
STUDENT LEGAL SERVICE'S PLAN

1981 Report

ANNUAL STATISTICS

The following data was gathered from records existing between August 1, 1980 and July 31, 1981.

CASES OPENED 271

Accident	3	Criminal	57	Name Change	12
Adoption	1	Expungement	6	Personal Inj.	1
Banking	1	Family	44	Power of Atty.	7
Bankruptcy	2	Housing	56	Small Claims	9
Civil	8	Insurance	1	Traffic	57
Consumer	6				

CASES CLOSED 277

Accident	2	Contract	1	Name Change	14
Adoption	1	Criminal	50	Personal Inj.	2
Banking	1	Expungement	5	Power of Atty.	7
Bankruptcy	1	Family	45	Small Claims	11
Civil	8	Housing	63	Traffic	56
Consumer	9	Immigration	1		

CASES IN LITIGATION AS OF JULY 31, 1981 88

Accident	3	Criminal	12	Insurance	2
Adoption	1	Expungement	1	Name Change	1
Bankruptcy	2	Family	19	Power of Atty.	1
Civil	5	Garnishment	1	Small Claims	8
Consumer	2	Housing	24	Traffic	6

CONTACTS 4221

Accident	86	Employment	72	Personal Inj.	29
Adoption	4	Expungement	10	Power of Atty.	14
Banking	13	Family	172	Real Estate	27
Bankruptcy	4	Fgn. Std. Aff.	2	Residency	1
Business	12	Housing	645	Small Claims	212
Civil	398	Immigration	11	Tax	50
Consumer	315	Information	1341	Traffic	328
Contract	29	Insurance	34	University	167
Copyright	13	Name Change	24	Wills	39
Corporation	1	Patent	9	Workman's Comp.	2
Criminal	157				

ADVICE ONLY CONCLUDED 1499

Accident	78	Employment	28	Personal Inj.	24
Adoption	4	Expungement	10	Power of Atty.	8
Banking	11	Family	120	Residency	1
Bankruptcy	4	Housing	274	Small Claims	91
Civil	233	Immigration	3	Tax	14
Consumer	121	Insurance	22	Traffic	259
Contract	29	Name Change	18	University	16
Criminal	128	Patent	1	Workman's Comp.	2

Civil	15	Family	4	Small Claims	111
Copyright	12	Information	1341	Tax	36
Criminal	2	Insurance	5	Traffic	22
Employment	23	Patent	5		

REFERRED TO SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES 641

Consumer	158	Housing	338	University	143
Fgn. Std. Aff.	2				

CONTENTS

	Pages
Introduction	
I. Office Procedure - Service to Individual Students	1 - 4
A. Scope of Service and Statistics	1
B. Complaints and Client Satisfaction	1 - 4
II. Preventive Law Activities	5 - 6
III. Liaison With Bar Association	7
IV. Law Student Participation in the Program	8
V. Evaluation	9
Appendix	

INTRODUCTION

This report covers the operation of the Student Legal Services Program for the time period from August 1, 1980 to July 31, 1981. During that period the office has continued to expand both its educational activities and its contacts with individual students. The Program has the support of the local bar and both attorneys are active members of the American, Illinois and Champaign County bar associations. The Program has been favorably reviewed by the Board of Trustees and has gained 711 program eligibility status from the College of Law. In its third year of operation the Program has continued to advance the objectives of the Student Legal Services Plan.

I. OFFICE PROCEDURE - SERVICE TO INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

A. Scope of Service and Statistics

The statistical data contained in this report includes both the monthly intake statistics and an annual statistic composite covering the period from August 1, 1980 to July 31, 1981. The number of client contacts with the office has steadily increased since the beginning of the Program and shows a marked increase over the same period a year ago. During the past 12 months, the office has had contact with 4,221 clients. Excepting weekends, official University holidays and vacations, an average of 18 persons per day have used the office during the past 12 months. This compares with an average of 14 persons per day using the office during the previous 22 months of operation. The statistical breakdown for the past year is included in the Appendix and reflects client contact in three broad categories: 1) general information and referral, 2) advice only, and 3) cases represented, as well as case-type categorization.

