

**Oral History of Dean Broderick
Third Interview**

This interview is being conducted on behalf of the Oral History Project of The Historical Society of the District of Columbia Circuit. The interviewer is Robert Gross, and the interviewee is Dean Katherine Shelton (“Shelley”) Broderick. The interview took place on November 28, 2016. This is the third interview.

MR. GROSS: Okay, Shelley, it’s November 28, 2016. When we last left off, it was September 1988. You purchased the new building, the new law school class had come in, you had been the Administrator for a year of the new D.C. School of Law, and you had already hired a Dean of the law school. I believe your next role was Associate Dean? Or Academic Dean?

MS. BRODERICK: Bill Robinson, our founding Dean, said he would not accept the job unless the two of us who had been running it, Stephanie Brown and me, agreed to stay on. He said, “You could be special assistants.” Bill was not of the Academy, and I said, “You know, they don’t really have special assistants, we could be associate deans. You’re going to need an academic team. You’re going to need an associate dean for administration. I actually tried to get him to make us Vice Deans. I thought that would be more fun, but he rejected that opportunity. So the idea was to do it for at least six months, and I ended up doing it for four years. I became an Academic Dean, something that in my wildest dreams I never imagined doing. And, in fact, one of my close friends in law school, who’s now a judge, Diane Berman, and I both started teaching at Antioch in 1979, and after a few years she told me she wanted to be academic dean, and I remonstrated with her for hours. I think it was the worst job on the planet. You do

exam schedules, you make faculty serve on committees they don't want to serve on, you make them teach at times they don't want to teach. It's a horrible job. Anyway, flash forward, and the next thing you know, I'm Academic Dean. And pretty quickly, I also became the Clinical Director. So I was the Associate Dean for the Academic Program, or something like that, and I was Clinical Director, and then I also was teaching Professional Responsibility. So I was a very busy person for four years.

During that time, I also got married and had a baby, which is the only way I got out of it at the end of four years. I stepped down the day Isabella was born. In any case, I became Academic Dean, and I had no idea what academic deans really do. So one of the very first things I did is email – actually, I guess it was probably pre-email, come to think of it – I called the academic deans at the area law schools and invited them to lunch to kind of find out what they did. They had never done that before, and it actually was enormously helpful. We became a support group for each other. I've often said this. No one ever goes to the academic dean with good news, right? They go to the academic dean when they've been caught cheating or when their family member is dying, when they have a health crisis, or when they are flunking out. And they go for accommodations when they need extra help. There are a lot of tears in the academic dean's office. I would come back from lunch sometimes, and I'd see a line of three or four people lined up to see me. "Oh God, maybe

I can just sneak back out,” you know? But it’s also an enormously rewarding job.

We had rules that said we didn’t want to flunk anyone out until they’d at least had a year to see if the light bulb goes on. But if they had done very poorly in the first semester—below a 2.0, say, GPA—they had to see the academic dean, who would counsel them. If you do the math, and get straight A’s in the second semester, you still would not have a grade point average that would allow you to continue, so financially it makes sense to leave now. Or, you know, all the panoply of possible counseling you might give.

MR. GROSS: You had decided, right, that you would make the D.C. School of Law academic curriculum and standard—that it would be much more sort of traditional versus that old Antioch model you did have grades and exams and everything was not pass/fail. So, it must have been a different kind of academic environment from an administrative experience?

MS. BRODERICK: Well, we tried to learn from our mistakes. It was different, but, I’ll give you an example. We decided to have grades instead of pass/fail, and we did that because students with pass/fail had trouble getting jobs because employers didn’t know what that meant. “Pass plus? What is that?” Students really, really wanted actual, concrete grades. And so we agreed to do that, but we decided we would never reveal them so we don’t rank. We just did not want a competitive culture. We wanted a collaborative and cooperative culture where people wanted to help each other. And that

is really true still today. We have an incredible, incredibly close family feeling at the Law School to this day, and students cite that. And I know this because we have a community outreach guy named Jordan Uhl, a very talented guy. For graduation last year, he interviewed about 15 third-and-fourth-year graduating students, and he asked them what was special about the law school. This was to be a video for the actual graduation ceremony. He came to us in the administrative team and said, “You won’t believe it, they all said the exact same thing. It’s just bizarre. I mean, I didn’t tell anybody what I was going to ask. They didn’t have a chance to tell each other what was going to be asked. They just all said, “It’s a family atmosphere. We’re not competitive.” It’s probably because we’re not ranked, and people help each other. There’s none of this dog-eat-dog and, you know, I need to come out better than you kind of thing. We’re not – what’s the word? We’ve never done it, so it doesn’t loom large for me, but some schools require that there have to be 10% A’s and 10% F’s, and there has to be a curve. We don’t do that. If lots of people earn A’s, that’s a wonderful thing. We were good with that. If lots of people earn really poor grades, we’re good with that, too. Because we want to actually give you the real message. This is working for you or it isn’t.

In any case, as Academic Dean, you have a wonderful opportunity to really work with people to help them try to diagnose what went wrong. I learned a huge amount from the students in those sessions. There were grownups who came in and said, “I’ve been a cop for a long time and I’ve

always been the smartest cop around, and I didn't think I had to work very hard, and I was wrong." And a guy like that who turned it around and did very, very well ultimately, but the first semester was just a crash and burn. You have people going through terrible personal crises. Illness and death and divorce and, you know, everything that happens to people, only it's happening while you're in law school, and so law school doesn't work for you. People decide pretty quickly, "I hate this. I don't like this. I don't want to do this after all." And people who desperately want to do it and can't. They can't, they just can't get the hang of it. It's deep. It's very real. It's where people live and their hearts and souls are on the table. So for four years, I had that wonderful opportunity to help counsel students and help them to diagnose what had gone wrong and to think about employing some time management strategies and taking advantage of academic support systems, of seeing the professor, and you know, this professor has his or her former exams on file in the library. Did you take a sample exam so you had the practice of what it's like to write a law school essay? Because everybody tells you, "Oh, that's totally different." But, what is it? You don't know until you've tried it. So it's a really good idea to try it before you're actually performing for a grade.

MR. GROSS: As you've said, a lot of these students, it may have been a long time since they had – they may have taken a lot of time off since they were in college, right?

