unfair competition.
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Student Support
Scholarship endowment to support our students is a high priority for the campaign and the future of the School of Law. More than ever, scholarships are critical to attracting a strong and diverse student body.

Endowing a scholarship will permanently associate the donor with the School of Law.

- Full Academic Scholarship: $600,000
- Full Tuition Scholarship: $500,000
- Half Tuition Scholarship: $250,000
- Quarter Tuition Scholarship: $125,000
- Partial Tuition Scholarship: $50,000 minimum

Faculty Support
Professorships represent endowments, the income from which provides needed extra support and recognition. Because fine teaching and research are crucial to our mission and our reputation, increasing the number of professorships is a top goal of the Campaign for the School of Law.

Endowing a professorship will permanently associate the donor with the School’s most outstanding members of the law faculty.

- Professorship: $500,000
- Visiting Professorship: $250,000

Program Support
Endowments in support of specific programs for our students are necessary to enhance the student experience. Endowments in support of programmatic areas listed below can be established. Naming opportunities are available for each program endowment by consultation.

- Centers of Excellence
- Law Clinic
- Library Enhancement
- Moot Courts
- Student Exchange Programs
- Student Journals
- Student Organizations
- Technology Enhancement

Unrestricted Endowment
Unrestricted endowment funds provide important funding for the law school. To recognize donors who make a gift to the School of Law General Endowment Fund, an appropriate plaque will be placed in the selected room or area to recognize the donor’s generous support. The following rooms and areas may be named:

- Connector Building: $2,500,000
- Queen’s Daughters Hall: $2,500,000
- The Dean’s Office: $1,000,000
- Clinic Building: $1,000,000
- Career Services Suite: $500,000
- Student Services Suite: $500,000
- Classrooms: $100,000
- Faculty Offices: $50,000
- Library Study Carrels/Tables: $5,000/$1,000

Beyond the opportunities listed above, the School of Law, as does every institution of quality, looks for that single, strategic and transformative gift. Other opportunities are also available. For more information, please contact the Office of Development and Alumni Relations at 314-977-3300.

The Law Annual Fund
As part of the campaign, the School of Law asks graduates and friends to continue to make annual gifts to the Law Annual Fund in support of the School. The Law Annual Fund has a tremendous impact on the School’s quality. By combining gifts from hundreds of individuals, the Law Annual Fund raises more than $250,000 annually, thus enhancing the law school experience.

Gifts to the Law Annual Fund are encouraged and recognized at a variety of levels.

Partners in Excellence*
Requires a minimum gift of $2,500 per year for four years, for a total commitment of $10,000. Annual giving at this level allows the donor to sponsor a course of their choosing for the full four years of the commitment. In addition, donors are invited to present the Excellence Award to a student receiving the top grade in their sponsored course.

Dean’s Circle*
Requires a minimum gift of $1,500 per year for five years, for a total commitment of $7,500. Donors who give at this level are recognized in the DuBourg Society category of the School of Law Honor Roll.

Dean’s List*
Requires a minimum gift of $1,000 per year for five years, for a total commitment of $5,000. Donors who give at this level are recognized in the Dean’s List category of the School of Law Honor Roll.

Dean’s Associates*
Open to alumni who graduated 10 years ago or less. Requires a minimum gift of $500 per year for five years, for a total commitment of $2,500. Donors who give at this level are recognized in the Dean’s Associate category of the School of Law Honor Roll.

The University also recognizes donors in the School of Law through membership in the DuBourg Society and the Century Club. Annual giving levels are as follows:

- DuBourg Society: $1,500-$2,499
- Dean’s Fellow: $1,000-$1,499
- Ambassador: $500-$999
- Patron: $250-$499
- Member: $100-$249

* The School of Law encourages unrestricted gifts to the Annual Fund along with gifts to restricted funds. All gifts to the School of Law will be recognized at the giving levels indicated above.