B. Complaints and Client Satisfaction

During its third year of operation the Student Legal Service's office has continued its follow-up evaluation questionnaire procedure in an effort to measure client

I. OFFICE PROCEDURE - SERVICE TO INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

B. Complaints and Client Satisfaction (cont.)

satisfaction with services rendered. The survey results contained in the Appendix cover the period from August 1, 1980 to July 31, 1981 and are divided into two categories: "advice only" (problems generally resolved through advice of law students in direct consultation with the attorneys) and "clients" (cases in which one of the attorneys enters an appearance of record in a court proceeding). Questionnaires were sent to each client whose case was completed during that time period and to a randomly selected one out of ten "advice only" clients. All responses were tabulated.

The questions presented can be divided into three cluster groups: a) program perceptions (Questions #1, 9-15, 17-19), b) case perceptions (Questions #2-4, 20), and c) system perceptions (Questions #5-8, 16). The percentage response to each question is fully detailed in the Appendix.

a) Program Perceptions

Data assembled indicates a continuing overall high satisfaction with the Program among both advice only contacts (A.O.s) and clients. Although satisfaction still appears to run somewhat higher among clients, satisfaction among A.O.s has shown a marked improvement

I. OFFICE PROCEDURE - SERVICE TO INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

B. Complaints and Client Satisfaction (cont.)

a) Program Perceptions (cont.)

over the last year. An extremely high percentage of both groups continue to express satisfaction with services received.

b) Case Perception

Satisfaction with case handling was very high among clients. Although A.O.s indicated a somewhat lesser degree of satisfaction, here also is evidenced a considerable improvement over last year's responses. The results indicate marked success in the office's efforts to improve satisfaction among A.O.s with the services received.

c) System Perceptions

Both groups appear to be somewhat skeptical regarding the efficacy of the American legal system although there is considerable contradiction in the responses. Roughly 45% believe the system is biased but only a very small percentage indicate that they have little respect for the system.

I. OFFICE PROCEDURE - SERVICE TO INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

B. Complaints and Client Satisfaction (cont.)

The survey results show a high degree of satisfaction with the Program and the quality of individual representation and counseling. Efforts will be made to maintain and improve upon this record.

II. PREVENTIVE LAW ACTIVITIES

One of the primary goals of the Student Legal Services Plan is the implementation of a significant legal educational program aimed at informing students of their rights and obligations under the law. In turn, this has been one of the major goals of the office. The efforts expended in this direction have been designed to assist students in the management of their personal affairs in such a manner as to minimize potential legal problems. This program has involved both personal appearances by the attorneys and publication and distribution of written materials designed to inform students of their legal rights and responsibilities.

Over the past year, the Students' Attorneys have given numerous talks, seminars and workshops for campus groups and organizations. They have also participated in several University functions such as New Student Orientation, Quad Day, and the Campus Resource Fair. (See Appendix).

The number and scope of the publications made available to students has expanded in number and scope. The office continues to provide students with the many informational pamphlets published by both the Illinois and American Bar Associations. In addition, the office has published and made widely available the Student Legal Service Guide to Small Claims Court, the Guide to the Student Legal Services Program and the Your Legal Rights and Responsibilities booklets. This

II. PREVENTIVE LAW ACTIVITIES

latter publication provides students with basic legal information in the areas of consumer affairs, domestic relations, housing matters and the criminal justice process.

Further ideas for extending and broadening the educational functions for the office are presently under consideration. It is contemplated that these will include both additional written material and, as time allows, an expanded schedule of speaking engagements. Efforts continue to evaluate the reach and effectiveness of these activities.

III. LIAISON WITH BAR ASSOCIATION

The Student Legal Services Plan mandates that the Students' Attorneys establish and maintain a liaison with the Champaign County Bar Association in order to secure local support for the Program and to facilitate effective and prompt handling of referrals. The relationship that has developed between the Student Legal Services Program and the Champaign County Bar Association is excellent and the local bar continues to be very supportive of the Program. During the past year, Ed Rawles has served as the Champaign County Bar Association Representative on the Student Legal Service Advisory Board.

Both of the Students' Attorneys are active members of the Champaign County Bar Association, the Illinois State Bar Association and the American Bar Association. I continue to serve as a member of the Illinois State Bar Association's Standing Committee on Legal Education and Admission to the Bar and as a representative from the Sixth Judicial Circuit to the Illinois State Bar Association General Assembly. During the past year, I have also been elected to, and serve on the Board of Governors of the Champaign County Bar Association and the Executive Steering Committee of the Student Legal Services Section of the National Legal Aid and Defenders Association.

IV. LAW STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN THE PROGRAM

The most significant event that has occurred during the past year has been the granting of "711" program participation status by the University of Illinois College of Law. Under this program and pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 711, senior law students are now allowed to engage in actual litigation and representation under supervision of one of the attorneys. This is particularly significant as the realization of one of the goals set forth in the original Student Legal Services Plan adopted by the Board of Trustees. During the first two semesters of eligibility under this program, the attorneys have carefully monitored the performance of participating students and the results have been highly favorable. Continued 711 participation will not only provide law students with a valuable learning experience, but should continue to enhance the credibility and stature of the Student Legal Services Program.

V. EVALUATION

During its third year of operation the Student Legal Services Program witnessed the attainment of two significant goals. In October of 1980 the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois reviewed the operation of the Program (along with that of the SORF program) and authorized its continued funding and operation. This successful completion of the two year "pilot" period serves to insure the stability and viability of the Program for the foreseeable future. The other significant development of the past year has been the designation by the College of Law of the Program as an eligible 711 agency. This has been a goal of the Program from inception and its realization is a particularly welcome accomplishment.

The overall operation of the Program continues to reflect the broad success of the Plan. The office offers extensive educational opportunities to the student body at large and provides high-quality legal advice and representation to increasing numbers of individual students. The Program continues to receive broad support from the campus, the community and the local bar association. It has established itself as a viable and valuable service that benefits all of the students. The Program begins its fourth year in operation having accomplished the goals of the Plan and having earned the respect and confidence of the people it serves.

APPENDIX

Book list

Client Contacts - Statistics

Survey Results

Minutes

Budget Summary

Speaking Engagements

Articles

Court Appearances

INVENTORY OF BOOKS IN THE OFFICE

JULY 31, 1981

Publisher: ALI-ABA COMMITTEE ON CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Immigration Law & Practice

Trademarks & Copyrights

Publisher: BUILDING OFFICIALS & CODE ADMINISTRATORS INTERNATIONAL, INC.

BOCA Basic Property Maintenance Code (1978)

Publisher: CALLAGHAN

Callaghan's Illinois Civil Practice Forms, Volumes 1-8

Goldstein Trial Technique, Volumes 1-3, 2nd Edition (Goldstein & Lane)

Publisher: CLARK BOARDMAN COMPANY, LTD.

Guidebook to the Freedom of Information and Privacy Acts, Bouchard & Franklin

Police Misconduct Law & Litigation, 2nd Edition, Avery & Rudovsky

Publisher: COMMERCE CLEARING HOUSE

1981 Master Tax Guide

Publisher: THE FOUNDATION PRESS, INC.

Damages, 2nd Edition, Parts 1 & 2, 1952, McCormick & Fritz

Publisher: IICLE (Illinois Institute for Continuing Legal Education)

Code of Professional Responsibility Annotated

Creditor's Rights in Illinois

Equitable Remedies in Chancery

Immigration & Naturalization

Law for the Legal Secretary and Para-professional

Misdemeanors & Moving Traffic Violations

Tenant's Rights

Workmen's Compensation Practice

Illinois Civil Practice Before Trial

Illinois Civil Trial Practice

Illinois Civil Practice After Trial

Page 2
Inventory of Books

Publisher: IICLE (Illinois Institute for Continuing Legal Education)

Illinois Civil Trial Evidence
Illinois Family Law, Volumes 1-2
Illinois Basic Practice Guide
Illinois Criminal Practice, Volumes 1-2
Illinois Matrimonial Law System

Publisher: ILLINOIS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION- PANTAGRAPH PRINTING

