

Classroom 101: Course Design + Teaching with Technology

Susan S. Kuo



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Overview

- What to teach and how to teach it
 - Course descriptions and learning outcomes
 - Course evaluations
 - Casebooks
 - Syllabi
- Using technology
 - Polling platforms/student response systems (Poll Everywhere, iClicker)
 - Learning management systems (TWEN, Blackboard)
 - Game-based learning platforms (Kahoot!, Quizlet)



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

What to Teach



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Course Description—Civil Litigation Capstone

This simulation course is for third-year (3L) students interested in civil litigation. Students will be divided into two “law firms” and serve as “associates” in the law firms. The assignments will focus on the pretrial aspect of a civil litigation. Students will have an initial client meeting, write a research memo to the client, draft pleadings, draft and argue motions, prepare discovery requests and answers, take depositions, and hire and prepare witnesses for a deposition. In the course of these exercises, students will confront problems dealing with choosing the proper parties, identifying the proper jurisdiction for the litigation, settling discovery disputes, and calculating damages.



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Learning Outcomes—Civil Litigation Capstone

- Students will gain practical, substantive, and in-depth knowledge and experience through simulated experiences and projects.
- Students will use, develop, and refine lawyering skills needed for ethical and proficient representation of clients in civil litigation and will learn to work effectively as part of a team.
- Students will develop and practice necessary skills for the handling of a civil lawsuit, including written and oral communication and advocacy skills, drafting skills, critical thinking, negotiation skills, and interpersonal skills.
- Students will be exposed to the various phases of civil litigation and will use existing skills and knowledge from a variety of law school courses and will gain knowledge and skills necessary to perform duties involved in civil litigation, including interviewing clients and witnesses, drafting pleadings, arguing motions, taking depositions, and preparing discovery requests and answers.



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Course Description—Drafting with Generative AI

This course offers an exploration of generative AI tools and their integration into legal writing workflows. Students learn how AI-driven technologies can enhance the efficiency and accuracy of drafting memoranda, client letters, and other legal documents. Students will learn about the risks and limitations of legal drafting with AI. The course begins with an introduction to AI fundamentals, including large language models and prompt engineering, then delves into hands-on use of various AI platforms. Students will also examine the ethical, professional, and policy implications of AI in the legal field—covering confidentiality, compliance with professional disciplinary rules, bias, and liability considerations. By the end of the course, students will have developed concrete strategies for responsibly integrating AI into their real-world legal writing.



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Learning Outcomes—Drafting with Generative AI

By the end of this course, students should be able to:

- Articulate core principles of generative AI, including how large language models function and where they may excel or fail in legal writing tasks.
- Demonstrate proficiency in prompting AI tools to produce, revise, and refine various types of legal documents.
- Critically evaluate AI-generated text to ensure accuracy, tone, and alignment with professional standards.
- Identify and analyze ethical considerations—including confidentiality, bias, and professional discipline risks—that are associated with AI-assisted legal practice.
- Integrate AI tools into a human-centric workflow that emphasizes attorney oversight and ethical compliance.



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Course Description—Criminal Law

This course provides an introduction to the substantive law of crimes. The primary emphasis is on those rules, principles, and doctrines applicable to most or many crimes. These doctrines include actus reus (What is a criminal act?), mens rea (What states of mind are criminal?), and the defenses of insanity, intoxication, impossibility, mistake, duress, necessity, and self-defense. Some attention is also given to several specific crimes and to theories of punishment. The primary materials are selected appellate court opinions and the Model Penal Code.



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

How to Teach It



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Learning Through Class Discussion

Jacob wanted to kill Vanessa, his wife. He drove his car at a very high rate of speed into Vanessa, who was holding Xavier, their infant son, in her arms. Jacob fervently hoped that Xavier would survive the collision. The car struck Vanessa and Xavier, killing both instantly.

With what form of culpability did Jacob kill Vanessa?

With what form of culpability did Jacob kill Xavier?

*From Dressler & Garvey, Criminal Law: Cases and Materials



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Learning By Doing

Jacob wanted to kill Vanessa, his wife. He drove his car at a very high rate of speed into Vanessa, who was holding Xavier, their infant son, in her arms. Jacob fervently hoped that Xavier would survive the collision. The car struck Vanessa and Xavier, killing both instantly. With what form of culpability did Jacob kill Vanessa?

- A) Purpose because a person acts purposely with respect to a prohibited result when it is their conscious object to cause such result.
- B) Knowledge because a person acts knowingly with respect to a prohibited result when they are aware that the result is practically certain to follow from their conduct.
- C) Recklessness because a person acts recklessly with respect to a prohibited result when they consciously disregard a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the result will follow from their conduct and their disregard involves a gross deviation from the standard of conduct that a law-abiding person would observe in the actor's situation.
- D) Negligence because a person acts negligently with respect to a prohibited result when they should be aware of a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the result will follow from their conduct and their failure to perceive the risk involves a gross deviation from the standard of care that a reasonable person would observe in the actor's situation. .



