



1985

A Short History of the School of Law at UALR

Lawrence H. Averill Jr.

University of Arkansas at Little Rock William H. Bowen School of Law

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lawrepository.ualr.edu/lawreview>



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lawrence H. Averill Jr., *A Short History of the School of Law at UALR*, 8 U. ARK. LITTLE ROCK L. REV. 619 (1986).

Available at: <https://lawrepository.ualr.edu/lawreview/vol8/iss4/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Bowen Law Repository: Scholarship & Archives. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Arkansas at Little Rock Law Review by an authorized editor of Bowen Law Repository: Scholarship & Archives. For more information, please contact mmserfass@ualr.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK
LAW JOURNAL

VOLUME 8

1985-86

NUMBER 4

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE SCHOOL OF LAW AT UALR

*Lawrence H. Averill, Jr.**

I. INTRODUCTION

The Law School at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock has both a short and a long history. In its current status, it is but ten years old. As a part of the University system for twenty years, it has barely passed adolescence. But as an institution of legal education, it can trace with pride its roots back to the previous century as the successor to the Arkansas Law School. Under all these circumstances, the Law School has served its constituency well. It is appropriate that a short history of this legal institution be written.¹

Legal education as an intellectual and academic endeavor is not very old in this country. Most law schools are creations of the twentieth century. The reasons for the growth of law schools are similar to the reasons for the growth of any educational program. Those in the field

* Dean and Professor of Law, University of Arkansas at Little Rock; A.B., Indiana University, 1962; J.D., The American University, 1964; LL.M., The George Washington University, 1965. Dean Averill assumed his present position on July 1, 1982.

1. Others have written about the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville and its law school. R.A. LEFLAR, *THE FIRST 100 YEARS—CENTENNIAL HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS* 257-72 (1972); J.H. REYNOLDS & D.Y. THOMAS, *HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS* (1910); D.Y. THOMAS, *ARKANSAS AND ITS PEOPLE—A HISTORY, 1541-1930* (1930). Although the Arkansas Law School deserves a history through 1965, such a story is beyond the scope of this article.

or profession desire that new entrants into the vocation be trained in a comprehensive and consistent manner. As the necessary skills in the profession increase, a high quality educational experience is necessary to properly prepare its new members. Only a school can provide that type of educational experience. In simpler days, apprenticeships and clerkships were adequate training grounds for lawyers, but as the complexity and quantity of legal issues increased, so did the need for a more concentrated and comprehensive educational system. Although the "Lincoln lawyers" and "readers of the law" still exist today in a few states, law schools clearly dominate the process for producing new lawyers and are the primary gateway to the legal profession.

II. THE LITTLE ROCK DIVISION

Although the Arkansas Law School had operated successfully for over fifty years, there was a desire on the part of the local bar to establish an accredited law school in the Little Rock area. By the mid 1960's, this desire had become a significant political movement by certain bar leaders and legislators. The 1965 General Assembly of the Arkansas Legislature "directed and authorized" the Board of Trustees of the University of Arkansas to establish an evening law school division in Little Rock and to begin operation in the fall of 1965.² A specific but small appropriation for the division was approved for the 1965-67 biennium.³ The Law School in Fayetteville, with some faculty expressing reluctance and unhappiness, dutifully complied.

The school accepted its first evening class in the fall of 1965. The second floor of the Gay Building at the corner of Fifth and Broadway became the makeshift law school facility. The library was composed primarily of the Pulaski County Law Library and had a volume count of less than 30,000 volumes. Under the leadership of Dean Ralph C. Barnhart, D. Fenton Adams, from Dickinson Law School in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, was hired as Professor of Law, and Ruth H. Brunson, a clerk at the Arkansas Supreme Court, was hired as librarian. Robert R. Wright III, from the Fayetteville faculty was appointed the Assistant Dean and was in charge of day-to-day administrative matters. These individuals, a few others from the Fayetteville faculty, and a corps of adjuncts from the Little Rock Bar became the school's teaching faculty.