Illinois Criminal Decisions Outline
Illinois Rules and Practice Handbook

Publisher: INSTITUTE FOR MANAGEMENT

Federal Register Digest

Publisher: THE LAWYERS CO-OPERATIVE PUBLISHING COMPANY

Am-Jur Proof of Facts 2d, Volumes 1-26 and Quick Index
Complete Manual of Criminal Forms, 2d Edition, Forms 1:1-28:7, Bailey
& Rothblatt
Complete Manual of Criminal Forms, 2nd Edition, Forms 29:1-70:3, Bailey
& Rothblatt
Handling Consumer Credit Cases, Clark & Fonseca
Illinois Evidence Manual, 2d Edition, Volumes 1-2, Gard
Successful Techniques for Criminal Trials
Trial Handbook for Illinois Lawyers, Hunter

Publisher: MATTHEW BENDER

Bankruptcy Code 1981
Bankruptcy Rules 1979
Collier on Bankruptcy 1981

Publisher: MARTINDALE-HUBBELL

Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory, Volumes I-VI, 1976

Publisher: SHEPARD'S INC.

Shepard's Illinois Citations, Case Edition, Parts 1-2, 1966
Shepard's Illinois Citations, Statute Edition, 1966
Shepard's Illinois Citations, Supplement to Case Edition, 1966-80
Shepard's Illinois Citations, Supplement to Statute Edition, 1966-80
Shepard's Illinois Citations, Cases & Statutes, June, 1981
Shepard's Illinois Citations, Cases & Statutes, July, 1981

Publisher: WEST PUBLISHING COMPANY

Illinois Annotated Statutes, Volumes 1-148, Smith Hurd
Illinois Annotated Statutes, Constitution, Articles 1-end, Smith-Hurd
Illinois Annotated Statutes, Index, A-Z, Smith-Hurd
Illinois Annotated Statutes, Tables and Cumulative Supplement, Smith-Hurd
Illinois Annotated Statutes, 1963-78, Tables, Smith-Hurd
Illinois Annotated Statutes, 1978, Laws, Volumes 3-6
Illinois Annotated Statutes, Supplement, July 1979 and October 1978,
Smith-Hurd
Illinois Legislative Service, Volumes 1-7, 1979; Volumes 1-7, 1980
Corbin on Contracts, 1951, Corbin
Simpson on Contracts, 1954, Hornbook
Illinois Decisions, Volumes 1-355 N.E. 2d
West's Illinois Decisions, Volumes 1-48 (continuing)
West's Illinois Decisions, Paperback Supplements (continuing)
Illinois Digest, Volumes 1-37
Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions - Civil 2nd Edition
Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions - Criminal - Burdette Smith Company
Blacks Law Dictionary, Revised 4th Edition
Illinois Law & Practice, Volumes 1-40
Illinois Criminal Law & Procedure, 1981

1980 Illinois Vehicle Code books
The Code of the City of Champaign, Illinois
Code of Ordinances, City of Urbana, Illinois

ATTORNEYS' SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS

August 13, 1980	Campus Resource Fair
August 14, 1980	International Students' Orientation
August 22, 1980	Quad Day
September 18, 1980	Triangle Fraternity
October 22, 1980	Sherman Hall
November 5, 1980	Illini Dames
November 10, 1980	Clark Hall
January 8, 1981	International Students' Orientation
January 17, 1981	International Students' Orientation
February 17, 1981	Allen Hall
February 18, 1981	Sherman Hall
February 19, 1981	Gregory Drive Residence Halls
February 23, 1981	Florida Avenue Residence Halls
February 23, 1981	Tax Seminar
February 24, 1981	Peabody Residence Halls
February 26, 1981	Ogelsby Hall
March 2, 1981	Evans Hall
March 3, 1981	Allen Hall- Unit One
March 10, 1981	Snyder Hall
April 2, 1981	Saunders Hall
June 10, 1981	International Students' Orientation

SLS SURVEY

CLIENTS ONLY (145 responses received)

PLEASE CIRCLE ONE (Category response indicated by percentage)

1. I was satisfied with the goal the staff and I agreed to pursue in my case:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
66.2	26.9	4.8	2.1	0

2. I consider the final resolution of my case to be fair:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
60.0	25.5	4.8	5.5	4.1

3. The outcome of my case resolved my legal concern:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
50.7	24.8	9.0	2.1	3.4