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Learning By Doing

Jacob wanted to kill Vanessa, his wife. He drove his car at a very high rate of speed into Vanessa, who was holding Xavier, their infant son, in her arms. Jacob fervently hoped that Xavier would survive the collision. The car struck Vanessa and Xavier, killing both instantly. With what form of culpability did Jacob kill Xavier?

- A) Purpose because a person acts purposely with respect to a prohibited result when it is their conscious object to cause such result.
- B) Knowledge because a person acts knowingly with respect to a prohibited result when they are aware that the result is practically certain to follow from their conduct.
- C) Recklessness because a person acts recklessly with respect to a prohibited result when they consciously disregard a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the result will follow from their conduct and their disregard involves a gross deviation from the standard of conduct that a law-abiding person would observe in the actor's situation.
- D) Negligence because a person acts negligently with respect to a prohibited result when they should be aware of a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the result will follow from their conduct and their failure to perceive the risk involves a gross deviation from the standard of care that a reasonable person would observe in the actor's situation. .



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Course Evaluations

- Where applicable, the instructor related topics covered in the course to other areas of the law.
- The instructor focused on the most important aspects of the course instead of relatively insignificant points.



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Casebooks and Syllabi



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Teaching with Technology



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA



Polling Platforms and Student Response Systems



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IMPERFECT MULTIPLE-CHOICE QUESTIONS

Taylor and her nemesis, Kanye, couldn't seem to let bygones be bygones. Taylor decided to plant an explosive device into Kanye's microphone so that, whenever he started singing his song "Famous," it would blow up. She didn't want to kill him but knew that there was a chance he would die. When Kanye comes on the stage, the mic blows up, and Kanye's head blows off. Under the Model Penal Code, what is the best charge for Taylor?

- A) First-degree murder
- B) Second-degree murder
- C) Murder
- D) Manslaughter
- E) Involuntary Manslaughter



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

NAVIGATION

Criminal Law, Section 2
(Kuo-Fall)
(Fall 2024)
[Manage Features](#)

Weekly Reading Assignments
Syllabus & Course Materials
Sample Questions
Discussion & Announcements
CALI Lessons
E-Mail Options
Legal News
Formative Assessments
Exam Review Sign-Up Sheet

Administrators Only
Syllabus
Calendar
Web Links
Live Discussion
Scheduling Survey
Training
Grade Book (A)
Manage Course (A)
Course Usage (A)

Law School Portal > TWEN > Criminal Law, Section 2 (Kuo-Fall) > Grade Book > Assignments & Quizzes

Assignments & Quizzes

Grade Book Navigation

Current TWEN time: Sunday, June 01, 2025 at 10:38 PM
Times displayed in Eastern Time.

Susan Kuo
Manage Anonymous I.D.'s

Assignment/Quiz	Submitted	Version	Comments	Grade
Assessment 1 (Decina) Due: 9/06/2024 9:00 AM (Fri) Time until Due: 0 days, 0 hours, 0 minutes Submit	No Submission		Respond	Not Released
Assessment 2 (Roberta I) Due: 9/13/2024 9:00 AM (Fri) Time until Due: 0 days, 0 hours, 0 minutes Submit	No Submission		Respond	Not Released
Assessment 3 (Roberta II) Due: 9/20/2024 9:00 AM (Fri) Time until Due: 0 days, 0 hours, 0 minutes Submit	No Submission		Respond	Not Released
Assessment 4 (Jacob 1) Due: 9/20/2024 9:00 AM (Fri) Time until Due: 0 days, 0 hours, 0 minutes Submit	No Submission		Respond	Not Released
Assessment 5 (Jacob II) Due: 9/27/2024 9:00 AM (Fri) Time until Due: 0 days, 0 hours, 0 minutes Submit	No Submission		Respond	Not Released
Assessment 6 (Jacob III) Due: 10/04/2024 9:00 AM (Fri) Time until Due: 0 days, 0 hours, 0 minutes Submit	No Submission		Respond	Not Released
Assessment 7 (RAF) Due: 10/23/2024 9:30 AM (Wed) Time until Due: 0 days, 0 hours, 0 minutes Submit	No Submission		Respond	Not Released
Absences: 0			Total:	

Learning Management Systems



Joseph F. Rice
School of Law

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Criminal Law, Section 2
(Kuo-Fall)
(Fall 2024)
[Manage Features](#)

Weekly Reading Assignments
Syllabus & Course Materials
Sample Questions
Discussion & Announcements
CALI Lessons
E-Mail Options
Legal News
Formative Assessments
Exam Review Sign-Up Sheet

Administrators Only
Syllabus
Calendar
Web Links
Live Discussion
Scheduling Survey
Training
Grade Book (A)
Manage Course (A)
Course Usage (A)

Display Assignment/Quiz

Grade Book Navigation

View Assignment/Quiz ?