Although underfunded, understaffed, and inadequately housed, a

2. Act 525, § 10, 1965 *Ark. Acts* 1889, 1905.

3. Act 525, § 9, 1965 *Ark. Acts* 1889, 1904-05.

part-time law program had been established. Slowly the night division grew. In 1966, two full-time faculty members were added. Adjuncts and commuting professors from Fayetteville constituted the remainder of the faculty. By January 1975, the school had eight full-time faculty, including two librarians, and 204 students.

This arrangement permitted the Little Rock division to be affiliated with a fully accredited law school. Consequently, there were no accreditation problems at that time. It was not a situation in which there were two schools, each requiring separate accreditation. It was one school with two locations. There was only one faculty: the combined faculty of both divisions. Students were given the same degree and worked for the same honors including, for example, positions on the *Arkansas Law Review*.

What appeared to be the perfect solution was not working in reality. Relationships between the faculties of the two divisions became increasingly strained. Jealousy, rational and irrational, developed and a great deal of bitterness emerged between the faculties. In addition, what appeared to be a perfect solution to the accreditation issue soon became its primary problem. The accrediting agency, the American Bar Association, expressed its concern about solely part-time law schools. It soon became clear that the ABA was going to decide that purely part-time law schools were not accreditable unless they had the same facility, faculty, and quality of student body as a full-time law school had. The end result was that the perfect solution was no solution at all.

III. CREATION OF THE UALR LAW SCHOOL

Soon after the Little Rock Division of the Fayetteville Law School was created, discussion and interest grew in the creation of a separate and full-time law school in Little Rock. This had probably been the underlying goal of those who supported legal education in Central Arkansas. In the early 1970's, several attempts, both formal and informal, were made to create this full-time law school. Special efforts were made during the 1971 and 1973 sessions of the Arkansas General Assembly to establish a full-time law school in Little Rock, but they failed for lack of support from the University and because of resistance by Northwest Arkansas legislators. The University, however, agreed to look into the matter.

In October of 1974, the University took on this project when Charles E. Bishop, President of the University of Arkansas, established a special committee to study the "feasibility of expanding legal educa-

tion in Little Rock."⁴ This committee was composed of Dr. Arthur D. Browne, Chair; Wylie H. Davis, Dean at the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville Law School; Judge G. Thomas Eisele, United States District Court; Hershel H. Friday, a well known and influential local attorney; Joshua M. Morse III, then Dean of the law school at Florida State University; Glenn E. Pasvogel, Jr., Assistant Dean of the Little Rock Division; and James P. White, Consultant on Legal Education to the American Bar Association. The committee made its report on December 6, 1974. It was an elaborate report on legal education in Central Arkansas. It recommended the creation of a separate, accredited law school that would be part of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, have full-time and part-time divisions, and ultimately be housed in a new building to be constructed on the UALR campus.⁵

To accomplish these recommendations, it was suggested that the 1975 Arkansas Legislature be approached for authorization and funding. This proposal was endorsed by the president and the Board of Trustees of the University of Arkansas. A bill was drafted incorporating the committee's recommendations for introduction into the 1975

4. Ad Hoc Committee Report, *1975 Self Study Report, School of Law, UALR*, Appendix D-2. The charge to the committee stated:

Specifically, the committee should determine (a) the scope of the program to be provided by the law school in Little Rock; (b) the feasibility of offering day courses in Little Rock; and (c) the practicability of the Little Rock Division of the School of Law affiliating with the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. *Id.*

5. *Id.* at D-3. A \$1.3 million biennium appropriation was set as the necessary appropriation for a 1975 start; \$9 million for a 1976 start. *Id.* A \$2.56 million, 46,480 square foot facility was suggested for the UALR campus. *Id.* at D-34.

The recommendations were preceded four years earlier by a consultation report by Page Keeton, Dean of the Law School at The University of Texas at Austin. Keeton Report, *1975 Self Study Report, School of Law, UALR*, Appendix C. Dean Keeton concluded:

It is my opinion that there should be almost of necessity a good law school in every city with a population of as much as 200,000 if that city is also the state capital; the place where most of the law is made, both by the courts and the legislature. Such a law school should always have a day division, although not necessarily an evening division. This is not to say that the evening division at Little Rock should be discontinued. *It is, however, clear to me that the University of Arkansas should maintain and operate a law school with a day division at Little Rock, and that this should and would become in the long run the major legal education program.* I do not suggest that the Fayetteville law school should be discontinued. I merely suggest that the first priority at this time should be given to the creation and development of an outstanding legal education program at Little Rock.