4. The final resolution of my case was what I desired:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
53.8	24.8	9.0	6.9	5.5

5. In my opinion, the U.S. legal judicial system as a whole is:

a. Very fair,	Fair,	Unfair,	Very unfair,	No opinion
4.1	64.1	15.9	6.2	9.7
b. Very understandable,	Understandable,	Confusing,	Very	
2.8	48.3	36.6		
confusing,	No opinion			
4.8	7.6			
c. Very unbiased,	Unbiased,	Biased,	Very biased,	No opinion
4.1	25.5	41.4	6.2	22.8
d. Very responsive,	Responsive,	Unresponsive,	Very unrespon-	
6.2	46.9	20.0	6.9	
sive,	No opinion			
20.0				
e. Very helpful,	Helpful,	Unhelpful,	Very unhelpful,	No opinion
5.5	48.3	14.5	2.8	29.0

6. Lawyers and other legal professionals on the whole are:

a. Very trustworthy,	Trustworthy,	Untrustworthy,	Very untrust-
13.1	59.3	5.5	1.4
worthy,	No opinion		
20.7			
b. Very approachable,	Approachable,	Unfriendly,	Very unfriendly,
20.0	64.1	4.8	0
No opinion			
11.0			

- c. Very professional, Professional, Unprofessional, Very unprofessional, No opinion
24.8 64.1 2.8
.7 8.3
- d. Very industrious, Industrious, Lazy, Very lazy, No opinion
19.3 66.2 2.1 0 8.3
- e. Very responsible, Responsible, Irresponsible, Very irresponsible, No opinion
18.6 62.8 3.4
0 15.2
- f. Very clear, Clear, Vague, Very vague, No opinion
15.2 48.3 18.6 2.8 15.2
- g. Very concerned, Concerned, Unconcerned, Very unconcerned, No opinion
9.0 54.5 15.1 0
21.4
- h. Very dependable, Dependable, Undependable, Very undependable, No opinion
20.7 59.3 3.4 0
16.6
7. I respect the U.S. legal judicial system:
Very much, Somewhat, Very little
32.4 57.2 10.3
8. Since my recent experience with SLS, this respect has:
Increased, Remained the same, Decreased
27.6 66.2 6.2
9. I felt I was treated with courtesy and respect by the SLS staff:
Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
79.3 19.3 1.4 0 0
10. The staff members were approachable: I felt as though I could ask questions and discuss matters freely:
Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
71.7 25.5 1.4 .7 .7
11. I felt the waiting period for my appointment with SLS was reasonable, given my understanding of their situation:
Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
68.3 29.0 .7 2.1 0
12. I felt the staff members assigned to my case were competent:
Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
73.1 22.1 4.1 0 .7

13. I felt the staff afforded me adequate opportunity to participate in the handling of my case:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
44.8	40.7	11.7	.7	2.1

14. I felt SLS gave me the same quality service as a private law office would have:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
51.7	20.0	24.8	2.8	.7

15. I would use SLS again if I had a qualifying legal problem:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
79.3	17.9	2.1	.7	0

16. Through my experience in the legal process, and because of the particular way SLS operated, I have:

- a. A better understanding of the legal process:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
18.6	46.2	22.1	11.7	1.4

- b. A better understanding of the role and function of attorneys:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
21.4	53.1	13.8	11.0	.7

- c. Been motivated to take a greater interest in the law and current legal issues:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
10.3	22.8	33.8	28.3	4.8

- d. Learned that there is not necessarily a legal remedy for every problem situation:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
18.6	33.8	37.9	6.2	3.4

17. I feel the SLS represents a valuable service to students:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
87.6	9.0	3.4	0	0

18. I feel support of SLS to be a good allocation of a percentage of my SORF fee monies:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
86.9	10.3	1.4	.7	.7

19. I feel that without SLS I would have had greater difficulty in resolving my problem:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
71.0	18.6	6.9	2.1	1.4

20. In retrospect, the legal problem I had affected my:

- a. Academic performance:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
21.4	15.9	13.1	29.0	20.6

- b. Job performance:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
15.9	10.3	22.8	31.0	20.0

- c. Family life:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
29.0	13.8	10.3	26.2	20.7

- d. Social relationships:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
20.7	19.3	7.6	31.7	20.7

