

Memorandum

DATE: March 14, 1996

TO: John Sexton

FROM: Peter W. Martin

SUBJECT: A Proposed Framework for Involvement by Peter Martin and Thomas Bruce (Cornell's Legal Information Institute) in NYU Law School's Efforts to Make More Effective Use of Computer Technology

I have consulted with my technology partner, Tom Bruce, and have given Russell a chance to say "no". Both are comfortable with a working relationship that would have the following elements:

- As is true of the arrangements we have with commercial publishers and for 1995-96 with Chicago-Kent, the agreement should be between NYU Law School and Cornell's Legal Information Institute for the services of Martin and Bruce rather than with the two of us as individuals.
- Starting next month (April 1996) Tom and I would commit up to five days a month between us to NYU Law School, over a two year period. Depending on how we decide to structure the process, this may be a firm schedule or it may represent an average, since we anticipate that at the beginning there will be a greater need for us to be physically present.
- Because of my teaching schedule and Tom's other commitments not all that time can be spent on site in New York City, but much of it can and should be.
- We can charge for our services using the LII's daily consulting fee (currently \$2,000), but would prefer a fixed annual amount based on the agreed to level of effort (e.g., five days a month).
- The two of us would, in addition, need reimbursement of our costs of traveling between Ithaca and New York and any housing or other living expenses while at NYU.
- Our role would be principally advisory -- assisting you and the NYU faculty with information and advice -- although that can take many forms, including: 1) serving on committees, 2) preparing written reports and guides on uses of networks, CD-ROMs, the Internet in support of research and teaching, and 3) conducting workshops, demonstrations or less formal advising/brainstorming sessions. We would not have budgetary, personnel, or course responsibilities.

Undoubtedly, you have better sense than we about how to label and present our role to and within the NYU community. Options that occur to us include: visiting faculty (my current status at Chicago-Kent), consultants, or participants in a joint study. The key would be to characterize and report our activity and involvement in terms that will allow us to communicate directly with the principal elements of the NYU Law School community (e.g., faculty, librarians, technology people, and students) without having to furnish a detailed explanation in each and every case why we are asking questions, sending a memo, etc.

Let me know if you wish to proceed and how. I'm ready to move to pinning down any necessary details very quickly. If we are going to do this, I'd like, as soon as possible (the term being well underway), to begin a round of conversations with individual faculty members to learn more about their needs and

experience. And Tom will need to begin getting acquainted with NYU. Except for a meeting in Colorado with one of our corporate sponsors next Tuesday I'll be around for the next two weeks.