So, I recommend without qualification the establishment of a day division at Little Rock, and I further believe that other decisions should be made with the objective of making the Little Rock division the major law school program in Arkansas.

Id. at C-2 to -3. (Emphasis in original). One does not have to know much about the issue to see that this Report was extremely controversial.

Arkansas legislative session.⁶ The proposed bill apparently did not satisfy many of the individuals concerned about legal education in Little Rock.⁷ Some local bar and law school supporters were skeptical of the University's sincerity and commitment to this plan. They felt that promises had been made and broken before and that this was just another example of a carrot at the end of the horse's nose that would be withdrawn when any difficulty arose.

In addition, a great deal of emotion had developed concerning the location of the Law School. Several leaders of the Arkansas Bar Association, including Henry Woods, Ed Lester and James Sharp of Brinkley, and John Deacon of Jonesboro, had put together financing and plans for a building that would house the Little Rock Division of the law school and both the law school's and Pulaski County law libraries. Moving the Law School to the UALR campus would destroy or significantly interfere with these plans.

In response to these concerns, on January 20, 1975, Max Howell of Jacksonville, Arkansas, in the Senate, and William F. Foster, Sr., of England, Arkansas, in the House, introduced separate but identical bills into the 1975 Arkansas legislative session.⁸ The bills proposed the immediate creation of both full and part-time law school programs, the transfer of control over the Law School to UALR, the location of the Law School in downtown Little Rock and the appropriation of \$1.14 million for the 1975-77 biennium. These bills did not have the endorsement of the University of Arkansas.

The bill's progress through the legislative process was directed by its sponsors, Max Howell and William F. Foster, Sr. They carried the proposal through despite heavy lobbying against the bill by the University of Arkansas and the legislators from Northwest Arkansas. On January 28, 1975, only eight days after the bill's introduction, the bill, Act 19, passed both houses and was sent to Governor David Pryor for his signature.⁹

The story that concerns the day of reckoning for this legislation is infamous. With University of Arkansas President Charles E. Bishop, and five or more trustees and others on one side, and Senator Max

6. The bill was apparently never introduced due to the subsequent events. *See infra*, notes 7-10 and accompanying text.

7. *See* Draft of Report of the ABA and AALS Inspection Team, Visit to the Law School, UALR, October 5-8, 1975, pp. 6-7. Members of this team included Olin Watts, of the Florida Bar; Professor Betty LeBus, then Law Librarian at the School of Law at Indiana University at Bloomington; and Steven P. Frankino, then Dean at the School of Law at Creighton University.

8. S.B. 187 (Howell); H.B. 325 (Foster). Identical bills introduced January 21, 1975.

9. Act 19, 1975 *Ark. Acts* 43-A to 46-A.

Howell on the other, the Governor asked for their opinions. The legislative branch prevailed: the Governor signed Act 19 on Monday, February 3, 1975.¹⁰

The primary criticism of the bill, and one that continued for a period of time, was the question of funding for the new school. Although Act 19 contained some funding, it was clearly not adequate to establish an accreditable institution. It was this issue that UALR and the Law School faced in the accreditation process. Notwithstanding this difficulty, a separate law school in downtown Little Rock was to begin in the Fall of 1975, located in a building built by the Arkansas Bar Foundation and its affiliated Association.

IV. THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS

The Law School's road to accreditation and recognition has been a grand struggle, sometimes rewarding and sometimes disappointing. A great deal of time, tension, and effort was required by all who became a part of the Law School in the initial years toward gaining full accreditation by the American Bar Association and the Association of American Law Schools. Eventually the efforts proved successful, although not unquestioned.

Between 1965 and 1975, the school was a night division of the Law School at the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville. Because the Fayetteville school was accredited both by the ABA and the AALS, those who graduated from the law school, even though they were in the Little Rock Division, were graduates of a fully accredited and recognized law school.¹¹

10. The opinions of UALR officials are conspicuously absent in the media reports on the debate about Act 19. Because the University was against the Act, it would have been difficult for UALR to take a contrary position. No doubt, Chancellor Ross and others were involved in the "back rooms." The creation of a law school in Little Rock as a part of UALR benefited UALR greatly. It permitted what was primarily an undergraduate institution to legitimately claim a higher status among universities. This higher status is important for recruitment of faculty and students. Although UALR had some graduate programs, they were small, spread out, and offered the master's degree only. Clearly, a professional school such as a law school under UALR's domain would significantly add to its prestige and stature. Accreditation, however, was a must.

11. To those who are not part of legal education, the accreditation and recognition processes are confusing and seemingly duplicative. The primary accrediting agency is the American Bar Association. Because the highest court of most states in the United States require graduation from an ABA accredited school as a prerequisite for permission to take bar exams or to apply for admission to the bar, ABA accreditation is essential for any law school that expects to produce graduates who may wish to practice in other states. Theoretically, and it does exist in some of the larger states like California, a law school could be accredited within the state without being ABA accredited. Such accreditation greatly limits the horizons of its graduates and makes it difficult to recruit students and faculty. Without question, ABA accreditation is essential and is sought by

To begin a full-time program as well as to continue the night-time program, the problems of accreditation and recognition had to be faced. First, the ABA and the AALS¹² withdrew accreditation of the night division and refused to immediately accredit the day division program. Those actions angered both legislators and university officials in Little Rock.¹³ After substantial correspondence, consternation, and an on-site inspection in October 1975, the ABA agreed to continue the accreditation of the Law School's part-time program but to reserve accreditation of the full-time division until students were actually admitted and enrolled. A second on-site inspection was made in July, 1976. The next month the ABA gave permission to begin the full-time day program during the fall semester of 1977. In June 1977, the ABA gave provisional accreditation to the full-time day program at the Law School subject to the Law School renovating and occupying the old Federal Building located on 2nd Street between Spring and Center streets and a mere block and a half away from the other facility. In 1978 full ABA accreditation was given to both the day and the night divisions.

The AALS, with its policy of not accrediting purely night programs, initially stated that the Law School was no longer a member of the Association and could apply for membership no earlier than five years from the date of initiation of the full-time day program and after it had graduated its third class. Although this interpretation was withdrawn, the Law School still had to be judged anew for membership.¹⁴ On January 3, 1979, the Law School became the 135th member of the AALS by action of the Association's House of Representatives.

any law school that desires basic recognition.

The Association of American Law Schools (AALS) certification is of a different nature. Its approval confers membership more than accreditation. The AALS is just what its name indicates: an association for institutions concerned with legal education. Its requirements are both similar to and different from the ABA's. Failure to meet AALS standards does not affect the horizons and expectations of a law school's graduates. It does, however, reflect upon the legal community's perception of the quality of the law school. AALS member-law schools are generally considered of a higher quality than those which are not members. Membership is a recognition of quality, not basic accreditation. On the other hand, membership is important for any law school that wishes to have more than mere state or local recognition. It is particularly important for recruiting faculty on a nationwide basis. It may also have importance in recruiting students who may be concerned about the perceived quality of a school. Realistically, practically, and politically speaking, membership in the AALS was essential and a prime priority of those involved in the Law School.

12. Letter, Millard H. Ruud, Executive Director, Association of American Law Schools, Feb. 27, 1975.

13. See Arkansas Gazette, Mar. 7, 1975, at 1B, col. 2, and Mar. 8, 1975, at 6A, col. 5.

14. Letter, Millard H. Ruud, Executive Director, Association of American Law Schools, May 27, 1975.

The primary problems that the Law School faced in accreditation and recognition were its limited facilities, its inadequate library collection, and its small faculty. The last two issues were resolved by increasing the number of full-time faculty on the staff and by obtaining large amounts of money to purchase the necessary library collection. The facility issue was temporarily resolved in two unique ways. Through the determined effort of several members of the Little Rock area bar, a new facility became available to the night division on extremely advantageous terms. This was the new Arkansas Bar Center that opened its doors in January of 1975. Through a complex series of leases with the Arkansas Bar Foundation and the Pulaski County Law Library Board, the Law School was granted a lease of the north section of the building composed of approximately 30,000 square feet. The Bar Association and Bar Foundation retained the south wing composed of approximately 6,000 square feet. This facility enabled the Law School to have everything it needed: a library, classrooms, and necessary offices.

It was clear soon after operations began that the building was not large enough to accommodate the type of law school contemplated by Act 19. Although it might have been adequate for the continuation of a night program only, it would not satisfy either the library, faculty, or student demands of both full-time and part-time programs. Consequently, the University quickly began looking for additional facilities. The nearby old Federal Building constituted an obvious under-utilized facility. Since new federal facilities had been completed, the federal government was no longer using this facility and was interested in disposing of it.

Chancellor G. Robert Ross quickly seized the opportunity to obtain control over this facility.¹⁵ He negotiated approval for a transfer of the property to the University of Arkansas and made plans to seek a small amount of money for renovation from both the state legislature and private foundations that fund renovations of old buildings. With a little more than \$500,000, the Law School renovated the old Federal Building. Renovation included the complete restoration of one of the old federal courtrooms on the third floor, substantial renovation of the other courtroom, a complete renovation of the central heating and cooling system, and a partial renovation of a portion of the rest of the facility.

When the work was completed and the facility opened in 1979, the

15. See Arkansas Gazette, May 17, 1975, at 1A, col. 3, reporting on the University of Arkansas Board of Trustees' grant of authority to UALR to apply for acquisition of the old Federal Building from the General Services Administration.

University and the Law School made a great fanfare about the incorporation of the facility into the Law School. Associate Justice Byron White of the United States Supreme Court came to dedicate the building. The fanfare had both good and bad effects on the Law School. On the good side, it brought important recognition to the existence and quality of the Law School for purposes of attracting students and faculty. On the bad side, it gave the impression that the Law School's serious facility problems were resolved. Unfortunately, this was never the case. The Old Federal Building did not have sufficient space for the growth of the Law School and its library. The use of the Old Federal Building and the Bar Center created an unforeseen bifurcation of the law school program which paralyzed any growth and instituted an undesirable and potentially unaccreditable divided program.

The acquisition and remodeling of the Old Federal Building was clearly the right and necessary move at the time, but it was not a long-term resolution of the Law School's problems. It provided sufficient space to operate for a period of time and provided an immediate response to concerns expressed by the ABA and the AALS. It offered substantial proof that the University was committed to a Law School, helping to resolve fears by the various reviewing agencies about the continued existence and quality of the institution.

The accreditation issues did not go away, however. They were merely postponed. In the Spring of 1982, the Law School was the subject of another joint ABA/AALS inspection. This time the inspectors were not so kind about the adequacy of the facilities. Their report noted the difficulties the two-building arrangement created in the proper functioning of the program. In particular, the inspection team found that division of the book collection could cause substantial inconvenience to those doing legal research. But inconvenience was not the only problem. Growth of the law book collection had greatly limited the space in the Law Center Building for additional acquisitions. Using the Old Federal Building library for additional parts of the collection would increasingly exacerbate the division of the collections. There was no place to go, except to a new, unified facility.

V. FACULTY

The Law School has been blessed with an outstanding faculty throughout its existence.¹⁶ Five faculty members who started with the Little Rock Division between 1965 and 1975, were still with the Law

16. Listings of all UALR faculty members and administrators are appended.

School during the 1985-86 academic year: Ruth H. Brunson (1965),¹⁷ James W. Spears (1966), Arthur G. Murphey (1967), Glenn E. Pasvogel (1971), and Kenneth Gould (1972). These five fine faculty members have served as pillars of the Law School Faculty for over fourteen years.

Two faculty members started with the Little Rock Division, left for a few years, and returned to the Law School after it became part of UALR. Robert R. Wright III, who was the first assistant dean in 1965-66, returned in 1975. Fenton Adams, who was a faculty member between 1965-70, returned in 1976. From July 1981 to July 1982 Professor Adams also served as Acting Dean. Both are still with the Law School today.

Several faculty who are not currently with the Law School contributed significantly to its growth and maturity. Certainly, tops on the list is Robert K. Walsh, who became the first full-time dean in June 1976. He provided outstanding leadership through the school's formative years. He built a solid foundation for the development of the program, curriculum, library, faculty, and students. A great part of the success the Law School has today is attributable to the leadership of Bob Walsh. Although he left the Law School in 1981, he has never ceased to lend his support, encouragement, and advice. If the Law School can maintain the pace of development and progress set during Bob Walsh's years, the school is bound for greatness.

Several other faculty members deserve mention due to their service to the Law School. One such faculty member is John M. Sheffey, who died in December of 1985. John was a true role model for the new Law School. He desired and strove for excellence in his students and his colleagues. Although his untimely death left an indelible sorrow in our hearts, his spirit will help to loft us to higher plateaus.

The Law School benefited from the work of many others as well. Sandy Hendrick (1969-78) was UALR Law School's first acting dean. He played a significant part in the initial organization and caretaking of the Law School until Dean Walsh came on board. Professor O. Fred Harris (1977-83) was instrumental in preparing and designing the Law School's Winthrop Rockefeller Fellowship Program for outstanding minority Arkansans. This program has been a success and recognized nationally as a model program.

Professor Robert R. Wright became the Law School's first Distinguished Professor when he was named the Donaghey Distinguished

17. Ruth Brunson retired after 21 years of service on June 30, 1986.

Professor in 1977. The Law School's second Distinguished Professorship was created in 1981 by the Ben J. Alzheimer Foundation, and its first title holder was Morris (Buzz) S. Arnold (1981-83). Buzz Arnold left the Law School in 1984, subsequently became the Dean of Indiana University Law School, and is now United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas. Professor Fred Peel, who came to the Law School from a very successful tax practice in 1976, was named in 1986 the second Alzheimer Distinguished Professor.

VI. LAW JOURNAL

To develop a program of excellence and become a distinct separate institution, it was essential that the Law School begin publishing its own law journal. Previously, students at the Law School served as members of the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville Law Review. After separation of the schools occurred, a new law journal was in order and the *UALR Law Journal* was born in 1978. One distinctive feature of the *Law Journal* has been the publication of the annual surveys of Arkansas cases and statutes. These features of the *Journal* have received many compliments and enthusiastic support.

As with most law schools, the *Journal* is basically student operated and controlled. Students are initially selected for *Journal* membership by their grades and then are accepted as staff members after serving an apprenticeship. The journal's editorial board is elected from staff members. The editors-in-chief of the first volume of the *Journal* were Stephen W. Jones and Diane Mackey. Initially, only two issues were published annually. In 1981 three issues were published and in 1982, the *Journal* began publishing four issues a year. The *Journal* has published many outstanding articles, including an article by Chief Justice William R. Rehnquist. In 1983 the Arkansas Bar Association agreed to purchase a subscription to the *Journal* for each of its members, giving the *Journal* a total circulation exceeding 3,000 copies.¹⁸

VII. LAW LIBRARIES

A unique feature of the Law School has been the arrangement of the law libraries. The Law School maintains a joint collection in cooperation with the Pulaski County Bar Association. Although the two libraries are cataloged and recorded separately, the purchasing and arrangement of the collection is coordinated to effectively create one

18. Wayne Boyce, an attorney from Newport, Arkansas, was instrumental in negotiating the arrangement.

library. Both parties have benefited greatly by this joint venture. The bar has a fully staffed library and collection far exceeding what its own monies could produce, and the Law School has a significantly larger collection to use. The financial arrangement has been for UALR to pay 100% of the library personnel salaries and approximately 70% of the acquisitions, while the Pulaski County Law Library pays for the remainder of the acquisitions. This permits the law libraries to have a larger budget than they would otherwise have.

The joint collection has grown significantly since 1965, especially since 1975. In 1965, the law library had less than 30,000 volumes. When UALR assumed responsibility for the Law School in 1975, the volume count was 50,929. In January of 1986, the volume count was 156,048. Approximately 75% of the collection is owned by UALR, and the remainder is owned by the Pulaski County Law Library. Despite this growth, efforts are needed to permit the law libraries to expand their collection significantly in the future. The staff of the libraries has grown similarly, from a single librarian, Ruth Brunson in 1965, to a staff of twelve in 1986.