Grade Assignment

Edit Assignment

Assessment 2 (Roberta I)

Due on Friday, September 13, 2024 at 9:00 AM

Grading & Submission Information:

- Points Possible: N/A
- Grades have not been released
- Resubmissions are currently allowed
- Submissions are allowed after the due date

Description

Time until Final Due Date/Time: ?

Instructions: Please complete the analysis below. Your response must be no more than 100 words in length.

Roberta despised modern architecture. Therefore, she decided to burn down Sam's "modern" residence. Sam was inside, as Roberta knew. Roberta also knew that there was a very good chance Sam would die in the ensuing fire. Therefore, Roberta tossed salt over her left shoulder immediately before she torched the residence. Roberta was not sure if the salt-over-shoulder act would protect Sam, but she was optimistic that it would.

With what MPC form of culpability did Roberta kill Sam?

Issue: Did Roberta recklessly kill Sam?

Rule: A person acts recklessly with respect to a prohibited result when they consciously disregard a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the result will follow from their conduct and their disregard involves a gross deviation from the standard of conduct that a law-abiding person would observe in the actor's situation.

Analysis:

Conclusion: Roberta recklessly killed Sam when she torched Sam's house.

0 days, 0 hours, 0 minutes



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Roberta's action created a substantial and unjustifiable risk. She acted unjustifiably because her purpose was not that of a law-abiding person but rather to destroy a house she did not like. Further, the risk is substantial because fire is deadly. Finally, she was conscious of this risk, as she knew someone was in the house, and the act of tossing salt shows she was aware her actions created a risk. Being optimistic does not constitute not having knowledge of the risk she created and then disregarded. Her behavior grossly deviated from that of a law-abiding person.

	Yes	No	Yes and No	Comments
Identifies the salient facts			x	You nicely identify many salient facts, but you do not clearly state what the risk is (Sam's death), identify Roberta's action that created the forbidden risk (torching Sam's house), or connect Roberta's optimism to the salt throw.
Applies the rule to salient facts	x			"Being optimistic does not constitute not having knowledge of the risk she created and then disregarded" does not quite convey that Roberta's lack of certainty re the salt's protective powers confirmed her continued awareness of the risk to Sam's life.
Shows comprehension of the rule	x			
Provides a rationale for the conclusion	x			



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Please mark all issues that you see in the analysis below.

227

Roberta acted recklessly when she consciously disregarded the substantial and unjustifiable risk (Sam dying) she created by her conduct (torching his residence). She knew there was a very good chance Sam would die in the fire she created by torching his home. Yet, she still chose to burn it down. Her awareness of the risk she created is shown by her tossing salt over her shoulder, hoping it might save Sam. A law-abiding person would not have risked Sam's life by burning his house down, simply because they don't like the architecture of his home.

0
Answers

▲ Does not identify all salient facts

◆ Does not apply the rule to all salient facts

● Does not show comprehension of the entire rule

■ No issues raised in this analysis

1/4 kahoot.it Game PIN: 8057447

Gaming-Based Learning Platforms



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Explanation

	Yes	No	Yes and No	Comments
Identifies the salient facts			x	<p>You nicely identify many salient facts, but Roberta's decision to torch Sam's house because she did not like its architectural style is also a salient fact and renders the risk to Sam's life unjustifiable.</p> <p>You do not clearly state that Roberta knew Sam was inside. This fact made her aware of the substantial risk to Sam.</p>
Applies the rule to salient facts			x	Take full advantage of the facts you identify—e.g., Roberta's lack of certainty re the salt's protective powers confirmed her continued awareness of the risk to Sam's life.
Shows comprehension of the rule			x	You do not address why the risk to Sam's life was unjustifiable.
Provides a rationale for the conclusion	x			

This feedback is on p. 12.

< >

kahoot.it Game PIN: 8057447



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Please mark all issues that you see in the analysis below.

2

Roberta, who was aware Sam was inside of the house, took a substantial risk by torching the house. She was aware of the likelihood that burning the house would injure or kill Sam. Her “protective measures” of tossing salt confirm this awareness. While she did not want Sam to die, her uncertainty in protecting Sam by tossing salt demonstrates continued awareness of the risk that she consciously ignored. The risk is unjustifiable because disliking a house is not a valid reason to burn it and unreasonable because no law-abiding person would burn the house when a life is at risk.

▲ Does not identify all salient facts

◆ Does not apply the rule to all salient facts

● Does not show comprehension of the entire rule

■ No issues raised in this analysis

3/4

🔒 kahoot.it Game PIN: 8057447



**Joseph F. Rice
School of Law**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Explanation

	Yes	No	Yes and No	Comments
Identifies the salient facts	x			
Applies the rule to salient facts	x			
Shows comprehension of the rule	x			
Provides a rationale for the conclusion	x			

This feedback is on p. 14.



THANKS!

Susan S. Kuo
kuo@law.sc.edu
803-777-3597



Joseph F. Rice
School of Law
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA