

January 1972

## Appendix II: Legal Education at Berkeley High

Michael J. Hannon

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

 Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Michael J. Hannon, *Appendix II: Legal Education at Berkeley High*, 2 Golden Gate U. L. Rev. (1972).  
<http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/ggulrev/vol2/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Journals at GGU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Golden Gate University Law Review by an authorized administrator of GGU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [jfischer@ggu.edu](mailto:jfischer@ggu.edu).

Michael J. Hannon  
 Golden Gate Law Review  
 Berkeley High School  
 Teacher: Jeanne Himy

#### LEGAL EDUCATION AT BERKELEY HIGH

Berkeley High School is a large, racially balanced, progressive school of approximately 5,000 students. The school's educational philosophy encompasses a great deal of student freedom -- few required courses, free periods, and a multitude of alternative educational programs -- while emphasizing sufficient intellectual discipline in the classroom to allow students to learn and, for those who wish, to prepare for college.

The two classes with which I worked were quite sophisticated and had a marked interest in learning. The legal education class was an elective and advertised as requiring an unusual amount of homework, outside reading, and research for written and oral reports. As a result, virtually all of the students in the class were interested in the subject matter.

#### Freedom of Speech

Mrs. Himy, the class teacher, and I anticipated class interest in the case study approach to presenting legal concepts. This would allow students to read for the first time actual court opinions. Our decision to begin with the free speech issues was, quite frankly, unpremediated. However, in retrospect, the decision was a good one due to the controversial nature of the subject which allowed the class to express a wide variety of conflicting positions. The cases utilized for the presentation were selected to depict the evolution of government restrictions on speech under the Clear and Present Danger doctrine and to intrigue the students with their factual situations.

The first week, Mrs. Himy lectured on the development, purpose and function of the Constitution. During the second week, copies of the following cases were distributed to students, read and discussed:

*Schenck v. U.S.*, 249 U.S. 47 (1919);  
*Feiner v. N.Y.*, 340 U.S. 315 (1951);  
*Dennis v. U.S.*, 341 U.S. 494 (1951);  
*Brandenburg v. Ohio*, 395 U.S. 444 (1969).

The Clear and Present Danger discussions were led by Mrs. Himy using the cases, an outline that I had prepared, and Lockhart, Kamisar and Choper, *Cases and Materials on the American Constitution* (West, St. Paul, Minn., 1967).

## APPENDIX

49

Part two of the free speech section began the third week and focused on the distinctions between limitations placed on pure speech, symbolic speech and speech plus. We combined the case study method with a moot court presentation in order that the students might conceptualize for themselves the laws enunciated by the Supreme Court and their own views of those laws.

Prior to assigning the cases to prosecution and defense teams and selecting judges, Mrs. Himy lectured on appellate court procedures and outlined the tasks of prosecution and defense attorneys and the role of the appellate court judges. Material for this lecture was taken from DeAnne F. Sobul, *How, When and Where Should Freedom of Speech be Limited?* (Constitutional Rights Foundation, Los Angeles, California, 1968). The following cases were then assigned to use as precedent in developing their moot court cases: *Feiner v. New York*, *supra*; *Cox v. Louisiana*, 379 U.S. 536 (1965); *Brown v. Louisiana*, 383 U.S. 131 (1966); *Schenck v. United States*, *supra*; *Dennis v. United States*, *supra*; and *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, *supra*. The factual situations were taken from *Adderley v. Florida*, 385 U.S. 39 (1966), in which students, protesting in front of a jail the arrest of other students involved in a civil rights demonstration, were themselves arrested for trespass on jail property, and *United States v. O'Brien*, 391 U.S. 367 (1968), in which a young man was federally prosecuted for burning his draft card.

*Adderley* and *O'Brien* were assigned to both classes. Each class of twenty-five students was divided into four groups to serve as prosecution or defense on one of the cases. Assignment was made on a first-come-first-serve basis. Mrs. Himy selected three judges to hear each case. A week was allotted to prepare the cases. My function during this week was to aid students in the development of their cases and in the preparation of written briefs. Upon completion, the briefs were photo-copied and distributed to the classes. Oral arguments of one class period per case followed. One very useful technique we discovered was to open up the oral argumentation to the entire class following prosecution and defense presentations. This allowed students on the other case to question and voice opinions.