VIII. THE STRUGGLE FOR A NEW HOME

In the fall of 1982, following the ABA inspection team's report of the previous spring, the American Bar Association, through its Accreditation Committee, notified the University, UALR, and the Law School that its facility was inadequate and that the University must respond with its plans for dealing with these problems. After a year and a half of correspondence between the University and the Committee, the University President, UALR Chancellor, and Law School Dean were requested to appear before the Committee on May 4, 1984, to outline the University's plans. At that meeting, President Ray Thornton presented what I will call the Thornton Timetable. As recorded and endorsed by the Committee, the University would be committed to, and barring unforeseen circumstances would, meet the following timetable:

- (i) The master plan to determine whether the new Law School building should be built on campus or whether renovation and additions should be done downtown is currently underway.
- (ii) Final decision on the plan will go to the University of Arkansas Board of Trustees in either September or November 1984.

- (iii) If the decision is to move forward, then a request will be made to the legislature for planning and design money in January of 1985.
- (iv) The design is estimated to take 18 months, so that the planning and designing will be completed by Fall, 1986.
- (v) The legislature will be asked to fund the Law School building project according to plan and design in January 1987.
- (vi) If approved, the Law School building will be completed by Fall, 1988 and ready for occupancy.
- (vii) The Board of Trustees may decide to acquire the money for the Law School building through private sources either in whole or part.
- (viii) If either the Board of Trustees or the legislature fails to approve the new building project, a contingency plan has been decided upon which essentially involves the major renovation of the existing buildings.¹⁹

The Accreditation Committee adopted this timetable as a reasonable solution to the Law School's facility problems.

The timetable did not answer a very important question; that is, where is the Law School to be located? This concern had been discussed from the time the Law School was created in 1975 and was actually a part of the motivation for the legislative creation of the Law School itself. The faculty had broken down into three groups: those who favored a downtown location; those who favored a campus location; and those who favored a different location, such as the Cammack Village site. The Bar Center was constructed with the capacity of adding a number of additional stories and every effort was made to utilize this potential in the selection of a permanent location. High costs and development of the area, however, precluded this option. Through the years, the dean also considered practically every old building and vacant lot in downtown Little Rock as a prospective site. Again, the high cost of development or purchase were the common detractors.

Finally, in the summer of 1985, President Thornton developed a matrix concept to go along with the Thornton Timetable. This plan offered solutions to several difficult problems for the University. From the Law School's standpoint, it offered an appropriate, new home for

19. Letter from James P. White to Ray Thornton, President, James H. Young, Chancellor, and Lawrence H. Averill, Jr., Dean (May 17, 1986).

the law program in Little Rock. President Thornton's plan was to move the Law School to a University facility that had originally been a part of the medical school but that was currently being used by the University's Graduate Institute of Technology and Agricultural Extension Services. The facility is located in MacArthur Park, in the Southeast corner of downtown Little Rock. It would be totally renovated and a sizeable, new addition would be added for the Law Library. Current occupants would be moved to other locations.

The plan was clearly feasible and it offered significant economic and political advantages. First, it resolved several of the University's problems that had existed for many years, including the Law School's location problem. Second, it enabled the Law School both to have a campus atmosphere and to be close to downtown Little Rock. This would enable the Law School to carry out its urban educational orientation as well as offer a campus environment for its students and faculty. Third, because of the downtown proximity, the libraries could remain combined at the new site. And fourth, the plan offered a means to use under-utilized University facilities and properties.

With funds for planning and architecture appropriated by the 1985 Arkansas Legislature, the Law School is currently developing plans for this facility with the architectural firm of Wittenberg, Delony, & Davidson. Preliminary plans clearly show that, when completed, the Law School will finally have the facility it needs. The primary accreditation issue remaining will be resolved.

IX. THE FUTURE

The Law Center at MacArthur Park offers the Law School the opportunity to excel in all ways. When completed, the Law School will have a facility of which it will be proud, and from where it will work to improve its already excellent program. It will enable the Law School to attract outstanding law students and faculty, thus benefiting the Law School program, UALR, the University system, the legal profession, and the State of Arkansas.

The future for the Law School at UALR is bright. When the new facility is completed, the Law School will have reached a point where its full potential can be developed. With an almost perfect location, the Law School can provide the best of both worlds to educate young lawyers. It has been a long struggle for the Law School, but the battle is not over yet. The future holds great potential, and if the Law School can reach its destiny, the result will be worth the struggle.

UALR LAW SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

<u>Administrative Position</u>	<u>Law School</u>	<u>Last Name</u>	<u>First</u>	<u>Start</u>	<u>End</u>
Dean	UAF	Barnhart	Ralph C.	65	72
Acting Dean	UAF	Newbern	William David	72	73
Dean	UAF	Davis	Wylie H.	73	75
Acting Dean	UALR	Hendrick, Jr.	David Rogers	75	76
Dean	UALR	Walsh	Robert K.	76	81
Dean	UALR	Averill, Jr.	Lawrence H.	82	*
Associate Dean	UALR	Hendrick, Jr.	David Rogers	76	77
Associate Dean	UALR	Brantley	Ellen B.	82	83
Associate Dean	UALR	Sheffey	John M.	83	85
Associate Dean	UALR	Stafford	Logan Scott	86	*
Assistant Dean	Little Rock Division	Wright III	Robert R.	65	66
Assistant Dean	Little Rock Division	Adams	D. Fenton	66	70
Assistant Dean	Little Rock Division	Murphey, Jr.	Arthur G.	70	73
Assistant Dean	Little Rock Division	Pasvogel, Jr.	Glenn E.	73	75
Assistant Dean	UALR	Wright	Susan Webber	76	78
Assistant Dean	UALR	Patty, Jr.	Claibourne W.	77	*
Assistant Dean	UALR	Brantley	Ellen B.	78	82
Law Librarian	Little Rock Division	Brunson	Ruth H.	65	75
Director of the Law Library	UALR	Brunson	Ruth H.	75	86
Director of Clinical Programs	UALR	Gould	Kenneth S.	76	*
Director of Admissions and Registrar	UALR	Copeland	Mary Ann	76	86

UALR LAW SCHOOL FACULTY

<u>Last Name</u>	<u>First Name</u>	<u>Start</u>	<u>End</u>
Adams	D. Fenton	77	*
		65	70
Arnold	Morris S.	81	83
Averill, Jr.	Lawrence H.	82	*
Barnhart	Ralph C.	65	72
Boczar	James J.	75	78
Brantley	Ellen B.	78	*
Brunson	Ruth H.	65	86
Burke	Richard K.	84	86
		82	82
Casey	Paula J.	81	*
		79	81
Clawson	Ed	78	79
Cromwell	James J.	81	85
Danielson	Paul E.	76	77
Decora	Lambert G.	67	81
Derden	Catherine L.	84	*
DiPippa	John M. A.	83	*
Dupre	Helen	81	84
Effland	Richard W.	85	85
Eiseman, Jr.	Byron M.	76	*
Gitchel	W. Dent	84	*
Glover	Jerry W.	75	76
Goldberg	Steven H.	78	82
Gould	Kenneth S.	72	*
Harris	Ora Fred	77	83
Hendrick, Jr.	David Rogers	69	78
Hogue	L. Lynn	77	82
Jegley	Larry	81	84
Kennedy	Timothy J.	84	*
Lansky	Judith C.	84	86
Larkin	Murl A.	84	84
Leavell	Jerome F.	66	72
Maltz	Earl	78	80
Marquis	Robert H.	75	83
McCrary	Christy	79	81
McDonough	Nancy N.	82	*
Mullins	Morell Eugene	80	*
Murphey, Jr.	Arthur G.	67	*
Murphy	James W.	66	80
Oliver	Philip D.	80	*
Pagan	John R.	84	*
Pasvogel, Jr.	Glenn E.	71	*
Patty, Jr.	Claibourne W.	77	*
Peel, Jr.	Fred W.	76	*
Reynolds	Jason	80	83

<u>Last Name</u>	<u>First Name</u>	<u>Start</u>	<u>End</u>
Roaf	Andree L.	78	79
Sarver	Robert C.	79	*
Sheffey	John M.	78	85
Singleton	Charles	78	79
Spears	James W.	66	*
Spies	Frederick K.	76	80
Stafford	Logan Scott	82	*
Stein	Norman	79	84
Stengel	George W.	82	83
Walsh	Robert K.	76	81
Wright	Jacqueline S.	77	78
Wright	Susan Webber	76	*
Wright III	Robert R.	76	*
		65	66
Yowell	Marsha	79	80