MS. BRODERICK: That's right. And what the successful strategies for college are completely different from what you do in law school. I tell people it's like learning how to drive. Intellectually, you know that all these people can drive, and so you're going to be able to drive too. But those first few opportunities to drive are terrifying. You're supposed to be reading signs and seeing traffic coming at you from three or four different directions, including behind you. And you're supposed to be reading the lights and the signals and operating a wheel and pedals, and people are in the car and the radio is going on and it's terrifying. Then there's weather. And you know intellectually you're going to get there, but it's like your mind is changing gears in law school. It's the same kind of thing. You're using these tools you've never used. In college, you're supposed read everything there is to know about something and think about it and regurgitate it, to a large extent. You don't do that at all in law school. You never have a test that says "what's the rule on x?" You have to apply a whole new set of facts. You have to apply how would this rule work or this law work with regard to this set of facts. And it ain't easy. It's a lot of skills. I remember sitting in my class at Georgetown, 125 people in my class, and a 119 of us got C or below on the first Contracts task. There were 119 people who'd never seen grades like that before, there were a lot of us who were absolutely horrified. It's humbling.

MR. GROSS: How were those first few years of the new law school, of the new building, the new student classes? It was the same admissions director, so

were the students substantially similar to the Antioch students? Was there a different feel? I'm kind of curious what your impressions were of being in the new place.

MS. BRODERICK: That's a great question. I would say the students were very similar. The founding class had 54 pioneers who – and don't forget, it was an unaccredited school. You would be fine as long as the school got provisional accreditation prior to graduation of the first class, and we did that. But you had to decide to go to an unaccredited law school and trust. The founding class had eighteen people with master's degrees and six PhDs. It was deeply diverse in every conceivable way. They were pioneers, and they're still close. It's an amazing group of people and they're doing wonderful things. They're public defenders, and they work at the Office of the Attorney General and in Legal Aid offices and the D.C. General Counsel's Office. All kinds of things, all over the place.

MR. GROSS: Did the subsequent entering classes grow? Did they shrink? What happened after the first class?

MS. BRODERICK: They grew every year, and by the sixth year, we were turning away eight students for every one accepted. We were just thriving. We had an excellent bar passage rate for a provisionally-approved school. They were getting great jobs, and it was wonderful.

MR. GROSS: Let's go back and talk about some of the personal stuff, because you mentioned that in these years, between 1988 and 1992 when you're the Academic Dean, you had gotten married.

MS. BRODERICK: Well, first I met John Clegg in 1989 at Dan's Café and Pool Hall in Adams Morgan on a Friday afternoon after a faculty meeting. Some of us were thirsty, so we went out for a couple of beers at Milly & Al's, and it turned out to be one of those breathtakingly beautiful September nights. We sat outside for a long time. My nieces were at a wedding party, a bridal party, and ended up in Adams Morgan for a couple of beers, and at Dan's Café and Pool Hall. They dragged me in with them, and there was this guy I had met vaguely before, but chatted with him. He called me and said, "Ever since I ran into you at Dan's Café and Pool Hall, I've been wondering if I asked you out, would you go? I have fourth-row center Rolling Stones tickets." I said "John, I'm going to tell you right up front. I would go with your mother or your dog, but yeah, I'll go." I had no interest in him at all. We had a great time at the concert, we went to hear music afterwards in Adams Morgan, at – there was a famous guy named John A. who tap danced on the bar in one of the bars in Adams Morgan. It turns out John went there often, I went there often, and we both knew John A., and that was kind of fun. I went to dinner with him a couple weeks later, kind of as a mercy thing, and I was on that second date for 25 years.

So, I met John. Our first date was September 25, 1989. I had quit smoking on September 21, which was a good thing because that wouldn't have worked. He hated smoking. I vowed that I would quit smoking on September 21, and the date was selected because our application for provisional ABA accreditation was due the 15th. I certainly couldn't

smoke while that was in the works. I had to smoke while that was in the works, and then I'd have a week to celebrate. And on the autumnal equinox, I would clean up my act and never smoke again, and I've never had another cigarette since September 21, 1989, and I had my first date with John September 25th.

MR. GROSS: He was not a lawyer, and had nothing to do with law?

MS. BRODERICK: Nothing to do with law, not a college grad. He was a businessman. I thought he was this big, tall, nerdy business guy. Ugh, no interest in him at all. But it turns out he was really cool.

MR. GROSS: Sounds like it.

MS. BRODERICK: He was really cool. He had described his mother as "if the car is leaving the driveway, she's in it." And he was just like that. Raring to go, always up for an adventure, hop in the car, go anywhere, do anything, go hear music, a ballgame, out to dinner, different kinds of food, but loved political debate around the dining room table more than anything else in life. And loved my hometown of Maine and learned, taught himself, how to sail, or I taught him how to sail initially.

MR. GROSS: Was he from there?

MS. BRODERICK: No, he was a northwestern Pennsylvania farm boy. He grew up on a 650-acre farm, 20 miles south of Erie. He was a really smart guy, bored in school and joined the Navy in his senior year. Got a GED and saw the world.

MR. GROSS: Your daughter was born in 1992?

MS. BRODERICK: Isabella Sophia Clegg. I felt with a last name like Clegg, she needed some music in her name. She was six days shy of being a first wedding anniversary present when she arrived. I took a sabbatical, the only sabbatical I've ever had since, literally, 1979. I've had one. A total failure on my part to take advantage of the glories of the academy. I was on sabbatical. I left the Dean's office and had the summer off and then had a fall sabbatical, went back the following spring and taught just one class and then had the next summer off. So I really had fifteen months with her, and that was the best decision I ever made. It does take two full-time people, a full-time job, with raising a child, as you may have noticed. She was just perfect in every way. Just an utter delight. A happy, tractable, cheerful, raring to go, went with us everywhere.

MR. GROSS: You guys had an active lifestyle, it sounds like to me.

MS. BRODERICK: We certainly did.

MR. GROSS: Don't let the child affect that.

MS. BRODERICK: "Come on, let's go." She was a character. She was just always surprising us. We'd be driving along, and in the back of the car, you'd all of a sudden realize she's singing "Lucy in the sky with diamonds." She's two! How does she know the lyrics to that song? She was a character.

By the way, we had a fabulous wedding.

MR. GROSS: Tell about that.

MS. BRODERICK: Well, we did it entirely by committee.

MR. GROSS: Did you get married here?

MS. BRODERICK: We got married at the Mott House, across from the Supreme Court, in a beautiful garden. My sister ran the Mott House for many, many years, and her successor was actually an old boyfriend of mine, Conrad Martin. A lot of weddings take place there, and so we had a lot of committees. So, my close, close lifelong friends, almost my brothers, the Nabb brothers. Christopher Nabb lives in Washington and is Isabella's godfather. His wife made my wedding dress. She was a fashion design major at Pratt, and her neighbor turned up with the hat. We had the rock and roll band committee. We went to hear some bands to hire a band for the post-wedding party, which took place in the basement of the Irish Times Bar on Capitol Hill. We had a tasteful string quartet at the wedding in the garden. My brother had been a chef. He had been the chef at the Tabard Inn, and my brothers and sisters and I all owned a restaurant together for years, and my brother was the chef.

MR. GROSS: Where was the restaurant?

MS. BRODERICK: In Cape Cod. It was called the First Edition. He catered this. We had 220 people, and so all of us chipped in. We had dinner for 75 the night before the wedding here at our house. All the out-of-town guests and family came to the night-before-the-wedding dinner party. Note to self, don't do that again. That was a lot of work. I had to go the next morning first thing for a fitting, the final fitting of the wedding dress, on the wedding day. It wasn't quite finished yet. She was actually sewing the sleeve up on the way to the wedding, in the Jeep, bouncing along. So we had wonderful,

fabulous hors d'oeuvres. My future sister-in-law is a baker, so she made the wedding cake for 220 people, which was a gorgeous chocolate cake with basket-weave buttercream frosting and a raspberry layer. Oh god, delicious.

MR. GROSS: How convenient is it for a wedding when half your family's in the food industry. That's great.

MS. BRODERICK: Yes. Dave Carp was there, and Fred Abramson was the chair of the board. Joe Rauh and his wife Olie were there. A friend from California who's a labor organizer said, "You know, I regard myself to the left of left, but your wedding, it was liberal heaven."

MR. GROSS: What year was that? When did you get married?

MS. BRODERICK: We got married April 6, 1991, and we honeymooned in Buenos Aires and Rio de Janeiro and also in Uruguay. We had a blast. John's dowry was over 300,000 frequent flier miles, so we went first class.

MR. GROSS: So those were busy years. And exciting years.

MS. BRODERICK: I'll say. Busy as can be.

MR. GROSS: So the school gets accreditation in 1991. That must have been exciting and thrilling and relieving.

MS. BRODERICK: Yes. February. In the nick of time. And we were thrilled, not surprised at all, that the law school was thriving. It was just great. We really did it right. It's wonderful to have a law school with a lot of great features, and then get to start over and sort of take all the great features but also kind of reinvent yourself.

Antioch had three required clinics, plus a required ten-credit internship. And at Antioch, in the early years, you went year-round the first year. The first and only time you got any time off was the second summer. And they had required something like 95 credits or something, and that's just a lot. Too many. The average law school is 88 credits. So, 88 seems good. We have 90. We figure we have a lot of clinic, which is instead of what would otherwise be electives. Ninety is good. It's an average of 15 every semester for six semesters, right? So that's doable without being too oppressive. If you take a summer here and there, you can have a little bit of a lighter load from time to time, that kind of thing. And that's what most people do. So it works. But we were very intentional about everything we did. We brought in a lot of very renowned legal educators, including Gary Bellow and others from Harvard, Jay Feinman from Rutgers, and some very, very thoughtful and innovative people to talk about curricular matters.

MR. GROSS: When did you start directing the clinical program?

MS. BRODERICK: I was clinic director roughly 1988 or 1989.

MR. GROSS: And what did that mean? As a non-law school person, what does it mean to be the Clinical Director?

MS. BRODERICK: I forget exactly how many clinics we had then, probably six or so. It meant that I held a Clinical Affairs Committee meeting weekly and made sure that everyone was doing their student evaluations and knew how to do them. We had a very elaborate competency-based legal education

system, so we wanted to make sure that everyone was teaching the competencies and the 52-some competencies. You know, what is oral advocacy? When you break that down, it has a lot of components that you have to get right, right? You have to be well-organized, it has to be an oral advocate, it provides a road map. Here's where we're going and then you go there and then here's where we went. You have to have good grammar. You have to make eye contact and otherwise engage the listener. You know, all of those things go into a good oral advocacy performance. So, if you're going to teach someone to be a good oral advocate, you have to let them know what it takes, what you'll be looking for. You have to provide them multiple opportunities to perform in gradually more difficult scenarios. And then you have to give them prompt feedback so that they know where they didn't make the grade and where they were successful. And then at the end, you actually evaluate them. So you assess them going along, and in the end there's an evaluation. And so that's all very focused. There are six competencies. There's oral advocacy, written advocacy, problem solving, professional responsibility, and so on.

MR. GROSS: Where do these competencies come from? Did you guys come up with them?

MS. BRODERICK: Yes. Russ Cort and Jack Sammons did it at Antioch. So when I was hired at Antioch, I was hired as a graduate student, and I took a course on the competencies so I got really fluent in them. So if you decide these are the

competencies you're going to be teaching, that helps drive the development of your syllabus. So, I'm going to want to sprinkle opportunities for problem solving. I'm going to want to make sure that the students have written advocacy opportunities.

MR. GROSS: That helps you know what you're trying to assess, as well, I guess, at the end of the day.

MS. BRODERICK: Yes. And then we spend a lot of time – we did things like, when I was Academic Dean, let's have everyone, clinic and non-clinic faculty, talk about the ways in which they teach the competencies. So everyone come to a – we used to call them APs, Assessment and Planning sessions. We'd have a two-hour lunch, and everyone would come with the way in which they teach Professional Responsibility in a clinic or a classroom. Do you have a set class where you go over the rules that are most relevant? How do you bring up ethical issues as they arise in cases? How are they discussed? How are students evaluated or assessed in their developing, what it takes to be an ethical lawyer? So we shared those across the curriculum, and that was really helpful. It was a very exciting time in developing law schools. Thrilling, actually.

MR. GROSS: That's really neat. And tell me about the internship program as well. You just never stop directing different programs. So, in 1993, you take over that as well.

MS. BRODERICK: So, Isabella's born in 1992. On March 31, 1992, and I went back in 1993. And I guess I was asked to take over the internship program, I can't

remember quite why. And the Legislation Clinic. So the internship program, as I recall, the person who'd been running it – so the American Bar Association has very strict rules, because they see internships as a farm-out. You pay us tuition, and we send you to the Public Defender Service and they teach you. How is this a good deal for the student? What safeguards do you have in place to make sure that there's a good learning experience happening? Well, one of the things you teach is, you know, I would tell students, "You're paying us a lot of tuition dollars to go work for free for an organization, so it's in your benefit to make sure that works for you." So one thing you need to do is make sure you get good supervision. Let's look at what goes in to good supervision. I always have students talk about what's an example of good supervision that you've received, what works for you? It's important to know what works for you and what doesn't work. So I have them write down an example of good supervision and of bad supervision. And you always get the same supervisory sins. Micromanaging. "I was micromanaged. I hated it. They made me report in every five minutes." Okay, so you want to be clear that while you welcome guidance, you don't welcome micromanagement. And so, you know what you're on the lookout for. Well, what are strategies you might employ if you feel that you're being micromanaged? What are some of the things you can do and how do you escalate up the scale? Okay, we haven't solved the micromanaging problem, what do I try next? Or you've got the supervising attorney

who's your hero but too busy or never available to give you any feedback. So you can request a weekly meeting, even if its thirty minutes. Lots of strategies you can employ to improve the supervisory relationship. But remember we're going to be judging you on your problem solving, and it's not gonna be okay to come to me at the end of the semester and say "I didn't get good supervision." You've got to try to get good supervision. Escalate your efforts. And then you got to bring it to me so that I can get into it to make sure you get good supervision and we'll make a change. That's problem solving. It's not okay to not get what you need. You have to ensure that you do get what you need.

MR. GROSS: Did you have to find any of the internships?

MS. BRODERICK: A combination. Some students came and said I've got this connection to this congressman, and I've got an opportunity to work there, and I want to do that. Others were I'd like to work at doing civil liberties work, but I have no idea how to go about making that happen. I've been in D.C. for a long time and know lots of people, and so it's not hard for me to arrange for people to get internships in lots of places.

MR. GROSS: And, were you teaching during these years as well?

MS. BRODERICK: We had a seminar component, and I taught something called Perspectives on Social Justice. We would read law review articles about critical race theory, feminist theory, labor union perspective, and many, many other topics. And I would actually have the students teach the class. They would take turns teaching the class, often. People did amazing things.

They would arrange debates, they would do a talk show. Fascinating. I loved it. It was a great, great course.

MR. GROSS: So that was not connected with the internship?

MS. BRODERICK: It was. If you have more than six credits, there has to be a seminar. And so some schools have an internship where it's all judicial and everybody clerks for a judge. We wanted to let people do whatever they wanted to do, so that meant a more generalized seminar component. And they all had to write a 25-page paper. So I had up to 20 students in the internship program at a time, and I had to grade multiple drafts of 25-page research papers. That was torture.

MR. GROSS: I know the pain well. And then you're also continuing to represent clients?

MS. BRODERICK: So at this time, I was teaching I think Professional Responsibility. And I taught Professional Responsibility by, I would have them actually do a take-home exam because I wanted them to roam through all of the Rules of Professional Responsibility and to find the right answer. I always had wonderful do-gooder lawyers making terrible mistakes. Do-gooders like me think that do-gooders are the angels and the saints and they always get it right, but they don't. And so I always have some wonderful crusader lawyers screwing up conflicts of interest and so forth, and they have to find and root out what the rules are and apply to these contexts. I loved teaching Professional Responsibility.

Then I got into the Legislation Clinic. At this time, we were downtown at 13th and G, and there was a guy who played keyboards at the Metro station every morning. Everybody called him the music man. Dave Clarke hired him to play at his birthday party. He was great. You'd be coming up and you'd hear him play and "All right!" you know? He'd play great soul stuff and wonderful uplifting, upbeat music. And one day, Louise Helms, a member of the faculty, came in and said, "They've arrested the music man!" It turned out he was arrested under this new statute that criminalized panhandling. They had taken him to jail for panhandling, when in fact, he just played music and had a bucket for tips. So the next day, I saw him, and I said, "I understand that you were arrested yesterday. I'm a lawyer, and I work right up the street, but I get paid by the D.C. government, so I don't have to charge people when I take cases, and if you wanted to talk to me about maybe representing you, I'd welcome the chance to do that." And he dashed into my office, picked up his keyboards and his buckets and all that stuff. And Phillip Smallwood became a client of mine for years. I represented him in countless cases. It turned out that we challenged the statute as unconstitutional and overbroad. It characterized saying "alms for the poor, alms for the poor." If you say it a second time, that's aggressive panhandling. It was just an outrageous statute, and it was used really to harass people. So I prepared to go to trial over and over again, and every time it went to trial, the government would dismiss the case. It was wonderful, and I got interested

in challenging the statute and ended up writing a Law Review article about it.

I had just been working on a case, a piece of legislation around the death penalty, with Dave Clarke. And through Dave had been introduced to Art Spitzer, who was the Legal Director of the ACLU in Washington, D.C., and I had gotten to be friendly with him. He was wearing a very handsome fish tie, a tie with fish on it for some reason, I'm sure why. I was writing this first Law Review article, and when I first looked into panhandling, I thought, okay, that must be commercial speech, and I was completely ignorant. Wrong. It was actually protected speech. Saying "alms for the poor," you're allowed to say that in the public forum. So I learned a huge amount about the First Amendment, and Art was kind enough to critique the article, the draft, and he loved it and wanted to send it around to other jurisdictions that were challenging these overbroad, quality of life statutes. Many of them criminalizing panhandling all over the place. And as a result of that, I was asked to actually join the Litigation Screening Committee of the ACLU and then ultimately, the Board and became the President and Vice President on the Board for a million years. I'm still on the Litigation Screening Committee and the Nominations Committee.

MR. GROSS: What happened to the statute?

MS. BRODERICK: It was upheld. It was a 2 to 1 vote.

MR. GROSS: In what court?

MS. BRODERICK: In D.C. Court of Appeals. But in the end of the day, there were a lot of amendments made to clean it up a little bit. It was awful. It was these Rudy Giuliani, quality-of-life statutes that were passed, thousands of them all over the country.

MR. GROSS: Was your client locked up?

MS. BRODERICK: He was locked up many times overnight, and they would seize his keyboard as an instrumentality of the crime of panhandling. He used to say to me, "Panhandling? Begging? I hate beggars. I'd rather rob you, and I know how." He had been a career criminal, and he was so smart that he became kind of a jailhouse lawyer, and he found the proverbial loophole and got himself out of jail when he was about 50. He said, "Begging? I don't beg. I work two shifts a day." Which he did. Every day. He was there every day, morning and evening shifts.

MR. GROSS: What happened to him? He kept playing and everything was fine? They stopped harassing him?

MS. BRODERICK: He kept playing for many years. He would move his buckets a little further away. He actually died of sickle cell anemia, and a lot of us contributed to try to help him at the end. He was a lovely, lovely guy. Wonderful guy. I have a wonderful picture of Isabella with him when she was a little girl. I loved doing that work with him.