- e. General well-being:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
26.2	32.4	8.3	20.0	13.1

SLS SURVEY

A.O.'s ONLY (66 responses received)

PLEASE CIRCLE ONE (Category response indicated by percentage)

1. I was satisfied with the goal the staff and I agreed to pursue in my case:
Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
28.8 53.0 12.1 4.5 1.5
2. I consider the final resolution of my case to be fair:
Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
12.1 45.5 31.8 9.0 1.5
3. The outcome of my case resolved my legal concern:
Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
13.6 50.0 24.2 10.6 1.5
4. The final resolution of my case was what I desired:
Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
18.2 34.8 25.8 13.6 7.6
5. In my opinion, the U.S. legal judicial system as a whole is:
 - a. Very fair, Fair, Unfair, Very unfair, No opinion
4.5 56.1 16.7 3.0 19.7
 - b. Very understandable, Understandable, Confusing, Very
4.5 56.1 33.3
confusing, No opinion
3.0 3.0
 - c. Very unbiased, Unbiased, Biased, Very biased, No opinion
0 34.8 42.4 6.1 16.7
 - d. Very responsive, Responsive, Unresponsive, Very unrespon-
3.0 39.4 33.3 3.0
sive, No opinion
21.2
 - e. Very helpful, Helpful, Unhelpful, Very unhelpful, No opinion
4.5 33.3 27.3 0 37.8
6. Lawyers and other legal professionals on the whole are:
 - a. Very trustworthy, Trustworthy, Untrustworthy, Very untrust-
7.6 63.6 4.5 0
worthy, No opinion
24.2
 - b. Very approachable, Approachable, Unfriendly, Very unfriendly,
10.6 74.2 0 0
No opinion
15.2

- c. Very professional, Professional, Unprofessional, Very unprofessional, No opinion
16.7 68.2 4.5
0 10.6
- d. Very industrious, Industrious, Lazy, Very lazy, No opinion
10.6 62.1 3.0 0 24.2
- e. Very responsible, Responsible, Irresponsible, Very irresponsible, No opinion
10.6 62.1 3.0
0 24.2
- f. Very clear, Clear, Vague, Very vague, No opinion
6.1 51.5 30.3 3.0 9.1
- g. Very concerned, Concerned, Unconcerned, Very unconcerned, No opinion
3.0 63.6 10.6 1.5
21.2
- h. Very dependable, Dependable, Undependable, Very undependable, No opinion
4.5 63.6 6.1 0
25.8
7. I respect the U.S. legal judicial system:
Very much, Somewhat, Very little
30.3 62.1 7.6
8. Since my recent experience with SLS, this respect has:
Increased, Remained the same, Decreased
15.2 75.8 9.1
9. I felt I was treated with courtesy and respect by the SLS staff:
Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
57.6 42.4 0 0 0
10. The staff members were approachable: I felt as though I could ask questions and discuss matters freely:
Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
57.6 34.8 4.5 3.0 0
11. I felt the waiting period for my appointment with SLS was reasonable, given my understanding of their situation:
Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
45.5 47.0 7.6 0 0
12. I felt the staff members assigned to my case were competent:
Strongly agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly disagree
36.4 43.9 18.2 0 1.5

13. I felt the staff afforded me adequate opportunity to participate in the handling of my case:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
28.8	45.5	21.2	4.5	0

14. I felt SLS gave me the same quality service as a private law office would have:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
13.6	27.3	36.4	18.2	4.5

15. I would use SLS again if I had a qualifying legal problem:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
50.0	40.9	7.6	0	1.5

16. Through my experience in the legal process, and because of the particular way SLS operated, I have:

- a. A better understanding of the legal process:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
4.5	47.0	33.3	12.1	3.0

- b. A better understanding of the role and function of attorneys:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
6.0	37.9	30.3	21.2	1.5

- c. Been motivated to take a greater interest in the law and current legal issues:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
1.5	42.4	31.8	22.7	1.5

- d. Learned that there is not necessarily a legal remedy for every problem situation:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
18.2	47.0	22.7	12.1	0

17. I feel the SLS represents a valuable service to students:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
71.2	19.7	7.6	1.5	0

18. I feel support of SLS to be a good allocation of a percentage of my SORF fee monies:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
63.6	21.2	9.1	4.5	1.5

19. I feel that without SLS I would have had greater difficulty in resolving my problem:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
36.4	36.4	15.2	7.6	4.5

20. In retrospect, the legal problem I had affected my:

a. Academic performance:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
4.5	19.7	25.8	30.3	19.7

b. Job performance:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
4.5	16.7	19.7	37.9	21.2

c. Family life:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
1.5	28.8	19.7	31.8	18.2

d. Social relationships:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
1.5	31.8	10.6	40.9	15.1

e. General well-being:

Strongly agree,	Agree,	Not sure,	Disagree,	Strongly disagree
13.6	45.5	6.0	25.8	9.1

Court: Landlord Must Pay Security Deposit Interest

By BRUCE LITTLE
News-Gazette Staff Writer

A state appellate court has ruled that landlords who own a group of buildings in a single tract of land are required to pay tenants interest earned on their security deposits — provided there are 25 or more rental units on the property.

The ruling, handed down Thursday by the Fourth District Appellate Court in Springfield, upheld an earlier decision rendered in a small claims dispute between two University of Illinois students and Urbana landlord James O'Malley.

The students, Steven A. Rushton and Margaret L. Plecki, filed suit against O'Malley about a year ago, demanding that he pay them 5 percent interest on the \$100 security deposits he collected from them and held for two years while they lived in the Michigan East Apartments, 366-410 E. Michigan Ave., U.

Rushton and Plecki based their claim on a 1978 state law requiring landlords with 25 or more rental units to pay vacating tenants the 5 percent interest.

O'Malley disputed the claim, maintaining that each of the eight buildings in the Michigan East de-

velopment is a separate entity. Since there are only 12 apartments in each building, O'Malley contended, he was not bound to pay interest to former tenants.

Last March Champaign County Associate Judge Jack DeLaMar ruled against O'Malley, ordering him to pay \$10 each, plus court costs, as interest to Rushton and Plecki.

The appellate court Thursday upheld DeLaMar. "Real property means land as well as buildings and land can contain within its parameters residential units," wrote Appellate Justice James Craven, the author of the court's opinion. "If more than 25 units are within a certain area, then the statute applies."

The attorney who represented Rushton and Plecki, UI Legal Service counsel Richard Witham, called the ruling "significant in that it effectuates the purpose for which the statute was designed — that is, a situation where a landlord has control over a substantial amount of money to do with what he pleases."

The decision does not touch on the situation where a landlord has more than 25 holdings which are not on

adjoining pieces of property. In that instance, Witham said, "It is my feeling that the statute would not be applicable."

A representative of the Champaign-Urbana Tenants Union, Terry Cosgrove, called the appellate court ruling "wonderful" but noted it affected "only a small number of tenants."

"We'd like to see the legislature extend the law to all tenants," Cosgrove said. "We'd at least like to see it extended to where, if you have 20 units in Champaign and 20 units in Urbana, or more than 25 leases altogether, then you'd have to pay interest."

O'Malley agrees with Cosgrove that the law should be changed, calling it "very cloudy."

"It's not clear what constitutes 25 units," he said. "Mine was a 12-unit building, and I have to have separate building permits for all eight of those buildings. Each one is a separate entity."

He said he had made no decision yet on whether to appeal further, adding that the amount of money involved may be too small to make it worthwhile.

▼

COURT APPEARANCES

August 1, 1980 - July 31, 1981

August, 1980

15 (Haasis)

3 (Witham)

September, 1980

13 (Haasis)

17 (Witham)

October, 1980

22 (Haasis)

23 (Witham)

November, 1980

32 (Haasis)

14 (Witham)

December, 1980

17 (Haasis)

15 (Witham)

January, 1981

28 (Haasis)

35 (Witham)

February, 1981

25 (Haasis)

23 (Witham)

March, 1981

17 (Haasis)

11 (Witham)

April, 1981

28 (Haasis)

27 (Witham)

May, 1981

28 (Haasis)

10 (Witham)

June, 1981

13 (Haasis)

15 (Witham)

July, 1981

15 (Haasis)

1 (Witham)

TOTAL 447