A difficulty arose during the oral presentation as to who would present the side's argument. The situation resolved itself by selecting a spokesman to argue the majority of the presentation with other members of the group adding to it.

The judges rendered written opinions after oral argumentation. These opinions and the Supreme Court opinions which decided the actual cases were distributed to the classes for discussion and debate.

While the free speech section was well received by the students, it could have been improved. The case study method combined with a moot court presentation is worthwhile, but, in retrospect, organization is the key. I suggest the following method of organization:

1. General lecture and discussion on history and purpose of the First Amendment;
2. Presentation of Clear and Present Danger doctrine using *Schenck and Dennis*;
3. Presentation of Time, Place and Manner doctrine using *Cox and Brown*;
4. Moot court presentation utilizing the factual situation of *Brandenburg* as an example of current clear and present danger thinking and *Adderley* showing a controversial application to the time, place and manner doctrine;
5. Utilization of *Schenck and Dennis* as precedent for *Brandenburg*; and *Cox and Brown* as precedent for *Adderley*;
6. Assignment of students to groups that, whenever possible, reflect their predilections; and
7. Nomination and election of judges by the class itself. (The judges did not feel a sense of participation in the development of the cases. The problem may be solved by a general election and additional direction from the teacher and the law student in developing their own ideas about the issues.)

#### Landlord/Tenant

The section on landlord/tenant law introduced me to teaching on a day to day basis. Over a period of two weeks, I lectured and led discussions twice a week and was in the class two to three days a week. Mrs. Himy and I decided upon a lecture-discussion format for this section. The basic text used in class discussions was a pamphlet entitled *Landlord and Tenant*, part of the Justice in Urban America Series published by the University of Chicago, and Joseph Kahn's "Note: Speaking Out: We Need More Slumlords," *Saturday Evening Post*, Vol. 239, Dec. 17, 1966, p. 8. Sections of the pamphlet deal with different aspects of landlord/tenant law followed by hypothetical fact situations and applications of the law discussed. Sections were reproduced and distributed to the students prior to class discussion.

This section was organized as follows:

1. Class lectures and discussions covering basic landlord/tenant concepts arising from common law, duties and obligations of the landlord under California law, tenant duties and rights, and forcible entry and detainer laws. (4 days)

## APPENDIX

51

2. Visits to Berkeley small claims and municipal courts to hear landlord/tenant cases. ( 2 days)

3. Speakers on various applications of landlord/tenant law. NOTE: Classes showed a fair amount of interest in a talk on urban renewal problems in San Francisco. (2 days)

4. Dramatization by the class of basic landlord/tenant concepts. (2 days)

Three things became apparent at the conclusion of this section. First, teaching is a very difficult job, especially for a novice. My particular problem was in judging class reaction -- silence can denote interest. Second, it is difficult to schedule a court tour to small claims court in search of a landlord/tenant action since frequently one or both parties fail to appear. Finally, the class skits were very good, for once the actors had a clear idea of the law, the skits depicted well the legal principles to the class.

## Voting Rights

The section on voting rights covered one week. The case study method was again used. Two cases were assigned - *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186 (1962), and *Katzenbach v. Morgan*, 384, U.S. 641 (1966). Discussion followed with emphasis on the expanding nature of law in this area. I concluded the section by a lecture on the recent amendments to the Voting Rights Act culminating in Title III of the Voting Rights Act of 1970 and the subsequent Supreme Court decision, *Oregon v. Mitchell*, 400 U.S. 112 (1970) interpreting the Act.

Mrs. Himy and I had anticipated that class response to this section would be favorable since most students are juniors and seniors who will vote in the 1972 elections. This was not the case. Perhaps this can be attributed to my poor handling of the subject and class discussions or to high school students' being generally turned off to politics. Our efforts to organize a class project to engage in some type of political activity were met with disinterest and a marked lack of fervor.