MR. GROSS: I just want to close the loop on the Legislation Clinic because it was around the same time. You're teaching in that capacity?

MS. BRODERICK: Yes. In December, the Dean said to me, “Shelley, I want you to run the Legislation Clinic.” Bob Bergdorf, who then ran it – It was founded by Bob Bergdorf and David A. Clarke, and Bob Bergdorf was the principal author of the Americans with Disabilities Act. He did supervise the federal portion of the clinic. And Dave Clark, the immediate past chair of the D.C. Council, supervised the local part. Dave ran for mayor in 1990 and lost very badly. When he ran for mayor, he had to give up his Council seat. So he came to teach at the law school and co-direct our Legislation Clinic and did that until 1993 when his successor, Johnny Wilson, committed suicide. Dave ran for the seat again and won handily. And so I all of a sudden, having worked closely with Dave to get the law school established, I became his boss as Academic Dean. I made him put up all his plaques and his memorabilia on the wall. “Oh, I don’t want to do all that.” And I said, “Yes. The students need to know who you are and the chops that you have. I want that up.” So we had a big unveiling of his gorgeous office with all of his amazing things.

MR. GROSS: You first met him when he was on the Council, then?

MS. BRODERICK: I did. Well, I met him first when he was a Ward One council member because my first client, when I was a third-year law student, he had been represented by him previously. They wanted to revoke his parole, and so I sought Dave Clarke out and talked to him about that.

MR. GROSS: And there he is then working at the law school, so then he leaves the law school?

MS. BRODERICK: He goes back onto the Council. But when he was at the law school he said, "Look, you need to place students in the offices of the D.C. Councilmembers because the D.C. Council writes the check, writes the appropriation for the law school, and they need to know and love the students. They need the help, and the students then will get jobs, and one day it will be the graduates of the public law school for the District of Columbia who become members of the D.C. Council and who work in the agencies and become the mayor and become the local judges. And that's all true. We currently have a member of the D.C. Council is an alum. We have two brand new judges who graduated from the D.C. School of Law, Nakia Waggoner and Shana Frost Matini. So proud of them I can hardly stand it.

MR. GROSS: Who is the Councilmember?

MS. BRODERICK: LaRuby May, Ward One. She replaced Marion Barry for whom she interned when she was in the Legislative Clinic. And if you look in the D.C. Council, Chiefs of Staff, and Legislative Council, and so on, all over, countless members of the Council, are our graduates.

MR. GROSS: And that's Dave Clarke's legacy?

MS. BRODERICK: One of his many legacies, yes.

MR. GROSS: So then you took over that program?

MS. BRODERICK: Well, I said to the Dean, "You want me to direct the Legislation Clinic? I know legislators, I know nothing about legislation." "You'll be fine, you'll be fine."

MR. GROSS: Following up a guy that was the chair?

MS. BRODERICK: Chair of the Council, yes. Well, one of the things Dave did, is he inveigled the general counsel to the Council to actually come and do three sessions teaching the students statutory drafting. So I picked right up on that, and Charlotte Brookins-Hudson, for years, guest-lectured and taught in the Legislation Clinic, the legislation drafting, and then when she retired from the Council, she actually came and co-directed the clinic for a few years and was fabulous. She just retired, and we just started a wonderful new clinic with a federal focus. They actually just drafted a piece of legislation, and that was approved this semester in the D.C. Council, that would eliminate the tax on feminine hygiene products. They don't tax Viagra, but they do tax Tampax. Why is that, exactly? They shouldn't. Our client was a group that supplies homeless shelters, and one of the biggest expenses is feminine hygiene products. And so if you eliminated the tax on those, it would be really helpful.

MR. GROSS: And the students did that?

MS. BRODERICK: The students did that.

MR. GROSS: Wrote the legislation? Very cool.

MS. BRODERICK: Really cool. The beat goes on.

MR. GROSS: Okay. So, a few other points here in the early 1990s. Because there's a lot going on, so I want you to help take me through this. There seem to be a number of battles over funding for the law school.

MS. BRODERICK: Yes.

MR. GROSS: First, in 1991, this is under Mayor Sheila Pratt-Dixon and then in 1994. Was it serious? I mean, these were times when there's at least threats of "We're gonna defund the law school" so why was that happening and what was that experience like?

MS. BRODERICK: Sharon Pratt-Kelly, Sharon Pratt-Dixon-Kelly, was her name actually. Sharon Pratt-Dixon, then, zero-budgeted the law school two years in a row. Marion Barry zero-budgeted the law school. So there were various reasons, I've talked to you previously about Barry. Sharon Pratt-Kelly just rubber-stamped the previous budget, so we ended up having all kinds of organizing efforts and, actually, John Wilson and John Ray – So the mayor proposes a budget to the Council, and we were zero-budgeted in that. And then the Council comes up with, they have to use the same total number, but they can move the money around. "Oh, we're gonna take it from this committee and give it to that." And so, John Wilson and John Ray came up with the money to restore the funding for the law school by moving it from other areas.

MR. GROSS: Did you think the mayor was driven by the same concerns that Marion Barry was driven by?

MS. BRODERICK: No. She rubber-stamped it. She just wasn't careful. There wasn't some initiative she wanted to do. It wasn't a meaningful thing to her. She didn't cry herself to sleep when it got reversed. But it was annoying because, if you recall, it made me work a lot. Sharon Pratt-Dixon-Kelly came in with a clean sweep. We're gonna do things right. We're going to

build a budget. That didn't happen. That didn't happen. It was sort of heart-breaking.

So Dave Clark becomes Chair again and so the law school had provisional accreditation, and in those days the ABA required that you owned your own building, and the law school at that time was leasing a building. And so Dave wanted to help us help to fund securing a building for the law school. So he added a million dollars a year to the budget so that the law school could enter into a lease-purchase arrangement and lease to purchase a building.

MR. GROSS: The same building you were in, or a new building?

MS. BRODERICK: No. We would identify a new building. And we were thrilled. Finally, we're going to own our own building, we'll have full accreditation. When you have provisional accreditation, the American Bar Association sends a site team in, a seven-person team, for three days. You have to submit a full-cell study and 2,000 pages of accompanying documents. It's an enormous work.

MR. GROSS: Every year?

MS. BRODERICK: Every year. It's an enormous time suck. And, of course, when we finally got full accreditation, my stock line was, "Now that we got the ABA boot off our neck, we can turn our attention to ending poverty and inequality." It was an exhausting enterprise, but a worthy enterprise. The ABA had some silly rules, like why do you have to own your building? Why wouldn't a 20-year lease suffice? What's up with that? But, in any case,

he announced the addition of a million dollars. And, right at that time, *The Washington Post* picked us out as the poster child for poor budgeting. The Senate Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia announced that they were going to cut a hundred million dollars from the D.C. budget and close the D.C. School of Law. This was announced on Bastille Day in 1994, and the front page of *The Washington Post*, and students transferred in droves and students made the decision not to come and attend. They attended other law schools as a result which had a terrible impact on us. We launched a battle, and at the end of the day, Carol Moseley-Braun wrote a “Dear Colleague” letter that we drafted for her and got members of the Black Caucus and others to sign on saying, “As a matter of Home Rule, it’s fine for us to cut the budget, but it’s not okay for us to say what items in the budget the District of Columbia has to cut. That’s up to D.C., and D.C. should do that.” So at that time, we won that battle, but, oh boy, was that devastating.

MR. GROSS: So that entering class in 1994, the people that had already accepted in the summer, some of them declined to come? Others decided to transfer?

MS. BRODERICK: Yes. Half the seat deposits didn’t come. Half the people who had put their money down to hold the seat.

MR. GROSS: They didn’t show up in August or September of that year?

MS. BRODERICK: They didn’t come. Yes. And lots of people transferred. So it was devastating because that plays out over who comes and who passes or

does not pass the bar three years hence, and so on. So, meanwhile, the writing was on the wall. The city had announced a \$722 million deficit.

MR. GROSS: Right. These were the times of the budget control mess.

MS. BRODERICK: Yes. Congress announced a financial control board, and Alice Rivlin came in and did the Rivlin Report, called for the closure of the law school. I've been teasing Alice about that ever since. Because we fought that back. It was every week, there was another extraordinary life-or-death struggle. Congressman Charles Taylor tried to get the law school closed. There were nineteen negative editorials about the law school. "We have plenty of law schools. We just don't need another law school." Alice Rivlin's report said, "It's a good law school, and it's got an important mission and it's meeting its mission, but we can't afford it." It was devastating.

MR. GROSS: So what ended that spiral? Because it's hard to attract students and faculty in that environment.

MS. BRODERICK: What happened was the writing was on the wall that we would be defunded, because with slashing the budget, every member of the D.C. Council was looking for money and here we were, the tiniest agency. Here was this \$4.5 million delicious dollop that everyone was lusting after. So Bill Robinson, our Dean, asked us to put together a taskforce, on which I served, to come up with a plan to survive.

MR. GROSS: This would have been in 1994?

MS. BRODERICK: And going over into 1995. It was a five-part plan we developed. It was to cut our budget in half, merge with the University of the District of Columbia, eliminate the million dollar annual rent cost, double tuition, start a part-time program to increase enrollment, and go after every grant there is, and we put that plan in force. Dave Clarke, as Chair of the Council, told UDC, "You're taking a law school" and UDC fought it. Dave Clarke called the Chair of the Board of UDC Law School into his office and read him the Riot Act. "Make this happen." Michele Hagans was the UDC Chair of the Board, and she is a major donor to the law school annually for years since because she regarded it as one of the great legacies that she had. She was a founding mother, because without her making that happen. She insisted that UDC do this important thing.

MR. GROSS: Why?

MS. BRODERICK: She got that public universities ought to have a public law school. You're training your people to run your own city. Law's a huge part of that. She just got it.

MR. GROSS: The Council was behind it?

MS. BRODERICK: The Council was behind it. Once our budget disappeared into the UDC budget, nobody was going to get their hands on it anyway. We cut it in half. It was another example of real leadership, and I give Bill a lot of credit. Everybody was slashing and burning everything. It's a miracle that we survived. We moved up to UDC, so we made plans to move July 1.

MR. GROSS: This is 1996?

MS. BRODERICK: No. This is 1995. And we were gonna move July 1 to UDC, and classes would start later in August. Our absolute drop-dead date was August 23rd, and I know this because I negotiated the lease with the help of David Split, our general counsel. There were huge penalties that would come into play if we overstayed August 23rd as the lease day. And July 1, we were all packed up and ready to move.

MR. GROSS: Are you having déjà vu as this is happening.

MS. BRODERICK: Oh, god. Traumatic. At least I wasn't negotiating this lease from a payphone. It could have been worse. So, the plans are made to move us to UDC, but UDC "we're not ready, we're not ready, we're not ready," and we go through the month of July, we're all sitting on the boxes in our office all packed up. Guess what day we moved? I bet you can guess. August 23, 1995. We moved on the last possible day. We arrived, and there wasn't a working elevator on campus. They had no cleaning contract. The city had cut \$18.6 million from the University's budget, mid-year. That doesn't work for an academic program. We had the only working copier, because we still had a copier contract, we were still paying our copier contract. The whole university's lined up to use our copier.

MR. GROSS: What building did you move into?

MS. BRODERICK: We moved into what is now Fannie Mae. It was called Building 49, and it was a lease building right over by where the Metro is. It was a horrible,

horrible building. My office was down this long hall in a windowless cave. It was just awful. They had us on the second floor, the third floor, and the sixth floor, or something like that, so we were not connected all together. You had to walk a million miles to get to a copier. It was just horrible. None of us had windowed offices except the Dean and the Associate Deans. Everybody else was in windowless offices. Many of them empty. All the windowed offices were empty, but they gave us the windowless offices. The HIV/AIDS Clinic files, suddenly that file cabinet was on the trash dock. We had to retrieve that. And people said awful things to us in elevators, and they assigned us one classroom. You had to walk all the way across campus, and because there wasn't a working elevator, you walked up four flights to get to your classroom, and half the time it was locked and you couldn't get in to hold the class. And when you did get in, there were roaches. But we persevered.

The ABA came in for the annual visit. We had provisional accreditation, but when you merge with a university, you have to start over. So once again, as long as you have it prior to the graduation of the class, and so the old folks were grandfathered in from the D.C. School of Law. We'd now become UDC School of Law. And we had to get provisional accreditation. We moved in August of 1995 and we had to have in by 1998. And sure enough we got it in February of 1998, but that was a miracle too.

MR. GROSS: I wanted to ask you about that. First, did students end up transferring as well that didn't want to move from the DC School of Law to UDC?

