

EXHIBIT 4

Feedback Form Qualitative Data and Methodology for Examining Qualitative Data

EXHIBIT 4

Stakeholder Feedback Qualitative Data and Methodology

The Feedback Form prompted each participant to offer their comments as why they believed we should keep or change the name of our Law School. A committee consisting of law alumni, full-time law faculty, law staff, and law students conducted a qualitative analysis of the 143 pages of narrative commentary. The methodology is outlined below.

In reviewing the narrative commentary, several major themes that supported keeping the name or changing the name were identified. A list of these major themes and some representative quotes are shown below.

Representative Themes for Keeping the Name

We Should Evaluate Chief Justice Marshall by the Standards and Values of his Time.

“Justice John Marshall was literally the father of the US Judicial System. We are all fallen in the eyes of God and holding every historical figure to current standards is a slippery slope. Under that standard, virtually no one will rise above that bar. Analyzing their accomplishments and, above all, positive impact on culture and history is the standard. Under that standard, Chief Justice Marshall was a giant and created and cemented true separation of powers and judicial supremacy.” – Law Faculty

“People need to be judged in their times. It is completely unfair to judge someone from 200 years ago using today’s standards. We will look back to how society behaved today and will grow, learn, and realize that people did some pretty stupid things in 2021. It is unreasonable to argue that we need to judge past behavior by today’s standards.” – Law Alumnus

Changing the Law School Name Is Erasing Chief Justice Marshall’s History as a Jurist.

“In naming an institution after a person, one should look to the lifetime of contributions of the person whose name will honor the institution. Despite his involvement with slavery, Chief Justice John Marshall made substantial contributions to the law and to our country. Though apparently a hypocrite regarding slavery, he did not spend his life trying to destroy our country through war and secession (as did Lee, Davis, Calhoun, and many others). Marshall was a much-revered jurist and a fitting choice for the name of the new John Marshall Law School in the 1920s. He is part of our law school’s legacy, and we should be as reluctant to remove his name as we would hopefully be to remove the names of other Founding-era people who were also

flawed but who have received similar honors (e.g., Jefferson, Washington, Madison, Monroe).” – Law Faculty Member

“It is sad to say that the formation of this country has not always been the prettiest story ever told, but that is the history for any country. We must learn from our history, but there is no reason to erase everything associated with our history no matter how unpleasant. The owning of slaves was a way of life that none of us can in present day understand but did not live during that period of time. We must not erase all our history with the removal of statues, name changes and one person's ideology.” – CSU Community Member

Stakeholders Associate the Law School Name with the Law School's Identity.

“Everyone in the local legal community associates the law school as being Cleveland-Marshall. Even those who aren't alumni or members of the legal community refer to the school with its "Marshall" affiliation. As an alumnus, I feel like a name change would impact some of the school's identity within the legal community. Cleveland-Marshall is really its own identity, separate from the identity of its namesake. Why rob the school of its identity because of the inspiration for its name?” – Law Alumnus

“There are many CMLAW graduates who associate their legal career with the name Cleveland-Marshall. Changing the name would cause for confusion between alums and future alums -- making it seem as though we have all graduated from different schools, despite being from the same community. In short, I think that the law school name should not be changed.” – Law Alumnus

Changing the Law School Name Is Symbolic Change, Not Substantive Change.

“I am one of a [number] African American graduates of the class of [class]...Cleveland-Marshall has a long history of encouraging, nurturing, and facilitating minority graduates especially those that are at a financial disadvantage, but have the tenacity and intelligence to be great attorneys. I think that the school would be better suited to attack racial justice issues by hiring more minority professors, allowing them to get tenure, and really using the student/professor appeal process in a way that defends students, rather than rubber stamping professors' decisions regarding certain students. I am staunchly opposed to a name change, and believe that Cleveland-Marshall would be doing its graduates a disservice by making this change.” – Law Alumnus

“The arguments on both sides of the issue are compelling. However, I worry that a name change will serve as a divisive issue in the CM Law School community and the Cleveland community at large. It seems to me that more productive activity can be concentrated on furthering the already outstanding CM Law School efforts on

diversity and in finding ways to bridge the widening social and economic gaps in our communities.” – Law Alumnus

Representative Themes for Changing the Name

We Should Evaluate Chief Justice Marshall by Present Day Standards and Values.

“I believe the school should change the name because it is traumatizing and ostracizing to the black students who are supposed to feel comfortable and included in the CMLaw community. Also, I believe that as a school we need to stand behind our motto of Learn Law Live Justice and I think that having the name of someone who was a past slave holder does not allow us to do that. The school should stand for something greater and not allow its reputation to be tarnished by having the name of someone who did not stand for the same things that our school stands for.” – Law Student

“Though Marshall is an important historical figure, keeping the name suggests we value history over more modern concepts of true justice and equality. That sends the wrong message to our students and the community.” – Law Faculty Member

Changing the Law School Name Is Facing Chief Justice Marshall’s History as a Slave Owner.

“I think the name should be changed in recognition of the ongoing harm resulting from slavery, despite that it supposedly ended long ago. Slavery gave rise to Jim Crow, and Jim Crow is alive and well today, as evidenced across the country, particularly in states such as Texas, Georgia, Florida, and many more. While changing the name does not erase the legacy of slavery, it will at least implicitly recognize the ongoing legacy of slavery, and the harm that is ongoing to all Black people in the U.S. as a result. I regret the necessity to make such a change, given the legal legacy of John Marshall. But we must recognize the harms that have been going on for 400 years.” – Law Alumnus

“Honors should be reserved not for people of their time, but people who rose above their time. Learning law and living justice is not about falling into the flaws of the society that we have right now, but rather about understanding what injustices exist in our world and doing what is necessary to dismantle them rather than perpetuate them.” – Law Faculty Member

Chief Justice Marshall Had No Connection with the Law School.

“Marshall's long ownership of hundreds of slaves, and active slave trafficking, was a truly terrible act of cruelty and a profound moral failing -- at a time when many of his contemporaries recognized the evil of slavery and renounced it. His opinions will always be studied, and rightly so, but he does not deserve

to be honored in this way. Other than the name he has no connection to our school, and historically our school has done little to emphasize the John Marshall legacy. Many of our students of color, and alumni of color, have made it very clear that the continued use of this name is a serious affront to their dignity, and those views must be taken extremely seriously. It is time for a change.” -Law Faculty Member

“Marshall has no relationship to Cleveland State, and, to my knowledge, never even stepped foot in Ohio his entire life. Additionally, his status as a slaver and his legacy as a justice (for instance, his unconstitutional invention of judicial review) do not seem to recommend naming an Ohio law school after him.” – Law Student

We Must Consider the Unique Impact of the Law School Name on People of Color.

“When institutions commemorate and honor dead slaveholders and confederate soldiers it causes an undeniable toll on the psyche of Black men, women, and children and can result in emotional and psychological harm to Black students, faculty, staff, alumni, and other people of color in the local community who must encounter these symbols of racism, oppression, and slavery on a daily basis. Thus, why would we, as a public institution, knowing all that we now know, should not continue to honor and commemorate a man who enslaved hundreds of human being.” – Law Student

“This issue is larger than Justice Marshall. This is also about who we are and who we endeavor to be in the community. Do we strive not just for some amorphous sense of "diversity and inclusion" or do we strive to be an institution that is actively anti-racist. I think some members of our community feel a sense of harm (and not pride) walking into an institution everyday named after such a figure. It seems to me, we should be more concerned about how we attend to those harms than the concerns of holding on to a name that may no longer serve us... My conversations with various constituents have led me to a few conclusions: 1) that the debate is about, in part, that we are not sure who we are as an institution and who we strive to be; and 2) that the African American students and other students of color feel deeply wounded and unheard.” – Law Faculty Member

Qualitative Data Methodology

Qualitative Coding Committee

- Nine people were selected to serve on the qualitative coding committee.
- They represented Law School students, faculty, staff, and alumni.

Organization of the Data

- Quotes were sorted by participant group, and assigned a letter (“Group A”) to prevent identification and bias. There were seven groups of quotes that reflected the seven participant groups.
- The Committee members were unaware of the identity of the group they were coding to prevent bias. All identifying information was removed.

Coding

- Committee members were trained on the coding process.
- Committee members were assigned groups of quotes to review and identify themes.
- Each group was coded by at least two committee members to identify themes.

Review of Data

- A comprehensive list of themes was generated from the coded data.
- Themes were reviewed and revised according to committee consensus.
- The most prevalent and recurring themes across all stakeholder groups were identified for inclusion in the Report