At the conclusion of each section, Mrs. Himy administered a substantive knowledge test. The format of the tests was multiple choice and true and false questions, plus a few short answer essays. Two written assignments were also made. Mrs. Himy and I prepared a list of topics (List is attached) from which students could select the subject for their papers. Topics touched on free speech, voting rights and landlord/tenant issues.

## Preparation for Classes

My involvement with Mrs. Himy's class described above covered a two month period, approximately October 1 to November 30. During that period, I met with the classes about twice a week. Mrs. Himy was very enthusiastic

about teaching a section on law and team-teaching with a law student. She mentioned to me on several occasions that the Golden Gate program was the first program she had come in contact with that actually offered and produced help not only in developing a course but in the classroom as well.

After working with Mrs. Himy over a period of weeks, I have come to the firm conclusion that high school teaching requires not only interest but stamina and determination to carry on day after day after day. Mrs. Himy and I averaged one planning session per week at which time we planned the following week's classes. These weekly sessions lasted from one to three hours. We also met two or three times prior to beginning a new section. Frequently, we planned on a daily basis outlining what would be covered and by whom.

Perhaps the greatest contribution a law student can provide is his knowledge of the law and current cases interpreting the law. But beyond his knowledge of current legal thinking in an area of the law, he can provide the teacher with guidance in selecting areas of law which may be interesting to a high school class. Areas which appear interesting on the surface may in fact not be so when case law on the subject is examined.

#### Class Profile

Berkeley High School is a racially balanced school and has eliminated "tracking" (dividing students according to learning ability and achievement). Therefore, my classes were mixed racially and represented various educational levels. I found that the majority of students regardless of economic or of social background were quite "school conscious." They were willing to work and participate, and eager to score well.

Student interest was high when Mrs. Himy and I had planned a certain section thoroughly. Such learning methods as a moot court, student dramatizations, and field trips were enjoyed by everyone including the teacher and me. However, there seemed to be a direct correlation between student interest and teacher-law student preparation. As I mentioned previously, it is in this area that the law student can be valuable -- providing the teacher with material, information and direction taken from case law with which few laymen are familiar.

In addition to teacher-law student preparedness, the single greatest factor in eliciting student interest was the subject's potential for controversy and debate. The section on freedom of speech was the best received by the class because Mrs. Himy and I had planned the section in-depth and because of the controversial nature of the subject.

In conclusion, I feel that the concept of law students cooperating with high school teachers to prepare and develop legal oriented curricula and to implement the curricula in the classroom is a good one. In this instance,

APPENDIX

53

it was well received by the teacher and high school students. It was so well received, in fact, that several law students in the program will continue to work with the high school classes beyond the Law Review eight-week course. I intend to remain with my classes to develop a section on Constitutional Rights and Criminal Procedure.

Jeanne V. Himy  
Berkeley High School  
Law Student: Michael J. Hannon

THE LEGAL EDUCATION PROJECT AT BERKELEY HIGH SCHOOL

This semester I have been teaching an elective course at Berkeley High entitled Constitutional Law. The course, offered through the History Department, is open to 11th and 12th graders. My purpose in the course has been to expose my students to some of the basic assumptions of the American legal system, some of the issues both past and present arising out of the Bill of Rights, and to help them to understand the procedural workings of the system. I have enjoyed teaching the class and I feel that my students have benefited a great deal. The registration for next semester reflects a three hundred per cent increase in the number of students who want to take the course. I sincerely feel that the success of the course is largely due to the assistance I have received from Mike Hannon and the Golden Gate Law Review Project.

After participating in the legal education project for almost an entire semester (from September to the middle of December), I can honestly say that this experience has been the most fruitful of my teaching career. I have learned a great deal about the law--information I have been able to pass on to my students. I have had access to materials and information that have aided me in the classroom, and I have had a resource person to help me organize material, answer questions, contact speakers--in general, provide me with the benefits of his legal knowledge.