MS. BRODERICK: Yes. I had inveigled my niece into coming to the law school. She was a Tufts graduate and came to the law school when we were downtown, thriving, and everything was wonderful, and next thing we know we're broke and we're moving to UDC in what felt like the dead of night. She actually graduated from UDC and had a wonderful experience. A wonderful, wonderful experience. Went to work for the Justice Department Honors Program and had a great career. But, boy, that was very difficult times. Very, very difficult times.

MR. GROSS: You continued to supervise the internship program?

MS. BRODERICK: I did the internship program and the Legislation Clinic.

MR. GROSS: And still doing it? When you transferred over to UDC, the academic program largely remained the same?

MS. BRODERICK: Totally. Yes.

MR. GROSS: Did all the faculty come over as well?

MS. BRODERICK: Yes. Well, actually, we laid off two faculty members and some staff. It was horrible times.

MR. GROSS: Did you think about leaving?

MS. BRODERICK: No. I was a true believer. I just was. I thought it was the greatest experiment in legal education and such important work, and we just had to keep going, make this happen. So we moved up to UDC and it was very lean times. So it was an adjustment in a lot of ways. We had been an

independent law school for years, even while we were Antioch. Antioch was in Ohio, so we didn't salute anybody. We were used to running our own show. Well we get to UDC, and there's this Board. I had nothing to do with the merger agreement, but Bill and the team crafted a merger agreement that said whatever laws are in place for the law school will stay in place unless or until the Board of UDC changes them, so the faculty handbook was grandfathered in, and it's still in place. The institutions were very different, so UDC didn't have tenure. We had tenure. We had different leave and benefits. UDC's were much better than ours. It took me years to get UDC to let us have the same leave and benefits as our colleagues down the hall. We were in this awful leased building that was never going to work, and in fact, the university gave that building up. It made provision for all of the university programs to move onto campus. The university owned buildings on campus, except the law school. They said we just don't have money for you. This is the space you can have, but there's no money. That was 1998 when I first became Dean. It was about the first thing I had to do. On our Board was John Pickering of Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, a legendary lawyer, and he looked the part. He looked like Gregory Peck as Atticus Finch. Tall and imposing, white hair and a cane. He went down to the control board with me because when the law school was independent, we had had a capital budget, and suddenly that capital budget, when we moved to UDC, just disappeared. It was there, and with John Pickering, I was on his arm, they found that

money and suddenly we had a capital budget that we could use to build out space for us. So suddenly we had space like everybody else had that actually had offices and looked like a law school.

The first year, no cleaning contract, it was horrible. The second year, they started classes for the rest of the university on October 1. The law school said no, we can't do that. That will violate ABA accreditation standards, so we started in August, and the rest of the campus didn't start until October 1. And some ridiculous notion that there would be money for the new fiscal year. It made no sense. It's just not how academic programs run. It was awful. So we were at the mercy of the Board. The Board had to agree to tenure people, and the Board had to agree to approve things that we needed. It's interesting, the university to their credit never required us to put our academic programs through a process that didn't work.

MR. GROSS: You kept the tenure system?

MS. BRODERICK: We kept the tenure system. The thing was no one at UDC really had any experience with ABA accreditation, so they were very deferential about that. And that was a good thing because we actually knew what we were doing with regard to accreditation, and we were in compliance and knew how to stay in compliance. We appreciated the hands off on that part of it. But boy, some very tough times.

So in 1997, things got a little better. There was a little more stability, and, of course, again we had to go for accreditation in this environment.

MR. GROSS: How were admissions? Were you bringing in new students?

MS. BRODERICK: Yes. Not in huge numbers. In 1997, we had to apply for provisional accreditation as UDC.

MR. GROSS: To make sure that those first graduates that came in in 1995 could take the bar exam?

MS. BRODERICK: That's right. So in 1997, we had to apply, and the decision was actually made in February of 1998. We had to put together the case.

MR. GROSS: Were you involved in that?

MS. BRODERICK: I was totally and completely involved. I wrote the testimony for the Chairman of the Law School Board, the President, and the Dean. Because you really need one person to do that so they each cover the appropriate bases and not the same territory. Our Dean was down in Tennessee for the hearing, and I was drafting testimony and hand-delivering it to the President's house and the Board Chair's house and faxing it to the Dean. I had always been the drafts person for the testimony through the years. The morning of the hearing, *The Washington Post* front page said the District of Columbia balanced its budget for the first time in years, and I faxed that headline down to the Dean.

MR. GROSS: Dewey defeats Truman [laughter].

MS. BRODERICK: And we got the vote by one vote. I had a dear friend on the ABA council named John Kramer who had been my professor at Georgetown and had gone on to become the Dean at Tulane. He was a family friend and a very close friend of my sister's. I had known him for years, and I knew him, and he had been enormously helpful in counseling how to approach various aspects of it. Our Dean, Bill Robinson, was wired too and knew a lot of the members of the council and was really working on building the vote. That night, John Kramer called me from the airport, and he said, "I'm absolutely not allowed to tell you, but you got it." That day, I had gone to church. My husband, daughter, and I went to church and we went out to brunch afterwards, and I remember weeping. I remember weeping. I was morally outraged that we were going to go down and this wonderful, bold and important experiment was going to fail because of stupid politics.

MR. GROSS: Why were you pessimistic?

MS. BRODERICK: Because the ABA teams would come in and put their arms around our shoulders and pat us, saying I'm so sorry you have to go through this. There wasn't enough money, the facilities were terrible, bar passage rate wasn't good. We knew how to do it. We were turning it around, but it's like turning a ship. It doesn't turn on a dime. A lot goes into it. But I really think that the fact that we had been doing so well and knew how to do it. We had the stable leadership. Little did they know, within a week of receiving provisional accreditation that February, Bill announced that he was stepping down. He was never so relieved.

Really, Bill was able to make the case that this is the public law school for the nation's capital, which is now a solvent city. Every jurisdiction has a law school. There are only a couple that don't. That was pretty compelling.

So we got it, and there was a big party. Everybody flooded over here. The students had been advised not to go. The president of the Student Bar Association was a great guy named Joe Askew, and Joe Askew rented a band and I encouraged him all the way, as did Professor Edgar Cahn, who was the founding Dean of Antioch with his late wife, Jean Camper Cahn. We both said, "Hell, we've got nothing to lose. Absolutely. This is your law school." They rented a van, and they drove through the snow through the Appalachian mountains of Tennessee, and they convinced the ABA to allow them to make a presentation, and they did, and they lobbied. The ABA never let another student body speak because it's sort of like what are you going to do, ruin their lives? They did a wonderful job. They were brave advocates. Joe is the government relations head of Verizon. Good advocate then, good advocate now.