Mike and I spent anywhere from 2 to 4 hours per week planning and outlining for a unit of work, or for a specific section of the unit. During these planning sessions, Mike was extremely cooperative, willing to explain historical trends and technicalities of a specific constitutional issue. He was always willing to research a topic, have class sets of cases xeroxed, contact a speaker, etc. On several occasions Mike worked with groups in the classroom who were preparing arguments for a mock trial, class debates or dramatizations. He was always enthusiastic and willing to help in any way. I strongly feel that law students are very necessary to this project.

I plan to continue teaching this course and look forward to again working with the law project. I think the students emerge from their study of the Constitution with a much greater understanding of issues, such as free speech, citizenship, and rights of the accused. I have witnessed striking changes in students whose attitudes toward the entire legal system were entirely negative. They began to listen to the pros and cons of an issue.

My only real suggestion for improving this program is to provide more material that can be used effectively in the classroom. I found



APPENDIX

55

obtaining and reproducing appropriate material to be one of my most difficult tasks. I think Mike would agree. Although we used cases, they were sometimes long and tedious for the students to read. On the other hand, the digested versions of the cases were so watered down that there was hardly any substance.

Since Mike has discussed in detail the material covered, I shall only reiterate my appreciation to Mike Hannon and others from the Law Review for making a really valuable contribution to the curriculum of my course.

Clyde Stitt  
 Golden Gate Law Review  
 Redwood High School  
 Teacher: Steve Holman

This is a subjective analysis of my participation in the High School Project of the Golden Gate Law Review. My activities were limited to Steve's United States History class, which was composed of 15 high school juniors. Steve had originally planned for this class to study the governmental or political history of the United States, with a particular emphasis on the effects of the United States Supreme Court in this area. Steve was particularly impressed by the lack of structure in the project as it was described to him and felt his students could benefit from the exposure to a law student in a classroom environment. At the outset, Steve and I agreed to limit formal structuring of both the subject matter presented and the method of presentation. Indeed, at times the presentation could best be termed exposure. With the foregoing as introduction, this analysis will be confined to the following areas:

1. The Students,
2. The Substantive Material,
3. The Mechanics of the Presentation, and
4. Conclusions and Criticisms.

#### THE STUDENTS

Larkspur, California, is basically a "bedroom community." A large portion of the community's residents commute to San Francisco daily. Larkspur is located in Marin County. To say that Marin County is not noted for its industrial concentration is to make quite an understatement. Considering that the cost of living in Marin County is one of the highest in the nation, it is reasonable to assume that the population is primarily middle to upper-middle class in economic comparison with the rest of the nation. There are virtually no minority races in the community. Redwood High School seems to be well-financed (indicating substantial local property taxes) and, according to the people I have come in contact with, is one of the more "liberal" schools in the area. There are no "dress codes" enforced by the school administration; nor is hair length a matter of administrative concern. The students in general are not subjected to "locker searches" and are not excessively policed while at school.

The particular students I dealt with reflected the middle-class nature of the community (the class had no blacks and was composed of 11 boys and 4 girls). All of the students thought the "system" of government in this country to be more than adequate, and none could name a better system. The students did not feel that any of their basic rights were in jeopardy, and seemed to feel at ease in the system as it stands. They could

not personally identify with the concepts of oppression or repression, since they have only an abstract idea of what the terms mean. The students were overwhelmingly in favor of wiretapping by police to prosecute and even prevent crimes.

Steve and I had much difficulty in determining what areas of the law in which the students were interested. They seemed to know precious little about the system in which they blindly placed their faith. Considering the relative success of their parents in the system, their level of ignorance and apathy about it seemed to me incredible. Throughout the course, the level of interest in the system seemed to rise quite sharply among most of the students, but I feel the relative "sterility" of their lives made any real personal understanding of human rights or legal rights impossible. I do not feel that any student in the project changed his or her mind as a result of the project.

All of the students composed a short summary of the effects of the class on themselves. The major criticisms of the project seem to be that we did not devote enough time in class to the project, and that the time we did spend was not optimally beneficial due to my lack of training in classroom instruction. Steve and I feel the latter criticism can be considered the direct result of our decision to use very nonstructured presentation methods.

#### THE SUBSTANTIVE MATERIAL

It should be noted that Steve and I agreed with the original ideals of the project as we understood them and did not consider a transference of substantive rules of law to the students to be of primary importance. We hoped that through exposure to the materials presented, the students would develop interests in areas they felt important, and that these interests would lead to a more sophisticated understanding of the legal system as it affects their own individual lives.

When I first met with the class, they were involved in, among other things, a discussion of privacy. The source of the discussion was a previous assignment to read certain parts of an American Education Publications Unit Book entitled *Privacy, The Control of Personal Information*. Subsequent discussions showed the primary area of interest of the students to be the general category of freedom of speech. The students then decided to have a moot court based on the *Wyatt Tee Walker v. The City of Birmingham* case as compiled by DeAnne F. Sobul and published by the Constitutional Rights Foundation. The majority of the class time was spent on this moot court demonstration. We then went directly into a mock trial based on material Steve had previously obtained. The subject matter was search and seizure. Throughout the course, the students had access to the following materials for reference and further study:

1. *The Supreme Court in American Life*, Leonard F. James, Scott, Foresman and Co., 1964;

2. *Vital Issues of the Constitution*, Robert H. Radcliffe, ed., Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1971;
3. *Great Cases of the Supreme Court*, Robert H. Radcliffe, ed., Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1971;
4. *The Bill of Rights, A Source Book for Teachers*, California State Department of Education, 1967;
5. *The Constitution of the United States*.

#### THE MECHANICS OF THE PRESENTATION

As I have said previously, a very nonstructured atmosphere was the ideal. We began with general discussion periods (one per week) to determine the interests of the class. There was no moderator or chairman for these discussions; everyone was equal. The students decided the material we would use and the number of class meetings I attended. They originally wanted me to be at three class meetings each week but settled for two a week because of my schedule problems.

For the moot court demonstration, the students chose their own roles; all participated as either a justice or an attorney. The students set their own pace, and digressions were the rule. The attorneys (two groups of four students each) researched the material and presented briefs to the Supreme Court (seven students). They then orally argued their case before the Court. The Court deliberated and retired, each justice then presented a written opinion.

The mock trial included several persons not directly in contact with the class. A Larkspur police officer appeared in class to discuss search and seizure laws as applicable to the Larkspur police, and then played the role of the arresting officer. The jury was selected from other students and teachers in the school.

After both demonstrations, we again spent much time discussing the effects of the particular discussions, rulings or questions involved.

A visit to the California Supreme Court is planned for February. I will accompany the students on this field trip.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND CRITICISMS

I feel the project was highly successful. The students became progressively more interested in the project as it continued. It was not unusual to hear loud arguments about the particular area we were studying in the halls before and after class. The discussions and demonstrations were generally animated and interesting. The students didn't "learn" much substantive law, but they did become somewhat more interested in the areas we covered. I feel lucky to have participated in this program, particularly with Steve Holman. His work with the students is superb, and he manages to develop a "free" atmosphere in the classroom that I didn't feel was possible in a "middle-class" public school. His insight into the personalities of the students helped me greatly in adjusting to the hostile environment of the classroom.

APPENDIX

59

Stephen R. Holman  
Redwood High School  
January, 1972

This will represent my effort to provide an analysis of the activities and outcomes of Mr. Clyde Stitt's participation in a team-teaching effort with me and my junior U.S. History (with emphasis on the Supreme Court and the Constitution) class.

I will follow the form suggested in your letter of December 8 [requesting and evaluation of individual projects]:

1. List of materials used.

Assigned texts (all classified as supplementary material):

- James, Leonard F., *The Supreme Court in American Life*, Scott Foresman, 1964;
- Ratcliffe, Robert, ed., *Great Cases of the Supreme Court*, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1971;
- Oliver and Newman, eds., *Privacy*, Harvard-American Education Press, 1970.

Printed reproductions:

- Sobul, DeAnne F.--Material for a Supreme Court hearing involving the First Amendment--the Birmingham march of Martin Luther King, Script for a moot court;
- CRF--brief outline of a court case involving Fourth Amendment search and seizure problem. Script used in a workshop, 1970;
- CRF Newsletter--Issue involving police and the community.

Films (from county film library):

- Miranda Case
- Aaron Burr Trial--John Marshall (Profiles in Courage Series).

2. Special units developed.

There were no units developed *per se*. We used the materials listed above for our mock trials and hearing.

3. Methods utilized.

The class operates on an informal basis. I seldom lecture. The class is set up for discussion with students and teacher (and other resource persons) sitting in a circle or scattered about the room. There are no seating charts or rolls. Students sit at different size tables, individual desks, on chairs or elsewhere (one student has appropriated a high stool and a lectern).

The initial procedure was planned around a tightly structured schedule; Monday and Tuesday, U.S. History with a quiz on the U.S. text--a chapter

a week. Wednesday through Friday was to be devoted to study of the law and Constitution. Materials and topics were selected by the students from a broad collection of materials (Amherst Project Units, Chicago Bar Materials--the commercial materials are published by Houghton Mifflin in conjunction with the "Law in American Society Foundation"--AEP/Harvard booklets, etc.). The program included classroom activities, research papers and book reports. The exact program for each individual student was to be based upon a written contract that specified what grade the student wanted and the work he or she was prepared to do in order to earn it. Failure to complete the program and contract was to result in a drastically lowered grade. The contract procedure and explanation were spelled out in a detailed seven-page, single-spaced explanation that included model contracts and criteria for different grades.

The students decided to do a unit on privacy using various readings, questions, and suggestions for discussion from the AEP booklet, *Privacy*. Mr. Stitt joined the class while this unit was in progress and spent several days assisting the students in its development.

The class was becoming dissatisfied with the structure of the program as described. There had been a few complaints about the contract, which I disregarded. The problem came to a head after Mr. Stitt joined the class. Unknown to me (and I think Mr. Stitt, initially), the class planned a formal protest. They paraphrased the Declaration of Independence and all but one signed it. They corralled Mr. Stitt before class and used him for a resource person and for moral support. I was asked to remain outside the classroom for a few minutes while the class consulted with him.

When I entered the class, the petition was presented to me and a number of students voiced their unhappiness with the class. The key complaint was that the class as structured was interfering with learning. I suggested that the students voice their complaints in a systematic manner with one student recording them on the blackboard. This took about twenty minutes. When completed, it was apparent that the contract was the major source of dissatisfaction. The weekly quiz and the lack of time for research were secondary complaints. The students also objected to the rigid schedule.

When I asked the students what they wished to do about the problem, they were somewhat at a loss. We finally decided to abandon the contract *per se*, but retain the criteria for grading. The students wanted Mr. Stitt to come twice a week instead of once a week as originally decided, and they wanted the weekly quizzes dropped. In essence, this was all they requested. One day a week was promised for research in the library or a similar activity.

APPENDIX

61

The class elected to study the Supreme Court hearing on the Birmingham/Martin Luther King trial. With Mr. Stitt's encouragement, they decided to conduct a mock trial using the material prepared by DeAnne Sobul. Materials were printed, distributed and discussed briefly by Mr. Stitt, and the students selected their roles.

I allowed four days for preparation--two in class and two for research outside the classroom. Mr. Stitt spent one additional day working with the students in their various roles. Actual presentation occupied four days over a two-week period. Mr. Stitt was present three of the four days. There were delays while briefs were prepared and presented, and after arguments were completed. The "Supreme Court" took a day's heated and noisy deliberation (so I am told by the school librarian) to reach its decision. The finding was presented and Mr. Stitt and I joined the class in a discussion of the implications of and reasons for the finding.

Mr. Stitt and I decided that the mock trial format had been so successful that we would try another. The class accepted our suggestion that we prepare a trial involving search and seizure. Preparation included a discussion of some of the concepts involved and a talk by a member of the Larkspur Police. We distributed roles for the mock trial and the students were given time to prepare. The police officer was kind enough to enact the role of testifying officer in the mock trial involving arrest for discovery of "pot" in an automobile. The jury for the trial was recruited from outside the class. The class members played the roles of court officers, attorneys, and defendants, etc. The trial took two days to complete, with the jury finding one defendant guilty and the other, not guilty.