MR. GROSS: You deserved that party.

MS. BRODERICK: It was a hell of a party.

MR. GROSS: You still had provisional space, you still get the visiting team, each year.

MS. BRODERICK: Bill announced that he was going to step down in February, and he and I put together a draft plan for the University to have a search committee and who would be on the search committee, and it would be Judge Pryor, who

was a member of the faculty, and I would be on it to do the grunt work.
That was always my role.

MR. GROSS: I'm sensing a pattern.

MS. BRODERICK: We did the advertisement that the University would need to publish for the Dean. We did the notification to the ABA. We put together a package of everything that was needed to have a smooth and quick transition, and then the Provost just didn't act on it. She didn't appoint the committee. UDC had a culture of interims, and that year, there were three deans, and all three were interim deans. It was just crazy. They just weren't acting. I was in New Jersey, at the Jersey Shore, at my sister-in-law's for Memorial Day weekend, and it occurred to me, oh my God, I'm going to be Interim. I have to buy some suits. I went out to Lord & Taylor and bought five suits because I knew I was going to be Interim. Bill said to me the following week, we were going up escalator, and he said, "You know you're going to be Interim," and I said, Yes, I bought suits." So I had to apply, and I applied, and I was the unanimous choice of the faculty, I'm proud to say. I was not a candidate for the Deanship. I had absolutely zero interest in being Dean.

MR. GROSS: But you had a lot of experience. When you think about going even back to 1988, you were kind of running a law school in some sense. So why weren't you interested?

MS. BRODERICK: I saw myself as an activist lawyer, not an administrator. Who wants to be the administrator? I still scratch my head. I had absolutely no interest. Joe

Libertelli was a vital role player. He was a Class of 1985 Princeton grad, first in his family to go to college, ran track at Princeton, and then went to Antioch Law School and was a radical student leader, very involved every day in the law school. It was his idea to go to Dave Clarke and say, “The law school ought to be part of UDC, you ought to take over Antioch.” Joe led a sit-in. We moved the whole law library down to the Freedom Plaza to capture the attention of the press and get people excited about the notion of having a public law school. Joe was the alumni member of the Board of the D.C. School of Law. Always a fabulous activist. When I became Dean, what had been the independent board of the law school had become the board of the D.C. School of Law, which was a fundraising board. They had been the operational board, but they became the fundraising board. The first thing I said to them was, “I need another pair of hands,” and I was allowed to hire Joe for \$20 an hour, and he’s been there for eighteen years. We eventually got him on in Career Services, now he’s been the Alumni Director for years. He’s just a valiant soldier in the cause. I’m just about to nominate him for a Founder’s Day award for most giving to the University, the most stalwart. So I’ve been thinking about him.

MR. GROSS: You found out you’re going to be Interim Dean, so let’s hear about that.

MS. BRODERICK: I remembered why I brought up Joe. Joe was my right arm as interim. What happened was UDC, the Provost was named Beverly Anderson, and she named Alice Thomas, a member of the faculty, as the Chair of the

Search Committee. Poor Alice Thomas was an untenured faculty member. That's not how you have search committees. There were all these tenured people, why would you not have a tenured person chair the Search Committee? So she came to me. There was a candidate that we all thought would be really good, and none of the other candidates we thought were good. They begged me to apply because if we didn't get the person we wanted, it'll be horrible. We could get some totally horrible person. Joe really convinced me to do it. He said, "You can do this. You're the only person who knows it and cares about the mission. It's like trying to tell a stranger about rock and roll for anybody else to come in and know the politics. You have to do it." It was spring break, and I forget what exact date the application was due, but I was driving to Florida. I was riding along in the back of my mother-in-law's motor home on the way to Florida to take my mother-in-law camping, my daughter, my husband and I, and I was handwriting out my application. In the application to become Dean, I talked about the five initiatives I had launched as Interim, and it was really the process of writing the application that fired me up because it just really hit me. I know how to do this. I will get us accreditation. I know what to do, and I know how to make this happen. And then they offered it to the first person. The faculty sent up three names. The person everybody wanted, me, and then somebody who they felt was totally unqualified. So the Provost offered it to the first person, and the day she sent the letter offering the Deanship to the first person, she sent a letter to

the rest of us candidates saying, “Thank you very much, we’ve selected so-and-so. So-and-so a month later said no, and so they offered it to the third person who we felt was had – let me just put it this way. He had no administration experience, no fundraising, no ABA accreditation experience. The Provost then went to Alice Thomas and said, “I want to open it up to the fourth candidate.” She came down shaking in her boots to tell me that on a night in August. She asked to meet with the faculty the next day, and I called the chairman of the board, who said, “Sorry. I can’t talk now.” Nobody was around. I was sort of shell-shocked. I had been invited by a member of the board to go to a D.C. vote event at the Mott House, the place where I was married, that night. Joe was going to go, and the member of the board had said there’s a funder I really want you to meet, so come to the D.C. vote thing. He’s going to love you. He’s a major funder, and it’s going to mean real bucks for the law school, so you have to come. I was disconsolate. I got into Joe’s truck, and we drove in his Toyota truck, and we drove over to the Mott House, and I was just disconsolate because the Provost was going to subvert the process the very next day, and we weren’t doing anything about it. I got there, and it was a surprise party for me. They thought we were going to have this other dean, so they planned this surprise party to thank me for being Interim for a year, and they had Joe Telman dressed up as me with his hairy legs and all in a dress, and they had written songs and skits. They had family and friends. My whole world was there. Board members, the whole faculty

and staff were there. What they had all realized is we'll just organize at the party. The Chairman of the Board was there, everybody was there.

MR. GROSS: So they all knew at this point what had happened?

MS. BRODERICK: Yes. And they were all organizing, so the next day, a posse of civil rights lawyers, Wade Henderson and Bill Robinson, went to see the President and said, "So your directive was that the search committee should send you three names, and three names and have been sent, and two offers made, and there's a third offer. What's going on?" Suddenly, I got the offer from the Provost. Boy, you never want to see sausage made, you don't want to see how legislation is made, and you don't want to see how my Deanship was made.

MR. GROSS: What a great ending.

MS. BRODERICK: She was having an orientation, because the entire two new Deans, and I suddenly became the third Dean. Two of us had been Interim the year before. They were having that orientation that day, and she called me up to go and took me into another room and said, "I'm offering you the job as Dean." So I went into orientation for the new Deans.

MR. GROSS: Very cool.