One other activity Mr. Stitt undertook was to arrange a visit to the State Supreme Court, meeting in San Francisco. The visit was cancelled at the last moment because the Court was hearing an abortion appeal and didn't want young people present. Mr. Stitt is going to help me try once more.

Mr. Stitt served as a constant source of information on points of law and procedure while the students were preparing their respective roles in both mock trials. Yet several students complained that we didn't use him effectively and felt that the activities could have taken place without his presence. I suspect he fitted into the class so smoothly that they simply weren't conscious of the amount of advice they called on him for--advice I simply couldn't have provided.

There is a paradox in this situation. By incorporating the student into the informal atmosphere of a "loose" class, the youngsters lose sight of his contribution. I suspect they would have appreciated several formal presentations in addition to the casual participation.

These might have dramatized the law student's role. The smoothness of participation and the total incorporation of Mr. Stitt into the operation of the class tended to obscure his contribution.

I believe that Mr. Stitt and I might have provided more direction in suggesting content to be offered. The students had few constructive ideas as to what topics might be pursued. Even when a number of options were suggested, they weren't clear in their choices. Once areas of interest are isolated, I believe the teacher and law student might well provide more leadership in deciding method and content of study.

One desire I did detect, in this class at least, was to know more about the vocation of law--what law school is like, what it means to be a lawyer, etc. I am going to attempt to meet this desire by inviting members of the school board who are lawyers to discuss these subjects with the class.

#### 4. Statement about the class in general.

Some of this has been touched upon in the above narrative. However, I'll attempt to describe the class.

The class is small, about fifteen students, all very bright. The emphasis is upon the Court and Constitution and the class is an elective. Therefore, there is an element of selectivity in the makeup of the class. I think it safe to say that most of the students are considering law as a vocation. Most of the students are success, grade and college oriented. It would be safe to suggest that the class, as a whole, tends to be elitist and conservative.

There was little problem of continuity in the absence of the law student. We shaped the class activities according to the program and to the times when Mr. Stitt could be available. Mr. Stitt helped by being flexible in this respect, too. There is no reason why scheduling need be a problem as long as these activities aren't the sole class content. One simply does something else until the resource person is available, or while preparations are being completed.

The students responded warmly and enthusiastically to Mr. Stitt. His presence added a valuable dimension to the class. As I have mentioned, some of the criticisms voiced by the students represent an unawareness of their total acceptance of Mr. Stitt which made them less conscious of his role as an instructor.

#### 5. Work relationship with law student.

There was a brief period when Mr. Stitt had to overcome his stereotype



APPENDIX

63

of public school teaching being purely authority based lecture. It is difficult for most college students to give up the image of teaching as being purely didactic, and instead being an arrangement where student, teacher and resource person function in a cooperative learning situation. Mr. Stitt adapted quite readily and his success has already been indicated.

Planning is another matter. Here I am to be criticized. There was inadequate attention devoted to this on my part. I had a free period before the class in which the Golden Gate project was implemented. Unfortunately, I had no place to meet with Mr. Stitt. My classroom was in use and the office is noisy and distracting. I failed to find some place where we could meet and devote time to in-depth planning. After class, I had no free time during the remainder of the morning. One needs time and place for planning; our planning was spotty and hasty. This was my failure.

Law students are invaluable resources. It is my fault that we did not fully use Mr. Stitt's abilities.

6. Future legal education programs.

I plan to continue teaching U.S. History with emphasis on the Supreme Court and the Constitution. Its content will vary depending upon students, materials and resources.

7. Simplify the effort. Clarify your goals and activities. Attempt to arrive at a clearer understanding of goals and activities with the teachers before students are assigned. Possibly narrowing the options and activities to a few that are more highly developed might help. You will always be plagued by the problem I represent--a teacher who doesn't devote enough time and attention to studying your program before embarking upon it. There are so many demands on the time of an enthusiastic teacher. Materials and programs that have been reduced to their barest and clearest essentials are bound to be most successful.

I enjoyed the experience and would be delighted to continue in the future.